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Anyone entering on the study of architecture must understand that even though a plan may have abstract beauty on paper, the four façades may seem well balanced and the total volume well proportioned, the building itself may turn out to be poor architecture. Internal space, that space which cannot be completely represented in any form, which can be grasped and felt only through direct experience, is the protagonist of architecture. To grasp space, to know how to see it, is the key to the understanding of building.


In Japan, no concept of "space" came into being. Not once has a concept of space like the ones in the West emerged. In the beautiful spaces at Jikō-in, there is no "space". Katsura Villa, Kinkaku-ji and all the other beautiful and elegant buildings considered to represent Japanese perfection in architecture do not contain any "space" as such. Such beauty as exists is a beauty stemming from the "non-existence of space".

This research presents the work of the Japanese architect Kazuo Shinohara (1925-2006) and studies five of his residential designs as epitome of his oeuvre. Its development is understood as a continuous quest to reconcile two key elements, the house and the city, in order to put emotion at the heart of domestic space. These two elements were present in his preoccupations from the beginning of his career, but only managed to merge them in his last designs.

This work is based on the assumption that it is one of the first in-depth research studies developed beyond the conventional segmentation and explanation of Shinohara’s work. It thus considers it more important now to open new perspectives on Shinohara’s oeuvre than to focus on any of its aspects, a task that might be pursued later on.

Analyzing some of Shinohara’s first writings and using as a starting point his simultaneous design of two very different houses, House in White and House of Earth (1964-1966), this thesis delineates a connecting line among three more choice projects spanning 20 years of practice, thus shedding a new light on Shinohara’s design methods and helping explain their unity behind their apparent dissimilarities: Tanikawa House (1972-1974), House in Uehara (1975-1976) and House in Yokohama (1982-1984).

After a general description of Shinohara’s relevance and main ideas on tradition, domesticity and the city, it continues with the argumentation of why a certain group of projects has been left out of this research and analyzes the five projects of this evolution, pointing out their common traits and their consistency with the general exploration, started by Shinohara in 1964, about the house as a work of art.

Further original contributions of this thesis to the field of Shinohara’s studies consist in the translation for the first time into English of a founding article, “The House is Art” (1961), and an abridged version of “Subjectivity of Residential Design” (1964), and the reproduction of a previously unpublished text by Shinohara, “A Discourse On Tokyo; From Tokyo, Via Kazuo Shinohara: An Objective” (1998).

The complete sets (as extant today) of the original construction drawings for the five houses are reproduced in a separate volume at reduced scale, with added English captions.

Key words: Kazuo Shinohara, Japanese Architecture, Residential Design, Tradition, House, City, Art, Emotion.
RESUM

Aquesta investigació presenta l’obra de l’arquitecte japonès Kazuo Shinohara (1925-2006) i n’estudia cinc dels seus dissenys residencials com epitom del seu treball. El seu desenvolupament s’entén com una recerca continuïa que mira de conciliar dos elements clau, la casa i la ciutat, per tal de posar l’emoció al cor de l’espai domèstic. Aquests dos elements ja eren presents en les seves preocupacions des de l’inici de la seva carrera, però només va aconseguir fusionar-los en els seus últims dissenys.

Es basa en la constatació que aquest és un dels primers estudis d’investigació en profunditat desenvolupats més enllà de la segmentació i explicació convencional del seu treball. Per tant, considera que ara és més important obrir noves perspectives sobre l’obra de Shinohara que centrar-se exclusivament en un dels seus aspectes, una tasca que pot ser desenvolupada en el futur.

Analitzant alguns dels primers escrits de Shinohara i utilitzant com a punt de partida el disseny simultani de dues cases molt diferents, la Casa en Blanc i la Casa de la Terra (1964-1966), aquesta tesi traça una línia de connexió entre tres altres projectes significats, abarcant vint anys de pràctica, per tal de llançar una nova llum sobre els mètodes de disseny de Shinohara i ajudar a explicar la seva unitat darrere de les seves aparents diferències: la Casa Tanikawa (1972-1974), la Casa a Uehara (1975-1976) i la Casa a Yokohama (1982-1984).

Després d’una descripció general de la rellevància de Shinohara i de les seves idees principals sobre la tradició, la domesticitat i la ciutat, continua amb l’argumentació de per què un determinat grup de projectes s’ha quedat fora d’aquesta investigació i l’anàlisi dels cinc projectes d’aquesta evolució, assenyalant els trets comuns i la seva coherència amb l’exploració general, iniciada per Shinohara el 1964, de la casa com una obra d’art.


En un volum a part s’inclouen els projectes executius originals per a les cinc cases, amb traduccions en anglès de les principals llegendes.

Paraules clau: Kazuo Shinohara, Arquitectura japonesa, Disseny residencial, Tradició, Casa, Ciutat, Art, Emoció.
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A NOTE ON TRANSLITERATION AND CONVENTIONS USED

As for romanization of Japanese words (rōmaji), even though there is an official transliteration system (Kunrei-shiki) sanctioned by the Japanese Government and taught at elementary school, it is actually rarely used even in Japan, and virtually unused in Western bibliography. Instead, the system of choice, also by governmental agencies dealing with foreign affairs and English-language Japanese newspapers, is Revised Hepburn because of its clarity and its closeness to English and most Western languages pronunciation. This is the system used in this work.

As for notation of Japanese words and their English translations, I have followed the general rules established by the Oxford English Dictionary, by which Japanese words transliterated in rōmaji are written in italics, and their translation between single quotation marks when necessary (‘romanization’).

For Japanese words that have been adopted into English (like Tokyo, Shinto, or Noh) or are in international common use (like Kazuo), I have preferred this transliteration instead of following the standard Revised Hepburn rule by which a long vowel is indicated with macrons (Tōkyō, Shintō, Nō or Kazuo). This exception is also the convention generally used in Latin-script signs and other Western-language information found around Japan, and very common in architectural, and Shinohara’s, literature.

Although not unanimous, it is a common practice among scholar literature on Japanese issues in Western languages to adopt the usual Japanese order for personal names, family name first, given name second. Thus, in Shinohara Kazuo, Shinohara is the family name and Kazuo the given name. But since in most of the English versions included in the books published by Shinohara he chose the usual Western order, ‘given name first, family name second’, this is the convention used in this thesis, for his name and for all Japanese names.

All texts in this thesis are published solely in English to allow for a fluid and consistent reading. Except for the name of his projects in the catalogue included at the end of this study, I have opted for not using any Japanese character in the text or quotations, transliterating their phonemes instead when necessary. Given the many homophones of Japanese language this option has the disadvantage of risking misinterpretation, but allows for the smooth English-phonetics reading I am aiming at.

Whenever deemed important, the Revised Hepburn transliteration of original Japanese texts or titles is given, usually in a footnote. The texts that are translated from Japanese for the first time ever in

1. The only exception being the Toto monograph, fully referenced later, the title of which, his own name, is transliterated Shinohara Kazuo, keeping the Japanese order.
this thesis are given in the annexes in their original Japanese version as well. As for dates of the texts, those indicated in the thesis are the date of first appearance, which is usually the date of the first publication of the Japanese text.7

The convention in Japan about the naming of storeys is to call 1F (or First Floor) what would be commonly called in English, as well as in other languages, ‘Ground Floor’. Any upper floors are named in Japan sequentially according to this numeration. The Japanese usage is the adopted convention in this work, by which ‘Second Floor’ or 2F, for instance, means ‘one floor above street level’.

Shinohara’s drawings and some texts use the customary Japanese way of designating date, the nengō system, which indicates the number of the year since the beginning of a certain era (usually defined by the emperor’s reign). Since the Meiji restoration, the system uses the 12-month Gregorian calendar (from 1873 on). Thus, Shōwa 50 is 1975, being Shōwa the period of Japanese history corresponding to the reign of the Shōwa Emperor, Hirohito (Dec. 25th, 1926-Jan. 7th, 1989). I have only used the Common Era years in the text, which is also the usual year-system in Japanese publications.

As for names, dates and other data about Shinohara’s work, I have taken as the standard reference the monograph published by Gustavo Gili in 2011 “Kazuo Shinohara: Casas/Houses”, based on, but improving and augmenting, the monograph “Shinohara Kazuo” published by Toto in 1996, which is the publication establishing Shinohara’s canon.

As for dates of built works, in the text I have usually stated the period from design to completion. In image captions, though, for sake of brevity only completion dates are stated.

Tōkyō Kögyo Daigaku, or Tōkōdai in its Japanese abbreviation, is the famed Tokyo Institute of Technology where Shinohara studied architecture and later was professor for over 30 years. It is currently also called TokyoTECH for short, and this denomination is the one used in this work.

All my translations and revisions are marked [AT], and notes inserted in some other authors’ texts [AN]. When I introduce my emphasis in a quote, I mark it with [AE]. My designs are marked [AD] in image captions.

2. Annex 3 includes a compilation of all published Shinohara’s texts, including their different versions or translations.
Hyakunen Kin'enkan (TokyoTech Centennial Hall): computer-generated drawings of the design phase (1986)
A NOTE ON GRAPHIC MATERIAL

Most of the accounts of Kazuo Shinohara’s work are based on a fixed set of elements: pictures, drawings or texts in publications are always virtually the same and were all tightly controlled by him in order to convey a sense of unity of his work, insisting on a single narrative.

When I first transmitted to him in June 2002 Editorial Gustavo Gili’s proposal to publish a monograph on his houses using newly taken pictures, his reaction was of refusal. Given the years since their completion it was more than probable that they were disfigured in some way. He couldn’t accept a deviation from the standard representation of his projects.

Nevertheless, after his passing away in July 2006 Gustavo Gili renovated its original interest in the publication of the 2G monograph, and after getting the permission of Shinohara’s heirs, a whole research was undertaken in order to assess the state of each house designed by him.

Some of his most important works don’t exist anymore, some are changed beyond recognition. As it happens, though, there are still many houses in good shape, some of them almost exactly as they were photographed 40 or more years ago, and a new perspective of Shinohara’s houses is now publicly available thanks to the 2G monograph.

Perhaps unsurprisingly, given that Shinohara’s main teaching subject at TokyoTECH was descriptive geometry, he very seldom used perspective representations, isometric or focal, neither for sketches in the process of a project, nor for publication or construction drawings, favoring instead conventional planar representations.

Almost the only exceptions are the computer renderings he developed using the facilities at TokyoTECH just before retirement in 1986. At that time it was a very rare innovation that required large computers (like those of TokyoTECH) and a good analogue camera to take long-exposure pictures of the screen, given that color printers were not yet available.

Shinohara used these computer-generated renderings notably in House in Yokohama and Hyakunen Kinenkan, and to a lesser degree in Hanegi Complex and Tennmei House.

An indispensable monograph for assessing the value of drawings in the work of Shinohara and their originality is “Kazuo Shinohara: Houses and Drawings”, compiled by a TokyoTECH committee led by Professor Kazunari Sakamoto and published in 2007 by Shokokusha in Tokyo. This monograph includes several fragments of texts by Shinohara on drawing, detailing and representation. When
House in Kugayama (1954): Second Floor 1/5 Detailed Plan, positioning 1/5 details on a 1/50 plan, keeping its overall proportions. Above, 2F publication plan.
CONSTRUCTION DRAWINGS

Shinohara’s construction drawings are invariably drawn in pencil on tracing paper, usually at A2 size, using the prevalent conventions in Japan. Lettering is hand written, but a large variety of stamps are used for titles and frequently repeated captions. Title block for each sheet is a square stamp with rounded corners and all captions in English: “research on”, “date”, “scale”, “subject”. This stamp was used since the early 1960s at Shinohara Lab at TokyoTECH, and continued to be used afterwards at Shinohara Atelier in Yokohama.

It is worth noting a special type of drawing developed at Shinohara Lab and used in all of his projects, consisting in placing construction details at a scale 1:5 on a plan or section typically at a scale 1:50, thus keeping the overall proportion of the plan/section while focusing at the important construction points. To my knowledge, this is a system of representation unique to Shinohara.

At the above mentioned “Houses and Drawings” monograph there is a comment by Shinohara on this peculiar representation, calling its result “a figure topologically analogous to the organization in plan. In our office, this sheet is routinely referred to as a 1/5 detailed plan.”3 This is the denomination I’ve followed in image captions.

I have quoted construction drawings as CDwg_##, according to the order established in Volume 2.

Two examples of a timeline progression in drawing styles: Yamashiro House plans and House in White elevations.
When a drawing doesn’t follow a numerical order or is unnumbered, I have added the caption UCDwg_## to designate the sheet where they are located, also according to Volume 2 order.

**PUBLICATION DRAWINGS**

Publication drawings for Shinohara’s works were always drawn in black ink on thick, translucent paper vellum, later photographed and printed in glossy paper. This was the base to be used by publications.

These drawings are a stylization of the construction drawings, but not an abstraction: they reproduce different thicknesses of the wall, protruding pillars, and so on, with high fidelity to the actual geometry of the spaces.

There is an evolution of drawing style for publication along Shinohara’s career, from a more specific (and some would say anecdotic) representation of certain features of the interior, to a very clean representation that, from the 1970s on, will be one of his trademarks.⁴

Since some drawings are more expressive of certain qualities than others, I have used them indistinctly according to the information needed to highlight, but as a general rule I am using the ‘cleaner’ version established in the 1970s and used consistently by Shinohara thereafter.

**PHOTOGRAPHS**

Very few of the photos used here are my own, which might seem strange in such a study, especially given that I have been in the five houses that constitute the central part of this thesis, and in several other works by Shinohara. His requirement to anybody wanting to visit his houses was always not to take any pictures, and I complied.

It is not a big handicap. The houses are or were small and the points of view limited, so the possible frames are not so many and most have been reproduced. Moreover, for the purpose of this thesis it is almost as important to analyze his published texts as his published pictures: he once famously said that “architecture is 50% construction and 50% photography.”⁵

At the time of Shinohara’s projects, architecture publication in Japan was very competitive and magazines wanted to have a unique set of pictures to publish projects, using their in-house photographers, instead of relying, as is the common practice elsewhere, in the pictures provided by the architect.

Therefore, I have used a variety of sources for photography, relying in general more in first publications than in the ‘canonized’ set of pictures that was to become the recurrent available graphic material. This way it is possible to bring into light

---

4. This evolution is explained in detail by Hironori Shirasawa in the above mentioned “Houses and Drawings” monograph, pp. 145-147.

Koji Taki: photograph of House in Uehara
features that otherwise might go unnoticed.

An exception that is worth noting are the recent photographs taken mostly in 2010 by Hiroshi Ueda for Gustavo Gili’s 2G monograph of 2011: they attest to the care that many original clients or their descendants still have for Shinohara’s houses after decades, and as such they are revealing documents, all the more extraordinary in an ever-changing country like Japan.

Another group of photographs that is worth mentioning are the ones taken by the architecture critic and photographer Koji Taki, a longtime friend of Shinohara. They cover many works and many years, always in a very distinctive way. They surely contributed hugely, as well as his articles, to the projection of Shinohara as a unique architect.
A NOTE ON BIBLIOGRAPHY

6. Many of his first texts are research studies related with Shinohara’s doctor thesis and/or with his academic activity at TokyoTECH.

7. These three books are:
   - “Chō dai sū shōjō tōshji e” (Towards a Super-Big Numbers Set City”, 02.2001);  
   - “Shinohara kazuo kēryu Tōkyō hatsu Tōkyō-ron” (“A Discourse On Tokyo; From Tokyo, Via Kazuo Shinohara”, 07.2001);  

8. English translations according to her personal communication of 20.01.2013.


Many of the main texts written by Shinohara are available by now in English in versions which appeared either right after their publication in Japanese (at times in abridged form; sometimes in good translations, but not always), or in recent retranslations. But also many of his texts, especially those at the beginning of his career, still remain only in Japanese, including three of his last books.⁷

The literality of the English versions of his texts is of minor importance to clarify his ideas or for the purpose of this work, but of course it may render the original more or less readable. I am using in this work the available translations listed at the Annex 3, revised or corrected when necessary, or my own, included in the Annex 1 where Jūtaku ga geijitsu dearu (‘The House is Art’) and Jūtaku sekkei no shutaisei (‘Subjectivity Of Residential Design’, abridged) are translated for the first time into English: I consider them particularly relevant for the purpose of this work.

The majority of Shinohara’s texts first appeared in Shinkenchiku magazine and their English versions in The Japan Architect, both published in Tokyo, and thus they are recurrent in the footnotes. When quoting one of these monthly magazines, for sake of brevity I simply note its name (shortening The Japan Architect as JA in citations) and the month-year of publication, a widespread usage in Japanese journals (i.e. JA 01.1975, is The Japan Architect issue number 1, of January 1975).

The dates and reference of texts in this work are usually those of their first English version or of its best retranslation, noting the place and date of publication of the original Japanese text.

Renate Jaschke has translated into German some of Shinohara’s less known texts, including “House is Art”, by an initiative of Christian Kerez financed by ETH Zürich (Switzerland), compiled in the book “Kazu Shinohara: Schriften”, only available as an in-house, non-commercial publication. Articles included are:¹

Kuro no kūkan (The Black Room);⁹  
Nihon dentōran (The Japanese Tradition);  
Jūtaku wa geijutsu dearu (House is Art);  
Ushinawareta no wa kūkan no hibiki da (The Lost Sound of Space);  
Jūtaku sekkei no shutaisei (The Concept of Dwelling House and Autonomy);  
Kūkan no shisō to hyōgen (Notion and Expression of Space).

Besides the original publications of his projects, there are five monographs of special importance in Shinohara’s literature, most of them unavailable to the point of having become coveted collectors’ items.
“Kazuo Shinohara”, 1971
“Kazuo Shinohara 2”, 1976
“Shinohara Kazuo”, 1996
I have simplified the recurrent referral to them in citations and quotations. All these works but the last were compiled and edited by Shinohara himself:

The first compilation of his works, “Kazuo Shinohara: 16 Houses & Architectural Theory” I have noted in citations as “KS: 16 Houses”;\(^{10}\)

Its subsequent “Kazuo Shinohara 2: 11 Houses & Architectural Theory” I have noted in citations as “KS2: 11 Houses”;\(^{11}\)

The Space Design monograph of January 1979, which I refer to as “SD monograph”, or just SD 01.1979 in citations;\(^{12}\)

The already mentioned “Shinohara Kazuo” book, which I refer to as “Toto monograph”, or just Toto in citations;\(^{13}\)

And the most recent compilation available in English, the first one not to be done or supervised by him, ‘Kazuo Shinohara: Casas/Houses’, which I refer to as “2G monograph”, or just 2G in citations.\(^{14}\)
Helsinki Contemporary Art Museum Project, 1993

Euralille Hotel Project, 1992-1993
INTRODUCTION

Kazuo Shinohara (1925-2006) was an architect that pushed architecture, especially residential design, beyond its conventional limits.

He is arguably the most influential architect of his generation in current Japanese architecture, and his long and lasting shadow spans the likes of Toyo Ito, Itsuko Hasegawa and Kazunari Sakamoto through Kazuyo Sejima and beyond, to the many excellent young studios of today. 15

Beyond that, his importance and inspiration is felt across different aspects of architectural activity. His impact on teaching, theory and design is very big, probably bigger now than when his proposals were first published, adding to the leading visionary nature of his work.

It is all the more surprising to realize that this enormous influence is based almost entirely on a very short list of houses, rather small for the most part, and on his architectural reflections, which basically revolve around the house as a device to create emotions, and around the city as a source of emotions.

These ideas, though, are taken by Shinohara to such degree of abstraction and elaboration that they are capable of informing a whole set of theories about domesticity, about technique and about the perception of architecture.

It is also surprising to realize that this current influence has been established almost by stealth, against all odds, navigating through different periods in which Shinohara’s was an isolated voice in the midst of powerful noises promoting other directions for architecture: Metabolism at the beginning of his career, Postmodernism in his final years of practice.

But although his work is acknowledged in Japan, it is barely known in the West nowadays, even if it did enjoy some international repercussion in the 1980s and the 1990s, when it attracted for example the attention of Rem Koolhaas, who invited Shinohara to design a hotel for his new town scheme at Euralille (1990-1992); or when he was invited to participate in the limited competition for the Helsinki Contemporary Art Museum (1993).

However, if his importance can be measured in part by the influence that his work has had over subsequent generations of Japanese architects, it must be primarily assessed by its enduring allure over the years, when many ‘interesting’ projects or architects of yesterday have gone down the drain of history and few remain, or are restated, as timeless references.

Umbrella House, 1961

Repeating Crevice Annex Project, 1991
And this is the first motivation of this thesis: to recognize the persistent significance of Kazuo Shinohara and his residential designs, the earliest of which date from over half a century ago, and to reassess their value today.

The second motivation is to open up the interpretation of his work, in two ways: on one hand, and in spite of its influence in contemporary Japanese architecture and abroad, the work of Kazuo Shinohara has been, I believe, widely misinterpreted as polarized between ‘tradition’ and ‘non-tradition’. On other hand, it has been interpreted solely in the terms that Shinohara himself established.

Being his early works apparently very different from his later designs, his oeuvre has been split by its commentators in two and read in two opposite ways: on one hand, and in spite of its influence in contemporary Japanese architecture and abroad, the work of Kazuo Shinohara has been, I believe, widely misinterpreted as polarized between ‘tradition’ and ‘non-tradition’. On other hand, it has been interpreted solely in the terms that Shinohara himself established.

Both interpretations are, more often than not, seen as irreconcilable, and whoever upholds one position tends to dismiss and be disappointed with the other.

These opposed views might very well have been encouraged by the closed system of interpretation of his work that Shinohara enforced consistently and successfully over the years.

His own account of his work as a sequence of so-called ‘styles’ grouping together works that share certain traits and which belong to a specific period, has become the canonical interpretation of his oeuvre and its recurrent narrative, inducing a syncopated reading rather than a unified understanding of it.

The effects of this interpretation have been further increased by the way he used photographs and drawings in publications. Photography characteristically freezes and idealizes architecture by fixing it in time through its selective regard, and he was well aware of this characteristic.

Kazuo Shinohara, very conscious of the fact that a building finally becomes in the collective mind what its images represents about it, published once and again the same pictures, very limited in their number, as if they were the sole reality of the buildings -constructing, actually, their reality.

Similarly, he nearly always used the same descriptive texts when publishing or exhibiting his projects, to the point that we can say that the construction of his oeuvre has as much to do with this set of texts, pictures and drawings as with architecture itself.

In this respect, if his own account of his projects
Hyakunen Kinenkan (TokyoTECH Centennial Hall), 1987

House with a Big Roof, 1961

Hyakunen Kinenkan (TokyoTECH Centennial Hall), 1987
is a consubstantial part of them, then it cannot be used directly as the sole explanation of his oeuvre or as the base to analyze it if one is to avoid a mere circular description.

In fact, if we want to cast some new light on certain aspects of his designs, one of the difficulties of dealing with them is precisely to avoid this self-referential interpretation, because it fails to consider, as well as the two opposite views mentioned earlier, the multiplicity of meanings that his buildings surely convey.

More precisely, these limited interpretations deny the simultaneity in which these meanings occur since the beginning of his career up to the end of his practicing years.

An alternative reading of Kazuo Shinohara’s design process, and his specific research aims, might well consist in an integrated interpretation that identifies the deep connections and similarities linking different projects of different periods.

This way, we can better appreciate the coherence of a kaleidoscopic figure that produced designs of seemingly disparate forms, ranging from what might be termed ‘Japanese vernacular’ to ‘Robot-age supersonic’ and both terms would be erring caricatures based on a superficial understanding of his work.

Thus, the hypothesis that I want to put forward here, however concisely, is that Kazuo Shinohara’s work can be seen as a consistent endeavor to set emotion at the center of domestic space by means of reconciling two opposite poles that were present since his first projects and since his first writings.

These two opposite poles may be best expressed by a set of overlapping dualities: sacred/profane, formal/informal, order/chaos. All these dichotomies, however, refer to a fundamental dichotomy that is present from the beginning of his career: the opposition between domesticity and antidosmeticity, embodied in the opposition house/city.

However universal this endeavor is in Shinohara’s oeuvre, this conciliation can be traced focusing on few of the houses that punctuate his career, conforming a sort of concatenated links gradually merging his ideas about the house and about the city.

In one of his articles in the mid 1980s, Shinohara gives an important clue about his struggle to come to terms with his ideas both about the house and about the city:

“When I wrote 20 years ago that ‘The contemporary city may be expressed through the beauty of chaos’, I could not find any direct correspondence between my design and my theory of ‘city’, even though these two themes were complementary to each other. But at the same time, my main residential theme at that moment for space composition was centered on the tranquility and completeness of Japanese traditional

17. See for instance his humorous comment about the nickname given to his Centennial Hall: “When Hyakunen Kinenkan was built children started calling it Gundam, an anime superhero, and very soon newspapers and magazines adopted the nickname. I like it very much because it means that neighbors accepted this strange building with sense of humor. It is not a building charged with symbolism or solemnity. This is one of the functions that our architecture can have in this society.” Comment included in the documentary “Kochi”, by Jesper Wachtmeister, 2003, 49’25”.
KAZUO SHINOHARA AND THE HOUSE AS A WORK OF ART

FIVE FORMS OF EMOTION

architecture. Thinking about this early manifest of mine, I can trace its development up until the present moment. Now my residential design is developing parallel to the concept of the metropolis of no-memory. 18

In many ways this is the main purpose of the present study. It traces this development based on the assumption that, in reality, the elements for this final convergence were already set in his works of 1963-1964, both written and built, and that it is possible to find the path that connects them with his last works, by focusing on five houses that become five forms of introducing spatial emotion in the home: House of Earth and House in White (1963-1964), Tanikawa House (1972-1974), House in Uehara (1975-1976) and House in Yokohama (1982-1984).

Belonging to different periods, using different construction systems and revolving around different typological and conceptual issues, they however embody this coherent and persistent research over a period of 35 years insisting in putting the house at the center of architectural thinking and reformulating domesticity.

These five different houses share nonetheless a common quest to place emotion at the center of domesticity, thus becoming moving machines. ‘Moving machines’, a working title for this thesis for a long time, has an intrinsic polysemy that constitutes its core.

Based on the common root of motion, it refers at the same time at a compelling (or commotion) quality, and at a quality of movement. In my view, Kazuo Shinohara’s architecture, and more specifically his domestic designs, is based on this simultaneous duality.

Obviously ‘moving machines’ is a direct English translation of machines à émouvoir, the famed expression coined by the Swiss-French architect Le Corbusier when he was still Charles Edouard Jeanneret. 19

For him, the function of art was to move, in a way that could be perfectly ascribed to Shinohara, and one that Shinohara acknowledged several times:

“The basic error was to consider as a criterion for beauty the idea of pleasure, a final reaction totally personal and changeable. [...] Parthenon is not pleasant for anybody. Great art is not decorative; to have pleasure as basis for art is lowering it; art has as a sole goal to move; [...] Parthenon powerfully moves everyone, even those that don’t like it; what it counts is the intensity of the emotion; we could go as far as saying that there is no true masterpiece that gives pleasure, because man’s great emotions don’t go by that word.” 20 [AT]

The development of the idea of the house as an emotional machine in Shinohara can be briefly traced as a process in which space becomes, increasingly, the protagonist of the design.

His early works, up to Tanikawa House (1972-1974),

show an inclination towards division that tries to separate domestic spaces from ‘art’ spaces, or spaces where the primary function is emotional. From House in Uehara (1975-1976) onwards, though, there is an increased mixing of both sorts of spaces, trying to reach unity by more direct means, and heading towards a certain completeness of the spatial experience: one lives in the emotional space.

But this emotion is not achieved by space itself, but by means of some of its elements, notably the structure: bare structural elements are capable of generating a strong spatial emotion by their interference in domestic life.

It will only be with House in Yokohama (1982-1984) that this embodiment of unified space in its own sake (that is, not depending on specific elements such as structure) as the main emotional cum functional space, will become true.

Once it is achieved it can be connected with the exterior: it can embody, for the first time, a true relationship with the exterior, i.e. the city, bringing together two main themes is Shinohara’s work: domesticity as art, and city as emotion.

By presenting three key elements of Shinohara’s thought, that is, domesticity, tradition and city, and analyzing these five projects, this work aims at proving the connections lying underneath their apparent disparity.

Consciously emphasizing breadth of scope over depth, it is meant as a stepping stone towards a new reevaluation of the exceptional value of Shinohara’s work.

Due to the relative scarcity of general or particular studies about Shinohara, and with the aim to make his work accessible to a wide audience not necessarily familiar with it, the present research has two differentiated parts:

The first, devoted to a contextualization of his work and his time, introducing Kazuo Shinohara’s persona;

And the second, devoted to the analysis of the five works representing the main argumentative line of this thesis.

It is complemented by a series of annexes compiling and updating his built and written work, and making available in a second volume the complete extant sets of the original construction drawings for the five houses, translating their key sheets into English.
CONSIDERATION TODAY OF SHINOHARA’S OEUVRE

The influence in Japan of Shinohara’s work, both theory and projects, is today very big, and is increasingly being recognized as a central reference. As noted by Ioanna Angelidou in an otherwise precise account on Japanese architecture genealogies:

“As curator of the 2010 Venice Biennale, Kazuyo Sejima honored Kazuo Shinohara, recognizing him as a figure of great influence both to her and the entirety of the contemporary architecture scene in Japan. Sejima neither studied nor practiced under him, yet Shinohara - a prominent figure in Japanese architecture since the mid-1960s - largely defined the approach of a generation, including the work of Toyo Ito, with whom Sejima apprenticed.”

In that 12th International Architecture Exhibition, the Venice Biennale awarded a Golden Lion in memoriam to Kazuo Shinohara. The press release of the award quotes Sejima’s words in which constitutes a quite widespread vision of Shinohara’s influence, and is worth quoting in full:

“Shinohara was a person who thought directly about the symbolism inherent in space and how that symbolism relates to individuals. In one way, he thought about how that symbolism was formed in the context of Japanese tradition but in another, he was concerned with more abstract geometries and the randomness of the city. With this research, he created very special and very sensitive houses that helped him form a thesis critical of modern architecture. People in Japan and around the world have been fascinated by him. I’m proposing to honor him here because he thought about the power of space on a very personal level.”

It is then striking to realize how this influence is more implicit than explicit. There are in Japan no recent publications or exhibitions about his work, and those that have been produced in the last decade have always had a foreign promoter and done in foreign countries.

The last comprehensive publication of Shinohara’s residential design with new contributions is the monograph “Kazuo Shinohara: Casas/Houses”, published in Barcelona by Gustavo Gili in 2011, and the most recent compilation is Chinese, “Shinohara Kazuo” the catalogue from a 2013 exhibition in Nanjing.

As for exhibitions, the last two devoted to Shinohara, very different in size and scope, have been held in 2014 in foreign countries. The first chronologically, in Saint Louis (USA), at the Mildred Lane Kemper Art Museum at the Sam Fox School of Architecture at the Washington University (January 31st-April 20th). Entitled “On the Thresholds of Space-Making”, it was a relatively small but choice exhibition centered on sketches and working drawings in a minimalistic installation.

The second, the largest exhibition ever about Shinohara, was held at the Power Station of Art in Shanghai (PRC) between April 20th and June 22nd.
Shinohara Exhibition. Power House of Art, Shanghai, 2014

Shinohara Exhibition. Washington University, St Louis, 2014

Shinohara Exhibition. Power House of Art, Shanghai, 2014
Simply called “Kazuo Shinohara”, it was a complete retrospective of all his works, including a full-scale replica of the central space of Uncompleted House, a 1:5 model of House in Tateshina and floor plans at 1:1 of House in White and House in Yokohama, drawn on the hall’s pavement. In both cases a series of lectures and discussions were programmed, adding another dimension to the installations themselves and furthering the renewed interest in those countries for Shinohara’s work.

But nothing at that scale has ever been done in Japan, not even during Shinohara’s life: his work was regularly shown in comprehensive retrospectives in several countries in the world, including France, the United States or Austria, while in Japan there were only scarce and partial exhibitions of his oeuvre.

The fact that current young generations of architects in Japan look up at Shinohara as a model is due to a sort of a legendary status, a legend he was never shy of feeding and that he already achieved early in his career.

This status perhaps prevents a clear and thorough understanding of his work, but at the same time it is quite understandable: Shinohara always advocated for recognition of small-house design as a field of experimentation and for the architect as an artist, two conditions now prevalent among young practitioners in Japan.

Nowadays, at a time when these architects have but few small single-family house assignments, very much in the line of Shinohara’s commissions, his plea for dignity at any scale or program for architecture, and his ascetic standing for it, can readily be seen as exemplary.

It could also be mentioned that many architects today work with bare elements, producing highly abstracted and stylized forms, a recognizable trait pushed forward by Shinohara as well.

But more importantly, beyond these concrete facts there is a very strong influence in the themes or, to be more precise, in the epistemological fields that these architects choose as their preoccupations in architecture.

How else, if not referring to Shinohara, can positions such as Toyo Ito’s “Tarzan in the Media Forest”, Kengo Kuma’s “Erasing Architecture” or “Anti-Object”, Junya Ishigami’s “Another Scale of Architecture” or Sou Fujimoto’s “Primitive Future”, be understood?

Even acknowledging the possibility that all these share a common, or Japanese, approach to nature, they all refer to a desirable condition of wilderness or primeval (‘savagery’) to use Shinohara’s wording of architecture brought about by Shinohara in the first place.

These positions, though, with their uncompromised
blurring between interior and exterior, may seem the opposite of Shinohara’s own inclinations to set limits or elaborated relationships between inside and outside.

But they could be readily understood as well as a further development of Shinohara’s progression towards “an exteriorization of the interior”, a progression that Ito or Sejima, to name but two of the most well-known nowadays, were also to develop in their own designs picking up after Shinohara.

A recent republication of the original pages where Shinohara’s projects were first presented in The Japan Architect since the 1960s seems to add to this reevaluation of his work in Japan.

In reality, though, it is still more focused towards a foreign market than to a local audience, which is left without proper publications to bring discussion to a public level.

Being this compilation a commercial move, one is left with the impression that Shinkenchiku, the publisher of The Japan Architect, does not rely in the response of Japanese public to a renovated appraisal of Shinohara, in what is otherwise an increasingly difficult market for architecture publications.

It is then all the more necessary to ascertain a public and clear assessment of Shinohara’s work in Japan, which might facilitate further moves, including as one of its goals the designation of his surviving houses as Cultural Property.
CURRENT STATE OF STUDIES ABOUT KAZUO SHINOHARA

The number of critical studies, or simply bibliography, in any language, about Shinohara’s body of work is very limited. Although lately there has been an international resurgence of interest in his architecture, as we have seen, it cannot be said that it has been systematically studied.

However important Shinohara’s work is in itself and for understanding contemporary developments in Japanese architecture, the state of the art of the subject is yet to be consolidated.

In English, two main contributions attempting at an overarching understanding of Shinohara’s oeuvre, both made more than twenty five years ago, still remain very significant, and solitary.

One is Koji Taki’s article published in Perspecta in 1983, “Oppositions: The Intrinsic Structure of Kazuo Shinohara’s Work”, which is an attempt at describing Shinohara’s design method from a structuralism point of view.29

Taki’s account does without the separation in styles that Shinohara established to explain his own work, and retorts instead to the definition of opposition as the main driving force in his designs.30

This brilliant insight is of great importance to understand how Shinohara operated in establishing relationships among the elements of many of his compositions.

In my view, though, it falls short in understanding key aspects of the complexity of how Shinohara understood man, house and city, especially the less rational aspects of his designs, which are crucial.

And, given the publication date, cannot account for the last works, like House in Yokohama, which in my view are capable of integrating these disparate aspects and go beyond the method of opposition to embrace coexistence.


In this indispensable work Stewart outlines a plausible explanation of the two main trends of contemporary architecture in Japan, the one originated in Arata Isozaki, and the one originated in Kazuo Shinohara:

“[The last part] of the book deals with the most important architects of the 1960s onward -Kazuo Shinohara and Arata Isozaki. […] these two men are unquestionably -though in different ways- the greatest theoreticians and practitioners at work during the period covered. […] what can be learned
Stewart highlights precisely those aspects of
Shinohara’s work more related with surrealist
practices, and is capable of establishing the
importance of Shinohara in the Japanese context:

“[…] in spite of appearances Isozaki was by
this date [1966-67] already deeply committed to
realizing Japanese ideas about space. This fact may
not have been recognized sufficiently, or at all, in
Japan at the time. For, while Shinohara’s important
theoretical breakthrough, seen in the House in
White, seemed barely to proceed beyond traditional
accouterments -shoji- and the rest- Isozaki began his
career in modern Western architecture at roughly
that juncture where Kenzo Tange -henceforward
active mainly abroad- had left off. The point is that
both these architects, Isozaki in the public realm as
well as Shinohara in private houses, were trying to
provide significant answers to the difficult question
of the identity of modern Japanese architecture. And
that, to be sure, is the chief issue I have wished to
raise in this book.”

Stewart’s contribution, like that of Taki’s, is made
just before the moment Shinohara finishes House in
Yokohama, a work that is not included in his book
and that, as noted before, is of crucial importance
to be able to understand the overarching aim of
Shinohara’s design.

A third work worth mentioning here, although its
scope covers from the 1880s up to the late 1990s
and is not devoted to Shinohara or to Shinohara as
a central figure, is Yann Nussaume’s “Anthologie
critique de la théorie architecturale japonaise”.

In this comprehensive work, though, there are
some of the most accurate insights available
on Shinohara’s role and status in the Japanese
architecture panorama, and effectively situates his
figure in the sequence of moments of its evolution.

It includes three essays by Shinohara belonging to
different moments of that evolution, namely “The
of Residential Architecture” (1967) and “Towards
Architecture” (1981), discussed and referenced at
length.

These three essays synthesize, in fact, the triad
tradition/house/city that is developed in this
thesis as the fundamental tripod of Shinohara’s
conceptual framework.
2 INTRODUCING KAZUO SHINOHARA

2.01 THE MAKING OF A SELF: AN OVERVIEW

BIOGRAPHICAL NOTES

The architectural historian Jackie Kestenbaum, in her book “Emerging Japanese Architects of the 1990s”, makes a statement that rings true for all those knowing the functioning of Japanese society:

“For all its modern dressing, Japan is still an extremely hierarchical society and the cap on opportunities is in many ways determined by the year of one’s birth vis-a-vis that of other members of the profession. A generational analysis might not be all that pertinent in the West, other than to indicate relative experience. In Japan, however, it is still critical to the perception of one’s role in society, and to the type of commissions that can be expected.”

Shinohara (Shizuoka Prefecture 1925-Kawasaki 2006, graduated 1953, first project 1954) belonged to an intermediate generation, placed between what most commentators of Japanese architecture call the First and Second generation of architects after World War II.

That is, between Kenzo Tange (1913-2005, graduated 1939, first projects early 1940s), and the group of architects patronized by Tange which originally formed the Metabolist Movement in the early 1960s, like Fumihiko Maki (1928, graduated 1952-1954, first projects mid-1950s), Arata Isozaki (1931, graduated 1954, first projects late 1950s), or Kisho Kurokawa (1934-2007, graduated 1959, first projects early 1960s).

Subsequently, “the third generation, including Tadao Ando, Toyo Ito, Takefumi Aida, and Monta Mozuna, came onto the scene after the oil crisis of the early 1970s.”

From the hierarchy noted by Kestenbaum a certain genealogy naturally derives: such lineages exist in all arts and crafts in Japan, very often in the form of schools or families, formed not by blood but by choice. In architecture, there are more than one traceable paths linking the first architects of the beginning of the 20th century with the young studios of today, and forming a generational tree of sorts. As Thomas Daniell puts it:

“A key figure who explicitly rejected Western influences yet appears on almost every branch of the family tree of contemporary Japanese...”

39. See for a precise and updated account of these genealogies Ioanna Angelidou, op. cit. As for Shinohara’s lineage, especially p. 51.
40. Jackie Kestenbaum, op. cit., p. 3.
41. “An important conduit for the introduction of early modernism was Kunio Maekawa (1905-1986), who spent 1928 and 1929 at Le Corbusier’s Paris atelier, then became a mentor to...”
42. “From the hierarchy noted by Kestenbaum...” From the hierarchy noted by Kestenbaum a certain genealogy naturally derives: such lineages exist in all arts and crafts in Japan, very often in the form of schools or families, formed not by blood but by choice. In architecture, there are more than one traceable paths linking the first architects of the beginning of the 20th century with the young studios of today, and forming a generational tree of sorts. As Thomas Daniell puts it:

Tōshōdaiji Temple, Nara (759)
architecture, from the most understated “dirty realism” to the most sophisticated diagrammatic minimalism, is Kazuo Shinohara [...]. Across [...] his career Shinohara addressed tradition and modernity, banality and mysticism, vernacular archetypes and futuristic sculptures. His effects on the discipline as a theorist, designer and teacher have been immense. Indeed, many of the former students of Shinohara, and their own successors, make up what is famously known as the Shinohara School.”

This formulation is problematic because the originality of Shinohara, to put it in philologically precise terms, and what sets him apart from his contemporaries, does not depend on a supposed rejection of Western influences (a too simplistic approach, especially in post-war Japan), nor suddenly appears from nowhere, as it is implied in the text (Shinohara’s beginnings are also easily traceable and belong to a lineage, as we will later see).

But it is true that one of the most striking characteristics of Shinohara’s attitude, consistently sustained since his first commissions until the end of his career, was the will to establish his own rules to think about and to design architecture, very often against contemporary main currents, like the Metabolist movement in the early 1960s or Postmodernism in the early 1980s.

In that sense it can be said that Shinohara, by design or by result, was an individualist who did not mind to voice his own vision, even at the risk of “being misunderstood or rejected”, as he put it in his founding text “The House is Art” (1961),“ and who never complained about it. Quite the opposite: all in all, the existence of a contrary against which delineate his own profile, was readily put by Shinohara at the service of the making of his self as an architect.

This making of a self has also a particular narrative with highlights and epiphanies. A key foundational moment in this narrative is his decision to become an architect, after graduating in mathematics in 1947 at Tōkyō Butsuri Gakkō (nowadays Tōkyō Rikka Daigaku - Tokyo University of Science) and teaching as assistant professor at the prestigious Tōkyō Ikashika Daigaku (Tokyo Medical and Dental University), from which he quit in 1949 to enroll as undergraduate student of architecture in TokyoTECH.

He narrated this moment of change in several occasions in his career, but still the most compelling is the first text in which he tells about it as a revealing encounter:

“I once stood fascinated by the huge roof of the Main Hall of the Tōshōdaiji Temple, Nara (759), as waves of light, urged by the irregular rhythm of a passing shower, undulated across it. That was my first encounter with Japanese architecture, only a few years after the end of the last war, when I was not yet committed to architectural studies.”

In this description we can find what will be throughout his career a very characteristic trait, namely the recount of impressions that trigger a
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Kazuo Shinohara: House in Kugayama, Tokyo (1954)
new state of mind and, ultimately, become new sources of inspiration. This sort of descriptions abounds in his texts, but one in particular is of special importance for the purpose of this work, and is worth quoting in full:

“[The Golden Pavilion, Kyoto (1398)] was shimmering under a mid-winter afternoon sun. The surfaces of its gold-foiled walls appeared to be giving off a mysterious sheen in the midst of the dark groves surrounding it and the deep-colored pond waters. I had casually stopped to take a glance at the reconstructed temple, without any specific expectation, and when I perceived the sudden materialization of the golden temple in front of me, I was quite taken aback. It was beautiful beyond all logic or reasoning.”

Shinohara started his long academic career as assistant to Seike, later on to become Seike’s successor in his professorship position.

For Shinohara, the laboratory was something else than a teaching post. In an interview for the French magazine *Techniques et Architecture* at the moment of his retirement as professor he explained how he worked:

“I do not have a private office, but work in the studio of a national university [TokyoTECH]. In this context, and perhaps because of my character, I like to take a long time to design a limited number of projects. I should act as an experimental scientist. Officially, our studio is designated a laboratory”

By 1968, at 39 and with some 16 houses built and published, he was already “one of Japan’s brightest residential designers”. This was a tag that would accompany him thereafter, and one in which he relished to be considered.

In fact, Shinohara’s prestige was never in doubt, although he was considered a somehow eccentric figure, for different reasons at different times. This fame undoubtedly stemmed from his contentious position against mainstream ideas, which was his way of establishing a persona in a very competitive and dynamic cultural environment.
In spite of that relative individual standpoint, he maintained a consistent dialogue throughout his career with different architects,\(^{51}\) and he published in the most prominent magazines in Japan all of his projects and theoretical texts, thus cementing the influence he would exert over subsequent generations.

As for international attention for his oeuvre, he was certainly helped to gain an audience outside Japan, like other architects of his generation, thanks to the English edition of *Shinkenchiku*, The Japan Architect (JA), which was the main showcase of Japanese architecture, contemporary or otherwise.

He published all of his works and main texts in *Shinkenchiku*, arguably the most prestigious architecture magazine in Japan, with subsequent versions in JA English edition, usually a couple of months after its original publication.

That meant that an up to date information of the rapidly evolving panorama of Japanese architecture was readily available around the world, and it furthered the establishment of Japan as one of the main centers to be taken into account for architecture production.

The relatively isolated and slow-pace way of working of Shinohara, devoted to the design of small and low-budget houses exclusively in Japan, thus found an adequate projection in JA, which reproduced the carefully selected photographs of his designs with great quality.

Only towards the end of his career he reaped this international repercussion in terms of invitations for competitions abroad, in coincidence with his shift from residential design towards non-residential projects.

Significantly, the first non-residential design he ever did was a proposal for a company in Germany, the DOM Headquarters Project in 1980. After that, several more invitations ensued, up to the 1993 participation for the design of the new Contemporary Art Museum in Helsinki.

From that moment on his views on the city and the chaotic circumstances of Tokyo allowed him to develop substantial projects outside the realm of the residential, all built in Japan in few years, from the Ukiyo-e Museum in Matsumoto of 1981 to the Kumamoto-kita Police Station of 1990.

But his reputation was established nonetheless in his residential work in Japan, a short list of projects in a long period of time, developed under different conceptual frames but always with the aim of establishing, at the heart of the house, a space of emotion.

**‘STYLES’ AND DESIGNS**

One of the most characteristic traits of Shinohara is his creation of a narrative aimed at explaining...
KAZUO SHINOHARA AND THE HOUSE AS A WORK OF ART

FIVE FORMS OF EMOTION

the development of his own work, persistently and consistently pursued especially in the second half of his career.

This narrative is based on what he terms yōshiki, or ‘styles’, a term referring to the similarities of a group of projects which are usually, but not always, in a chronological series and which share one or more key elements, or ‘themes’, in their design.

In one of his longest essays Shinohara explains how he willingly focuses on one ‘theme’ in each design, to render it more clearly:

“In fact, I often get an impulse to conduct an all-out war by taking on singlehandedly each element of the house. However, in view of my limited ability to express such feelings, I end up opting for a localized battle in limiting myself to just one theme [at a time]. Even so, I am quietly hoping that an overall coalescence of themes may one day take place.”

These ‘themes’ range from tradition (with manifold ‘subthemes’ so to speak, from the generic “things Japanese”, to material elements like beaten-earth flooring or wooden structure, to abstract ideas like ‘frontality’ or ‘eternal’) to random noise, to put but an example of his latest concepts which we will later see.

Shinohara is an impressionist, capturing and reproducing in his architecture his impressions, taken from a wide variety of sources, but always through the filter of his emotions or feelings, intellectualizing them as ‘themes’, and using them as inspirational triggers to produce his designs.

In a typical Shinoharian way of expression, he explains how this idea developed, noting that “when I completed the House in Chigasaki [House with a Big Roof, 1960-1961], the general concept of ‘style’ was already becoming something concrete in me”.

Based on these ‘themes’ Shinohara defines these ‘styles’ as an afterthought, a reflection a posteriori about the framework and intuitions that served to develop each project.

In fact, the first time he refers to ‘styles’ in the sense he will use thereafter is in order to explain the changes in the main concepts in his designs, in a long article as late as 1977.

From that moment on, it will be the recurrent way he will refer to his body of work. In the Toto monograph, which can be considered the ‘bible’ of Shinohara’s oeuvre, he uses this notion of ‘style’ as chapter separation. And effectively succeeded in establishing this narrative as the canonic way to refer to his works.

In that article of 1977, Shinohara refers to Picasso as a precedent of an artist with acknowledged different periods:

“I am beginning to feel empathy or the change in styles of expression as experienced by an artist like Pablo Picasso. […] Just when a beautiful and

52. Although Shinohara always sanctioned the translation as ‘style’, it is worth noting that yōshiki in Japanese is also used in the architectural sense of ‘order’, like in Doric order (dōriku yōshiki).


58. See for example the 2G monograph, where this notion of ‘style’, or its negation, is pervasively used by the editors.
distinctive style was established, he would embark on a new style that undermined it, and so on in sequence. I am now beginning to understand this mechanism.\footnote{59}

And he opposes Picasso’s way to that of Mies van der Rohe:

“I have enormous respect for this one-sided process of mastery, culminating in a perfect style. That respect persists, but I have recently gained a new sympathy with Picasso’s mode of working, as characterized by his ever-changing styles.”\footnote{60}

Although this thesis wants to understand Shinohara’s work transversally, doing without this established grouping of houses, it is worth describing here the four ‘styles’ defined by Shinohara. I follow the index of the 2G monograph to list them, noting their completion dates:

The ‘First Style’ consists of a group of houses designed between 1953 (House in Kugayama) and 1968 (Suzusho House), the ‘Second Style’ goes from 1970 (Uncompleted House) to 1974 (Prism House), the ‘Third Style’ from 1974 (Tanikawa House) to 1982 (Higashiya Tamagawa Complex), and the last ‘Fourth Style’ starts with House in Yokohama (1985) and comprises most of the non-residential works of Shinohara, including Hyakunen Kinenkan (1987), until the Kumamoto-kita Police Sation (1990), although all his projects until Tateshina House (last design 2006) could be included in it.

Each of these ‘styles’ can be characterized by a framing concept, and the change from one to another is due to a volition of finding new expressions.

Thus, to the ‘First Style’ corresponds a willing relation with Japanese tradition, understood in several different ways, extracting from the varied stock of heritage single elements capable of conveying an emotion rooted in the past.

To the ‘Second Style’, the shortest in the series and explained as a reaction against the ‘First’,\footnote{61} the ideas of ‘cube’ and of ‘fissure space’ are central both as specific architectural features and as a violent move against the single spaces of the previous period.

To the ‘Third Style’ corresponds the fertile ideas of ‘misalignment’ and ‘savagery’, which, although already presents in his earliest writings about the city, were not duly pursued in his designs.

And to the ‘Fourth Style’ the main concept would be that of ‘machine’, understood as a compositional device based on juxtaposition as the main procedure.

One of the problems with such sort of lineal explanation, declaredly built as changes of direction, is that it is based on visual, or material, traits rather than conceptual.

In truth, these groupings are apparently so
disparate in forms and physicality among them, that might be clearly seen as true periods.

But this disparity can also be detected within each period, even if the projects share some traits. Projects like Umbrella House (1961) or House of Earth (1966), for instance, both considered by Shinohara forming part of his ‘First Style’, have in reality very little in common besides being small and built in wood. And the same can be said of the others ‘styles’.

Even acknowledging that at any given moment an architect is preoccupied by a set of subjects, and designs according to these preoccupations, the explanations by Shinohara of his works always have an air of forced argumentations. He seems to acknowledge to this fact when he writes, speaking of the cancellation of the ‘First Style’ by the ‘Second’, that:

“[...] this only meant that for the houses that came afterwards, the possibility of situating them in the context of a single coherent style would remain unfulfilled. I sometimes wonder if each and every such house will end up independent [...]. Yet there are also times when I feel this very collection of seemingly discrete styles will in itself one day nonetheless amount to a Third Style. Will it be possible for me to traverse the category that embraces both abstraction and concreteness, the division between which has for me represented up until now the greatest divide.”

In reality, we might think that the whole notion of ‘style’ in Shinohara is forced, induced by the group of houses that form his ‘Second’ period. They are the most homogeneous both in terms of form and of concept, but this homogeneity is but an anomaly in Shinohara’s oeuvre, a short stage as noted before.

Transposing this anomaly to the rest of his works generates distortions of several sorts, not the least syncopating an entire body of buildings that in reality is produced as a continuous and overlapping experience.

But of course the main objection that may be raised against this periodization of his oeuvre, and his parallel insistence on the ‘themes’ brought about in each period, is that it can be taken for granted as the explanatory scaffold of its development, canceling any other possible reading.

Although Shinohara tries to intellectualize each period in terms of opposition with the precedent one, in his own account abound the instances in which he relates one with another. A clear example of this ambivalent position is his declaration that:

“I have always believed that the creation of new work is a two-tiered process. First, you must move yourself to an unknown domain, do some reconnaissance, and make it your own. Then you give whatever fresh nutrition is to be found in the new space, no matter how small it may be, back to the spaces of your past, operating in such a way that these old spaces do not remain isolated or negated. To me, this is not simply an issue of architectural theory but also one involving an architect’s responsibility toward past clients. [...] I have never designed to begin a new residential design where the
support of previous work was not enlisted at the same time.”

Here we find the designer-architect speaking, telling us that no matter how new conditions he might find in a new commission or what new preoccupations might have at the forefront, it is not possible, nor desirable, to escape from previous experiences. After all, the construction of an architect is built as the result of all his or her constructions.

At a certain moment Shinohara writes, criticizing the modernist Western approach to Japanese architectural tradition, that “it is more important to find the differences than the apparent similarities”, because “drawing conclusions about coincidental resemblances between phenomena” is a “slight to both traditional Japanese architecture and to modern art and architecture”.

Conversely I think that, in the case of his work, it is more relevant to find the basso continuo underneath the apparent dissimilarities in his houses, and render it visible to show the coherence that informed his work as an architect.

This coherence is to be found exploring three main preoccupations that were always present in his work: tradition, domesticity, and the city. Developed and reworked over the long span of his career, these three issues existed at the beginning as separate theoretical themes informing his thoughts and his designs. Only at the end of his career he could bring them together into a unified built result.

THE THEORETICAL WORK

Shinohara was an architect who, since the beginning of his career, wrote as much as he designed. Writing was a very important aspect of his activity, to the point that we could say that his reflections on architecture have a twofold nature: projects and texts, often in the shape of essays. By being very prolific in writing, he was a rare architect, especially in Japan, where architects don’t tend to theorize.

From the beginning of his career it became customary that he published his built works together with a written theoretical reflection aimed at reinforcing the conceptual nature of his designs.

The last compilation book published under his supervision, “Aphorisms”, graphically establishes a consistent parallel between texts and realized work along the timeline of his career, reinforcing the twofold nature of his work.

He understood publication as an important dimension to create his persona, and had the chance since the beginning of this career to publish his preoccupations, theoretical or otherwise, in
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65. Annex 02 lists a comprehensive and updated list of Shinohara’s writings.
influential magazines, or compile them in books. Most of his texts were originally published in *Shinkenchiku* (*New Architecture*), established in 1925, arguably the most important architecture magazine in Japan, and specially so since the end of the Second World War up to the early nineties of last century, when it entered a decline that seems to be lately reversed.

That period coincides with the active period of Shinohara. In June 1956 *Shinkenchiku* launched its English version, called initially *The Japan Architect*, later to be simplified as *Japan Architect*. In it, all projects by Shinohara, and most of his main texts, were introduced in English to an international audience.

It is undeniable that this widely internationally distributed English version of a magazine solely devoted to architecture produced in Japan has had a crucial role in positioning Japanese architects, and specifically Shinohara, in a world panorama controlled, at least up to recently, by Western media.

The writings by Shinohara are distant from the common subjects of debate in Japanese architecture, which more often than not deal with rhetoric topics rather than with pressing issues. Shinohara, on the contrary, writes almost always after a set of buildings have been completed. His texts use to start from the personal experience of the project in order to build an operational reflection that is meaningful or useful for understanding it, its motivations, and its future development.

In spite of the abstract nature of Shinohara’s designs, he was not a speculative architect whose ideas were developed and expressed through non-commissioned or self-appointed works in order to advance an idea, or through generic theoretical texts unrelated to his projects.

On the contrary, his reflections seem to need, and benefit from, the encounter with reality, with the complexities of reality, in order to be originated and, eventually, sustained.

The interest of Shinohara’s work lies clearly on the fact that his extraordinary projects have been built, that they have become materialized ideas, that is, the original motivation of the project has remained intact throughout the vicissitudes of their construction. Shinohara always explains the conceptual elements of his designs, but comments rarely about his choices (compositional, material, programmatic) as an architect, when in fact they clearly constitute a very coherent and very personal aspect of his designs.

The way he treats doors, or the detailing of ceilings...
and eaves, for example, or the way he chooses materials or colors, are very important aspects of his architecture and unquestionably contribute to its appeal and to the creation of a ‘Shinohara style’ in the true sense.

But they are very seldom explicitly dealt with or justified, like if they were part of the standard métier of an architect that needs not to be talked about, or doesn’t merit so in the face of the conceptual aspects of his architecture.

His texts are dependent on his works. They appear a posteriori, as explanations of his motivations, and sometimes even as an obituary for a period or ‘style’, to use his own term as we will see later. But even though a more material approach to his designs could be expected, the operational hypotheses on which they are based are highly abstracted.

Shinohara’s writings don’t form exactly a theoretical body, and thus an hermeneutics of sorts of his writings or ideas is not bound to yield any more significant information into light than the apparent issues or concepts already stated in his texts.

All what he wrote had the purpose of serving his designs or his intuitions, and therefore his texts are attempts at an explanation, not philosophical rules or modes derived from an abstract reasoning. How else to explain, otherwise, his own declaration that, “indeed, no matter how I try to explain my feelings, they remain illogical facts.”67

His texts are, rather, an attempt towards an intellectualization, or rationalization, of his several approaches to design, in what constitutes a self-explanatory body of thought or, in his own words, “an operational hypothesis”.68

In reality, his writings are built simultaneously on the preceding reflections and to act against those previous reflections, in an ever-evolving, self-destructing process of creation and cancellation that involves both designs and the theories they propitiate.

The evident goal is to create a personal body of thought, and to state it as original, that is, originated from within himself (to use a Shinoharian expression) and not influenced by exterior influences.

This attitude, though, is not without problems. At a certain point he goes as far as talking about “my own brand of logic”,69 which is a blatant contradiction in terms.

But for all his theories and the effort to formulate them, Shinohara remains an intuitive and impressionist architect who tries to make sense of his impressions in the world and the social situation in which he lives.
Shinohara’s typical approach to reality is highly abstract, combined with an impressionist attitude by which he ‘feels’ or ‘sees’ with his body. His visions of ‘nature’ or ‘city’, to put but two paradigmatic examples, are always explained both in abstract terms and as sensory results, avoiding though a sentimentalist approach.

He mentions the discovery of ‘nature’ while standing at the House in White main room in these terms, as if the space had not been designed by him, surprised:

“I felt something alien to the room. That something seemed to me to be best described by the term ‘nature’. It was not, though, the sense of raw nature I felt in the beautiful pillar. It was, rather, an abstract conception born as a result of the interplay between the simplified, abstracted, white-painted, square box and the cedar log.”

Shinohara’s language has some characteristics that set it apart from conventional architecture writing.

It is deliberately confrontational, delineating himself and his ideas against a contrary -a different contrary depending on epoch or issue. He uses often military terms to put forward his arguments (“attack”, “battle”, “field of operations” are but few examples found throughout his texts) and often adopts a challenging attitude.

It is deliberately convoluted in expression, using repetitions and pleonasms very frequently as his main rhetoric tools, trying to convey his message in what, aiming possibly at clarity, become entangled sentences and paragraphs.

It is deliberately poetic, and very often uses paradoxical expressions or, verging on naïveté, tries to redefine existing notions and impose his own terms (like “abstraction”, “machine” or “modern”, to name but a few).

It is deliberately complicated, proposing images and metaphors that more often than not don’t amplify or clarify the original meaning. One example of this is his frequent use of rare mathematical expressions, only at reach of those educated in the field like himself, which he uses to establish an intellectual distance.

And it is deliberately self-centered. He, his ideas and his feelings or impressions are the protagonists of his writings, the ones that form the basis for the intellectual elaboration of each essay, with the explicit goal of generating a quasi-theoretical corpus ultimately consolidating his persona, and capable of being transmitted as the basis for a ‘school’.

In his writings he also tends to be self-referential in themes, vocabulary and ideas, creating to what amounts to a closed system of references of which it is necessary to have the appropriate keys in order to make any sense of it.

---
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This attitude, though, is not entirely unique to Shinohara. David B. Stewart and Shin’ichi Okuyama, in their introduction to Tanikawa House, point out an important correlation:

“Like Tanikawa himself, and in many ways like the entire cohort of post-feudal Japanese intellectuals, including the well-known authors of the Japanese “I-novel” genre during the Meiji period, Shinohara is deeply concerned with self-orientation and identity almost as a kind of personal salvation. For him this was a goal, as stated here, to be pursued through architecture.”

One of the difficulties of entering Shinohara’s work is precisely to avoid this self-referential interpretation. In fact, if one tries to cast some different light on certain aspects of his work, as is my own aim, it is compulsory to try and find words different from the ones used by him to refer to concepts that, on the other hand, need an interpretation.

In this sense we could say that his own account of his works is a consubstantial part of them, and thus cannot be used directly if one is to avoid a mere description.

In terms of objectives, we could distinguish three different sorts of texts in Kazuo Shinohara’s written work.

On one hand, the texts about Japanese architectural and urban tradition. They are academical and abound at the beginning of his career, especially around the time that Shinohara is doing research for his doctor thesis.

These initial interests and insistences are related with his primary research of Japanese elements on which to build his work, but they are but a step forward. The subtitle of his first published book is “Tradition can be the point of departure, but not the point of arrival.”

As we will later see, it is clear that, from the very beginning, this interest in tradition is instrumental, a sort of platform to jump further towards a contemporary territory.

A second class of his writings would be those texts that explore certain ideas seemingly unrelated with the precise framework that conform the backbone of his designs, but that are an expression of interests that will sooner or later be present in his work.

And finally a third class, very often intermingled with the second, would be those texts in which Kazuo Shinohara explicitly explains his designs and gets to the point of interpreting his own development, thus creating the abovementioned peculiar self-referentiality of his texts, and subsequently a canon for the exegesis of his projects.

Among architecture scholars, Japanese or fluent in Japanese, Shinohara’s writing is quite (in)
famous for its difficulty. His intricate (or baroque) expression based on repetitions and pleonasms, tries to enhance and convey the importance of something that is, basically, quite simple or down-to-earth.

In the end, his preoccupations revolve around the idea of domesticity and the city, the very nature of which are everyday-like. His endeavor consists precisely in centering the focus of attention on domestic space itself and in the physical conditions of the city, and intellectualize them as a theoretical problem.

This will or necessity to exaggerate has to be understood within the conflictive context, intellectually speaking, in which he positioned himself and in which he strived to get his message across, first against the metabolists, later against the postmodernists.

Both moments involved a synthesis of sorts, connecting history, art, architecture, politics, literature: a certain zeitgeist, in short. But it was exactly these codified zeitgeists what Shinohara could not give for granted.

Not giving in, writing against them, and establishing his own conditions for architecture, was an important way, as well as true to his feelings even if at times a bit forced, to create his own self as an architect.

Or, as he put it: “An architect designing small houses pursues his self-assigned task looking toward the eventual day that is sure to dawn.” [AE]
Shinohara recurrently refers in his texts, from the first in the 1960s to the last in the 2000s, to his initial relationship with and interest in Japanese tradition. At the beginning, naturally so because he strived to sublimate some elements of non-modern Japanese architecture and give them renewed value for contemporary society.

In later texts, though, Shinohara refers to this initial phase as a counterpoint. That is an initial moment that, in many ways, prompted his way of designing but that was eventually left behind, serving solely as a background against which contrasted new figures.

He starts his article “Abstractions from the East” with what amounts to a warning for distracted readers that tend to classify his work as quintessentially Japanese, precisely by stating to what degree his new designs presented there (belonging to the ‘fissure space’ group) are not related to Japanese tradition:

“The three houses introduced in this issue have no direct connection with traditional Japanese architectural composition [...] primarily because the shells of the houses are cubical in form and because the interiors employ none of the traditional Japanese fittings - shōji, sliding paper fusuma doors, and so on.”

This last paragraph is specially revealing, and to a certain extent quite disappointing. It specifies what constitutes for Shinohara the basic elements of “Japanese architectural composition”: spaces that are not cubic (or space-like formed) and use of ethnical secondary elements to render space usable.

What makes the passage quite disappointing is that one would expect a much deeper insight from the architect that strived so long to rejuvenate not the elements, but the spirit of Japanese tradition, against all trends and odds:

“[…] the general trend [in Japan] for the past few decades has been to begin studying the architecture of the West and to return to Japanese styles. My own case was a reverse of this procedure.”

This ‘procedure’ as exposed by Shinohara, though, eludes a constituting fact in the development of modern Japanese architecture, namely, its dependency on Western ideas about Japanese tradition.

The reality is that a certain revival of tradition happened in Japan after its discovery by Western architects, starting in the 19th century, but taking its full drive with the advent of modern architecture in Europe in the 1920s and 1930s, defining its profile as we will later see.

This Western regard towards Japanese tradition...
was by the 1950s well established, and can be summarized in the exhibition, catalogue and built residence that the Museum of Modern Art held in New York.

The Shōfūsō (‘Pine Breeze Villa’) was built in the garden of the Museum of Modern Art and open to the public during the summers of 1954 and 1955. A long citation from Arthur Drexler’s preface will expose that vision precisely:

“A long citation from Arthur Drexler’s preface will expose that vision precisely:

“Farm houses, castles, and folk architecture in general have been included [in the exhibition and catalogue] only incidentally. However beautiful such buildings may be, they convey inadequately the power and subtlety of the art of architecture in Japan. The selection of buildings for detailed presentation has also been influenced to some extent by considerations of their relevance to contemporary Western architecture. The relevance of Japan’s architectural tradition to contemporary Western building is well known. Modern Western practice, with its general use of the steel skeleton frame, has developed effects known to Japanese architecture at least since the eighth century. Walls which do not support a roof but are instead hung like curtains on a structural framework are today a commonplace of Western building. Before 1900 Frank Lloyd Wright made fundamental to his work a Japanese respect for the beauty of natural materials, as well as the hovering, insistently horizontal roofs essential to the Japanese conception of a house. Open interiors and plain surfaces, as in the work of Mies van der Rohe and Le Corbusier, are other Ideas characteristic of Japan which we have been developing in our own way.

[...] Although some architects never entirely abandoned the old principles of building, modern architecture in Japan has evolved, perhaps of necessity, primarily along Western lines. Only recently have their traditional values begun to attract the sympathetic study of Japan’s younger architects.”

THE CONSTRUCTION OF ‘JAPANESENESS’

A decade later, in the year of the ’64 Tokyo Olympics, the monthly magazine The Japan Architect devoted its entire June issue to premodern Japanese architecture. With the title “Nature, space and Japanese architecture style” it covered from its beginnings (established at 30th century BCE) up to 1864, the year of restoration of imperial control over politics and the starting point of Meiji Era, which culminated with the Meiji Reform of 1868 and the subsequent modernization (or homologation) of Japan.

The monograph gathered several greeting notes from Western architecture figures. Their comments, even though concise and with a polite celebratory tone, reflect with precision the main lines of interest aroused by Japanese architecture in the West while mirroring the concrete interests of each architect.

Thus, Walter Gropius insists in the idea of the cultural formation of Japanese architecture from its historical exceptionality, since having been secluded as an isolated political and cultural entity could have a process of development and
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Richard Neutra insists in one of the most recurrent themes from the Western viewpoint: the one about the standardization of Japanese traditional architecture as a prefiguration of standardization of Modern architecture.

Nikolaus Pevsner, in his turn, declares himself an admirer of Japanese architecture not so much from a rational standpoint but as a fascination. In so doing, he indulges in the clichés about the ‘impenetrability’ of Japanese architecture for a Western mind.

In reality, Western perception of Japanese architecture has never been altruistic, but biased and instrumental for the very purposes of Western architecture: it has been more the confirmation of something searched for rather than the comprehension of something discovered.

Ever since the first decades of the last century, starting with the founding appreciations of Bruno Taut, this attitude has led to something that can be called “the Western canon” of Japanese architecture.

A canon, in fact, that beyond the power of conforming how Japanese architects appreciate their own tradition, does so discriminating between “pure Japanese” (honmono, ‘authentic’) and “foreign” (ikamono, ‘fake’), which Taut had dubbed “kitsch”. Or “good” and “bad” to put it simply, based on the prejudices of modernism.

Thus, examples like Ise shrine or Katsura palace have been seen, also by Japanese scholars, as honmono masterpieces of high taste, while other pieces of ancient Japanese architecture like Nikkō Tōshōgū mausoleums have been excluded from the canon as vulgar perversions of bad taste.

In this sense, only features like calmness, horizontality, naturalness or austerity fit into the modernists’ idea of “pure Japanese”, while ornament, dynamism, or monumental should be seen as negative, worthless traits, undeserving of attention. A sort of limited “Japaneseness”, to say the least.

Arata Isozaki calls this double process of assimilation of the Western regard on the part of Japanese people “Japanesquization”, which “resulted in restraining, draining off, and removing the energy conceived in each earlier transformative moment - a stylization today considered abroad as emblematic of the Japanese aesthetics.”

In fact, the whole issue of Japaneseness and how it is understood represents one of the recurrent subjects in establishing, first, Japan as a modern nation and, second, in establishing it as one of the respected democracies in the world.

The Japanese sociologist Koichi Iwabuchi argues...
that the idea of Japaneseness was no more than a cultural construct, fashioned in response to Western stereotyping in the late nineteenth century of Japan as an exotic, inscrutable society, fundamentally different from the European other.

Japan's leaders at the time embraced and reinforced the stereotype, and used it to inspire its people to a unified effort. While wanting to emulate militarily, technically, and economically the Western powers, the Meiji reformers also laid the basis for Japan's view of its own uniqueness:

"[The] emphasis on 'Japaneseness' has been crucial as a means of mobilizing the people. This strategic 'Japaneseness' is something which maximizes national interests and minimizes individualism, consisting of traits such as loyalty to or devotion for the country."

But it will also be necessary to dispose of the yardstick of modern art and architecture and find the intrinsic qualities of tradition per se. Or, as he puts it, "the characteristics and value of Japanese architecture were to be found not in similarities, but in differences between it and the great tradition of Western concepts of space".

But the idea has stuck, both in the West and in Japan alike, as a central concept around which many preoccupations revolve. It has become the looking glass through which to understand this country.

Trying to get rid of this reading and establish solid foundations on which to build his own architecture, while basing it in tradition, will be one of the main endeavors of Shinohara. And to start with, he restates the values of the examples excluded from the canon.

In his article of 1979 "The Savage Machine as an Exercise", he is explicit rememorizing the times in which he was dealing directly with tradition, both rejecting the Western regard patronized by Taut, and taking distances from the direct application of the decorative patterns such of Nikkō:

"[at those times] I regarded the elaborately decorated architecture of the Tōshōgū Shrine at Nikkō as orthodox architectural space and liberated it from the ethical accusation of decadence leveled at it by the German architect Bruno Taut. At the same time, I pointed out the difficulty of finding contemporary meaning for such style in other buildings, including my own designs."

But it will also be necessary to dispose of the yardstick of modern art and architecture and find the intrinsic qualities of tradition per se. Or, as he puts it, "the characteristics and value of Japanese architecture were to be found not in similarities, but in differences between it and the great tradition of Western concepts of space."

"THE JAPANESE CONCEPTION OF SPACE"

In that same 1964 issue of The Japan Architect previously mentioned, the only practicing architect invited to give his insight on Japanese heritage was Kazuo Shinohara.

Besides two short texts commenting on two classical buildings, Shinohara contributed the article "The Japanese Conception of Space",
adorned with a beautiful photograph by Yukio Futagawa. In truth, he merely used the platform of the monograph to express his own vision on the Japanese conception of space and its contemporary translation into (his) architecture.\footnote{Shinohara’s short texts included were: “Jōdo-dō at the Jōdo-ji”, p. 48, and “The kō-no-ma of the Nishi Hongan-ji”, pp. 52-53.}

In his usual contentious way, Shinohara starts with a reappraisal of the “wonderful structure” of the \textit{shoin} of the Jikō-in temple in Nara,\footnote{Literally ‘drawing room’, \textit{shoin} is a reception hall originally meant as a place for study or lectures on the \textit{sūtra} within a temple.} which “some criticize” for its crude construction, “but these beautiful spaces are above any such criticism. To eliminate such forms would be to do away with what we have left of Japanese culture”.

His argumentation goes along the lines of the necessity of establishing a renewed and inclusive reading of Japanese heritage, and in order to do that it is imperative to establish a conceptual framework independent of the Western regard, not only of Japanese tradition, but of architecture itself.

He epitomizes that regard in Sigfried Gideon’s “Space, Time and Architecture” (1941, first Japanese edition 1955), and utilizes Giedion’s approach that “there is a direct connection between the architecture of a period and the concept of space that the period achieves” to differentiate Japanese architecture, subverting the terms and declaring that there is no ‘space’ in Japan:

“In Japan, no concept of ‘space’ came into being. Not once has a concept of space like the ones in the West emerged. In the beautiful spaces at Jikō-in, there is no ‘space’. Katsura Villa, Kinkaku-ji and all the other beautiful and elegant buildings considered to represent Japanese perfection in architecture do not contain any ‘space’ as such. Such beauty as exists is a beauty stemming from the ‘non-existence of space’.”\footnote{2G, p. 244.}

Shinohara is not only trying to establish a differentiated standing point for Japanese architecture by stressing that the idea of ‘space’ is foreign to Japanese culture and tradition. He is implying that any consideration of architecture, and therefore of modern architecture as well, has to be rewritten in transcultural terms in order to encompass non-western ways of doing.

The Western regard was nevertheless, in architecture as in other aspects of Japanese culture, useful at homologizing the country internationally and reestablishing a sense of pride, especially in the light of the modern architecture of the 1930s. But it had its limits, and its perversions:

“The idea that there is an intimate connection between the old Japanese heritage of a sense of space and the point at which Western architecture finally arrived was very strong after the War. This gave the Japanese people confidence and helped them to quickly recover from the defeat of the War; however, it is quite clear that the beautiful Japanese spaces and the new spaces achieved in modern architecture are not things of the same nature. To look at the two, of course, there is a connection, but this is only the feeling that architectural spaces give, and it would be mistaken to believe that these two
Shinohara prepares the reader for the intellectual leap for which the essay is intended. He wants to base his modern architecture on Japanese tradition, but not because it resembles Western modernism. He wants to do without the alibi of the Western regard, and find new grounds on which to base it.

But then, which is the Japanese conception of space? Shinohara attempts at a possible explanation towards the end of the article, articulated rather rhetorically:

“Isn’t the transparent and quietly submerged flow of space that occurs in Jikō-in, Katsura Villa, or Kinkaku-ji a splendid expression of the Japanese worldview of space? Are these not also at the same time magnificent and representative examples of the non-existence of space? A logic of emptiness as an aesthetic of transience appears to flow as an undercurrent through Japanese society. A subtle and inexpressible beauty of impermanence or, in other words, the pathos of what cannot be spoken, or perhaps even thought […]”

To achieve this “pathos of what cannot be spoken, or perhaps even thought” will be Shinohara’s main goal throughout his career in his projects, trying persistently to convey emotions through the spaces of his works.

This aesthetics of transience though is not rooted, as it is in the West according to Giedion, in a scientific view of the world, but rather in a literary sophistication of the elite. Architecture, through the genius of its architects, is nevertheless very apt to express it in material terms:

“In the spatial expression of the typically Japanese examples mentioned here, one is bound to sense the aesthetic generated by the nobility. The reason it is expressed so magnificently in buildings is not that this aesthetic of transience […] is just passively, if accurately, reflected. It is rather because of the aesthetic intensity of the creators of these buildings, who were able to elevate a transient worldview into exquisite formal expression.”

It is quite clear by now that Shinohara could not avoid either to place tradition at the center of his discussions, however distanced from the mainstream. In that, he fully participated in a collective discussion that involved all the gifted Japanese architects of his generation and later, looking for clues in tradition to found their architecture.

Let’s mention three practicing architects of the same generation opening up relationships with the Japanese (lack of) idea of space in three different ways: Shinohara talks about mu (‘nothingness’, ‘void’ or ‘zero’), Izoaki about ma (‘interval’ or ‘gap’, also used as ‘space’), Maki about oku (‘interior’ or ‘core’).
Kazuo Shinohara: House in Kugayama, Tokyo (1954)

Kenzo Tange: Tange House, Tokyo (1953)
KAZUO SHINOHARA vs KENZO TANGE

Shinohara’s work, although inspired by Japanese tradition, and criticized by many in the 1960s for its apparent link to traditional Japanese imagery in his early works, at a time of plastic and megastructures, remains one of the less bound to Japanese clichés of all modern architecture in Japan.

In order to understand this condition, it is illustrative to compare Shinohara’s very first built work, a small house in Tokyo, with its contemporary, Kenzo Tange’s own house, the only single residential project that he ever designed.

Kenzo Tange (1913-2005) is widely regarded as a cosmopolitan and westernized architect. He participated in international forums and debates, and was influential in the Team X, for instance. He is considered the Japanese representative of modern architecture.

In order to understand this condition, it is illustrative to compare Shinohara’s very first built work, a small house in Tokyo, with its contemporary, Kenzo Tange’s own house, the only single residential project that he ever designed.

Kenzo Tange (1913-2005) is widely regarded as a cosmopolitan and westernized architect. He participated in international forums and debates, and was influential in the Team X, for instance. He is considered the Japanese representative of modern architecture.

Kazuo Shinohara, on the other hand, is routinely understood as the quintessential Japanese architect, deriving his oeuvre from traditional architecture, and embodying the essence of Japanese culture.

It is true that Tange and Shinohara represent two disparate directions of Japanese architecture, the two poles between which Japanese architecture will oscillate from the end of the 2nd World War up to now. But what is probably more relevant is the different approach that each of them had towards tradition, probably one that would invert conventional perceptions of both architects.

Tange had a continued relation with tradition. At the beginning of his career, during the war, he indulged in the prevailing political taste to assert the personality of Japan via remakes of traditional types. Later on, he published two grand books, first on Katsura, and later on Ise.

Both his contribution to a construction of a ‘National Japanese Style’ and his analysis of classical pieces of Japanese architecture follow in the steps of the established canon and appraisal of tradition, further reinforcing that same canon through his status.

This mediated Japanese of Tange can be seen clearly in his house. Designed in 1951 and completed in 1953 in Seijo, a well-off neighborhood of Tokyo, uses timber and paper as main construction materials, and is based in the modular system provided for by conventional tatami mats.

Even though the structure of the house has a peculiar double cantilever which is not to be found in traditional architecture, the cross section, the interiors and the detailing convey a familiar atmosphere of homologized Japanese domesticity.

The House in Kugayama (1953-1954) by Shinohara
Kazuo Shinohara: House in Kugayama, Tokyo (1954)
shares with Tange’s not only the period of construction, but also a Katsura air by being both raised on slim pilotis one floor above ground, reserving a fraction of the lower floor as functional spaces.

But the differences between the two houses are telling of two divergent approaches to domestic design and, by implication, to tradition.

House in Kugayama is built in steel, using combinations of small profiles due to material shortages, which indicates Shinohara’s determination to produce a specific image detached from Japanese imagery. That image is provided by Mies van der Rohe’s Farnsworth House (1945-1951), a direct relationship that Shinohara acknowledged in many occasions. From that project Shinohara would borrow, for instance, the structural detailing of pillars in front of beams.

The interior also reveals other interests about tradition. The tatamis were square, and the materials were not conventional: “dark-blue cotton cloth was pasted on almost all of the inner walls, golden-colored Japanese paper was pasted on ceilings”.

Still, he recognized those unconventional choices as “[…] direct expressions of my sensitivity, which longed for ‘things Japanese’”. These ‘things Japanese’ are elements extracted from tradition, but don’t comply with the prevalent views about tradition. Rather, they question them.

**EXTRACTING ABSTRACTION**

As we have seen, Kazuo Shinohara relation with tradition was long and multifold, and he explained it abundantly and reiteratively, to the point of becoming a mantra, or a legend. It started with his encounters with some classical Japanese buildings which acted as the trigger compelling him to shift from mathematics to architecture:

> “Many encounters with the wonderful heritage are still vivid in my memory. Strongly swayed by my own emotions, I longed to express myself in architecture and rushed into the construction of Japanese space.”

It started as an emotion. But it continued as a topic of study in which he persevered for many years. After his appointment as Assistant Professor at TokyoTECH, he started a series of field trips and analysis of folk architecture and urbanism that eventually ended up being his PhD dissertation.

His studies and conclusions were published in a long series of articles for the Architectural Institute of Japan, from 1957 to 1977. Their titles reveal the nature of Shinohara’s investigation: the series “The Nature of Japanese Architecture” or “The Methods of...”

---
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of Japanese Architecture” deal from “The Meaning of Open Space” to the “The Height Proportions of Ancient Architecture”, to name but a few of the first half of this 20-year research.105

The second half deals, in another long series of papers, with the structure of Japanese traditional cities and villages, their different residential and non-residential building typologies, and the other urban elements that constitute them, like roads or topography.

Shinohara undertakes this research with the goal of understanding the mechanisms of traditional architecture and how they can be used to rejuvenate contemporary architecture. It is not a nostalgic or preservationist regard, but instrumental.

Shinohara extracts from tradition some traits that he later on uses in his designs. But in this process of abstraction, he leaves behind many aspects of tradition, especially figurative ones.

What he is after is the essence of Japanese architecture and urbanism, and from them he isolates those elements that best suit his purpose as designer, in what has to been seen as a search for confirmation of his own architectural inclinations.

There are two aspects extracted from his analysis of tradition that he insistently mentioned, and that deserve a closer look to understand to what point they are an intellectual construction of his own.

The first one is what he called the ‘method of division’. What Shinohara understands by this is a process of compartmentation of the plan, originally oblong, in order to accommodate different functions that need separation.

He starts from the assumption that the primordial plan in Japanese architecture is a rectangle resulting from the construction of the roof; a shell, in short.

Although Shinohara opposes this system to what he calls the “European system” of creating space, that is, a system by which the house is a volume resulting from several additions, the truth is that throughout European folk architecture with similar building materials and climate conditions as in Japan we can find analogous solutions for the house.

Examples abound in rural parts of Central Europe, like the Swiss chalet; or in historical folk architectures such as the Nordic Halls.106 In all these examples we can find comparable ways of dealing with the necessity of providing a conditioned shelter and to separate functions as necessary, especially in more developed or sophisticated cases.

All share the situation of do the most with limited resources, trying to get the rain out and keep

105. See the complete list in Annex 3.
106. An excellent account of the Hall as primordial type-space can be found in Yago Bonet Correa, “La arquitectura del humo” (‘Smoke Architecture’), Sada-A Coruña: Edición do castro, 1994. I don’t know of any English version of this otherwise highly commendable book.
Jōdōdō at Jōdo-ji, Ōno (1194)

Katsura Palace, Kyoto
the heat in, giving similar shapes in what can be understood a universal constant, not a local peculiarity.

Yet more problematic is his claim of ‘frontality’ as being quintessentially Japanese and informing its architecture.

Even acknowledging the fact that many religious edifices in Japan, organized under the Chinese canon of symmetry and axial approach, have a front façade which is usually the only façade worth speaking of, this fact alone doesn’t explain the whole range of Japanese architecture or of its perceptive qualities.

Many other religious buildings, including the much-revered by Shinohara Jōdōdō at Jōdo-ji (Ono, 1194), are pavilion-like, isolated and approachable from any side, and thus have a volume which is accounted for in their designs, from turning pillars or eaves at the edges to detailing for surrounding decks, quite in the classical European way.

On the other hand, the traditional isometric representation of space in Japan, derived from the Chinese dengjiao toushi and used since the 7th century as the normal method of representation,¹⁰⁷ is a way of visualizing volumes and their interconnecting spaces which favors not only a single approach or point of view, but allows for many simultaneously, in a sort of kaleidoscopic result.

Especially problematic becomes Shinohara’s claim for frontality if one thinks of Japanese folk architecture, with its wide diversity of situations and solutions; or of the aulic shoin-zukuri architecture represented by Katsura Detached Palace in Kyoto, where a series of volumes generate a volumetric perspective far from frontal.

Shinohara’s claims for frontality or division have to be seen, then, not as a corroborated truth about Japanese traditional architecture, but as his own readings. They are elements identified by him that serve his purpose to restate this tradition and, especially, its associated Japaneseness, in his quest to find in it a value per se, independent of Western or modernist readings.

The very purpose of informing his architecture through a personal reading of tradition, using it as an inspirational source and extracting from it whatever he needs for his ideas, is a step towards liberating his architecture both from the constraints of ‘reenacting’ tradition, and from the clichés of modernism and its offsprings.

Yann Nussaume puts it succinctly:

“From the 1950s […] Shinohara starts questioning the founding principles of modern architecture and of rationalism […] and his reflections bring him to […] do a very personal reading of tradition and of Japanese space: a sort of abstraction born out of traditional forms. For Kenzo Tange and the Metabolists it will be different, and we witness a willingness to convert Japanese tradition into

Conversely, Shinohara succeeds in creating a radical new architecture for Japan: radical because it is rooted in a society, in its mores and modes, in its sensibility, and in its everyday life.

The result will be a reconsideration of domesticity and of the house, free from prejudices, apt to adopt different forms of emotion.
The renowned Japanese critic Hiroyuki Suzuki once made an observation that hints at how un-Japanese the designs of Shinohara are:

“Perhaps as a consequence of his concern with such matters [meaning, symbolism], his floor plans give very short shrift to both entrances and kitchens, which are apparently missing in his architectural prototypes. This is all the more surprising in the light of the Japanese way of life. In spite of the complicated nature of the Japanese entrance and entrance hall, where footwear is removed and stored, Shinohara treats such spaces as nothing more than the physical presences. Japanese families prepare all kinds of food, including traditional Japanese dishes, Western dishes, and Chinese meats; but Shinohara treats the kitchen with disregard.”

And continues with a strong criticism that amounts to a prejudice, since it is actually contested by the very fact that many of these houses still exist, inhabited by the same owners, and have served their dwellers for decades:

“His houses lack what it takes to make a house a place for human living. They are too perfect and strong in themselves to provide room for the unspecified activities that constitute daily life. Overweening concern with his own course of development pervades all his spaces, which do not appear to be places for people to live. I have sometimes wondered whether any other architect in history has so completely concentrated on his own personal awareness.”

This last one is a very Japanese reproach that frowns upon individuality. More importantly, what the otherwise sharp Suzuki fails to see, like many of Shinohara’s detractors going along similar lines, is that what Shinohara is interested is in exploring an alternative way of inhabiting a house. A way that, needless to say, requires the connivance of an active and daring client.

Many of Shinohara’s clients were artists or publishers, and this helps to explain the many chances he had to bring forward such unconventional designs, and their endurance. Even if the list of clients is quite long, it is worth recalling, noting on the side that several of them commissioned Shinohara more than one house:

- Tanikawa House 1 and 2 were designed for the poet Shuntarō Tanikawa;
- House with an Earthen Floor and House in Uehara, for the photographer Kiyoji Ōtsuji;
- Asakura House and Prism House, for the painter and set designer Setsu Asakura;
- House in White, for the publisher Tadashi Metsui;
- House of Earth, for the stage director Tetsuro Onuma;
- Yamashiro House, for the graphic designer Ryuichi Yamashiro;
- Shino House, for the poet and editor Hiroshi Shino;
- Cubic Forest, for the Japanese style painter Masayoshi Nakamura (now it is his museum);
- Sea Starcase and House in Itoshima, for the painter Gyōji Nomiyama;
- House in Karuizawa, for the sculptor Aijirō Wakita;
- House on a Curved Road, for the poet Yasuyuki Suzuki.
The rest of houses were designed for doctors or professors, including a former member of the Parliament (House with a Big Roof, for Yozo Kato). The rest of houses were designed for doctors or professors, including a former member of the Parliament (House with a Big Roof, for Yozo Kato).111

Quite naturally, an unconventional space needs a willing user, not only to commission and accept it, but especially to find a way to inhabit it in unconventional terms. To put it differently: to make the effort to understand the new lifestyle possibilities opened up by that space and make it his or her own. The saddest demonstration of this paradigm is the demolition of House in Yokohama, built for himself, after Shinohara had to sell it: a space too ‘characterized’ to be bearable by everybody. Shinohara was well aware of that:

“My venture towards abstracted simple forms could hardly be realized without the support of families able to understand how abstraction can empower spaces, which in turn invites a leap towards a new style for themselves. My contribution to such a leap may be quite minimal but I am hoping that it is a positive one that can be stored up for the future.”112

This much Suzuki sees and acknowledges, somehow contradictorily with his previous remarks, personalizing architecture as a character vis-à-vis with people:

“[Shinohara] seeks, not architecture that makes itself a servant for human beings, but architecture that can coexist with humanity.”113

In fact, what Shinohara is after is to make of the house a realm of emotions, bring in the core of the house an awareness of which is not domestic, because “the house, the one space that comes in most direct contact with humanity, must face the uncertainty of both interior and exterior worlds”.114

These uncertainties he talks about are not to be muffled by a pretended stability offered by the house. On the contrary, he is attracted by those uncertainties generating irrational conditions as a source of inspiration:

“I have found topics for my spaces in those areas of the heart where irrationalities are constantly being built and torn down. Consequently, I have insisted on the restoration of the irrational”.115

This will be done in a “super-human space”, that is, “spaces that are beyond mere human physical scale, and then return these to human beings”.116

A psychological space, in short, capable of giving human experience a dimension different from those proposed, systematized and conventionalized by society.

It will be the task of the architect to offer that, and he or she must “realize his unique expressive talent to create spaces that, by highlighting raw human emotions, will save architecture from becoming a unitary model. That is to say: spaces that incline toward the irrational, yet somehow remain at the heart of today’s vast flood of material production.”117 The architect of houses must be an artist.

---

111. Taken from the compilation of works published in JA 03.1979, pp. 84-89. David B. Stewart has noted that the smaller houses had unconventional clients and have been preserved better and in the same family, while the bigger ones had more affluent and conventional clients and many have been sold or replaced. 2G p.28.


115. Ibid.


117. Ibid, p. 250.
Another ‘irrationality’ of sorts prompted Shinohara to write, as early as 1962, one of the fundamental essays to establish his vision of the architect of houses as an artist.

That article was titled, simply but contentiously as usual in Shinohara, “The House is Art”. It marks his standpoint in a moment of rapid growth in Japan and the rise of Metabolism and its idea of the house as a disposable item. A few years later, talking about the Umbrella House, he recalls the situation in which he adumbrated that idea:

“To build this small house [55 m², the second smallest in his oeuvre], I commuted to the building site in the suburbs of Tokyo on many days. On cold winter days the road to the building site seemed to be very long. I wondered about the rationale for designing, supervising the construction of, and completing such a small house in the midst of this large industrialized society. Not the social production of housing but the creation of space which strongly appeals to people is the work of house designing. Unless they become art, houses have no reason for being”.

“The House is Art” is actually a manifesto in which Shinohara advances the idea that house design is not only worth of attention in spite of being economically irrelevant, but that the house is, above all, “a criticism of civilization”.

In order to establish this renewed status for the house, “the house has to be separated from the territory of architecture. It has to be moved into the community of Art, where painting, sculpture, literature and others belong”.

To claim that house is art, but not architecture, seems paradoxical. It is generally assumed that architecture is one of the arts, and that a house is architecture. The Japanese word *kenchiku* used by Shinohara covers the same epistemological field as ‘architecture’, so it is not a matter of cultural or linguistic difference.

What Shinohara attempts to point out, and expands later in the text, is at characterizing ‘architecture’ as heavily connoted with economic, political or social power, beyond its intellectual or aesthetical values, which may actually mask its true nature.

And not only ‘house’ and ‘architecture’ have to be differentiated, but the same name of the ‘creator’ of the house cannot be ‘architect’, but has to be changed. Shinohara uses the Japanese expression *jūtaku sakka*, literally ‘author of houses’, instead of the standard *jūtaku kenchikuka*, ‘architect of houses’. This way, at the beginning of the essay he stresses the link with art instead of the more conventional understanding of an architect’s role. But his use of this neologism is inconsistent, and in the text he uses both terms.

Shinohara frequently explains in his later texts that “The House is Art” declaration lied at the bottom of his confrontation against the “technology-above-all” approach to architecture and, specifically, to
In this confrontation, he takes sides: “Over the rationalism and functionalism that appeared the order of the day, I chose the diametrically opposed stand of irrationalism.”121 ‘Irrationalism’ is thus equated with ‘art’.

But he takes the sides of David against the Goliath of social production of housing, what he called before ‘architecture’, a powerful machine against which, the only reasonable move to do, is to step aside and let it pass: “[…] Once we recognize that house design has nothing to do with social production, we don’t have to worry to be hindering the progress of society”.

This is the keystone of this article, its founding justification. If house design is not constrained by the overwhelming responsibility of mass production and of adapting itself to the advancements of technical society, it is free to pursue other ways and other purposes and, therefore, become significant by contrast, offering a critical alternative to that same society that may prove indispensable for the survival of its polyhedral, humanistic understanding.

But even though his standpoint is that of affirming the individuality of design based on emotions, as opposed to standardization based on economic criteria, he will devise a way to make available his houses to a wider audiences. After all, art is reproducible.

THE HOUSE AS A REPRODUCIBLE WORK OF ART: ODAKYU EXHIBITION

In April 1964 it took place, for just five days, an exhibition in the Odakyu Department Store in the neighborhood of Shinjuku, Tokyo.122 It was then, like today, one of the largest stores in the city, located above the main train station of Odakyu Line in Shinjuku, nowadays the busiest transportation hub in the world, and already the main station in Tokyo back then.

The city, and the whole country, was in full gear giving the last touches to the urban transformations taking place to host the Summer Olympics in October that year.

Those were years of great social and political turmoil, and in fact announced what would be the big social leap of 1967 and 1968, when students’ protests resonated around the world, marking the way of the more famous 1968 riots in Paris. Artists were very involved in these discussions and had an important role in making that particular zeitgeist visible.

Starting in the 1950s, and well down to the 1970s, many groups appeared and disappeared, aiming at disparate directions but all sharing a will to connect with what was happening in society. To the point that a recent exhibition in the Museum of Modern Art in New York could put them all under the umbrella “Tokyo 1955-1970: A New Avant-

---

120. See for instance “Now and Function”, SD 01.1979, p. 7.
121. Ibid.
122. It took place between the 3rd and the 8th of April, 1964. This is the same year that Shinohara publishes “Jūtaku kenchiku” (‘Residential Architecture’). Odakyu Department store, 7th floor exhibition area.
FIVE FORMS OF EMOTION
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Those transformations affected all aspects of society:

“Japan’s wholesale reconstruction in the first postwar decade and the period that followed was so thorough that it had to be engaged not only on the social and spatial strata, but also on the subjective levels of the individual and of the body itself.”

Amidst this frenetic activity the newspaper Asahi Shimbum, one of the main media companies in Japan and producer of the exhibition series “Living: Living” at Odakyu, asked Kazuo Shinohara and the painter and set designer Setsu Asakura, a friend and client of Shinohara’s, to present their ideas about domestic space.

Shuntarō Tanikawa, one of Shinohara’s first clients and the most prestigious alive poet in Japan today, was asked by them to contribute his poems and thoughts as well, and Toru Takemitsu, of international fame years later, was in charge of the ambient music.

They called the exhibition, very literally, Depāto no naka ni tatta futatsu no ie (‘Two Houses Built inside a Department Store’), and it was described as an inverted tandem at the time:

“Asuno seikatsu no imegi o tsukuru to omō”.

They apparently “evoked a good deal of discussion”. So much so that “Although this type of exhibition frequently ends in disaster, this particular one was a great success.”

The two houses actually built in the exhibition were fragments of two different designs for detached houses. This ‘house within the house’ condition, as we will see later, was not as neutral as one would expect. That is, the space in the floor of the department store was not a non-existent or forgettable context which Shinohara could obviate.

While Shinohara built two prototypes of residential designs at full scale, “Miss Asakura cooperated by doing the curtains, the fusuma-e, the furniture, and the lighting designs.”

It apparently “evoked a good deal of discussion”. So much so that “Although this type of exhibition frequently ends in disaster, this particular one was a great success.”

The idea of showing full-scale houses or apartments in a department store, or even a museum, was of course not new at the time, and certainly has not vanished from our current experience. We can recall a contemporary of Shinohara’s, Macy’s department stores’ Leisurama line of houses which were available for purchase in the United States in
Nowadays, the company Muji is showing in Japan its model house in several locations, as Ikea is doing globally. And in more recent times this custom of showing architectural prototypes has also been sustained. This was the way how Toyo Ito presented his “Exhibition Project, or the Pao as a Dwelling of Tokyo’s Nomad Women” in 1985.

All these examples, and their being shown in mass-consumer venues like department stores, are obviously meant to be replicated, however ‘personalized’ they might be. Prefabrication, modularity and standardization of elements and systems are necessary to make them reproducible. They are ‘models’ of infinite series with no recognizable, or acknowledged, designer, meant to serve a ‘model’, impersonalized inhabitant.

Shinohara’s approach is different, and very characteristic of his defense of the role of the architect as artist and his parallel defense of the individual against the economic machine of mass production.

There is a latent contradiction between the necessity to establish a unique piece of art and the necessity to make it available to as wide an audience as possible. His way of circumventing this possible conflict is to equate the production of ‘artistic’ houses to the reproduction of art, akin to the way that ukiyo-e woodprints are made, so that parts are mass-produced but the ensemble done by craftsmen will be personalized.

This system he calls ‘house duplication’, “a production method between the creation of the individual house and industrial prefabrication”. 134

“What I call a prototypical house is the result of a system of reproducing beautiful houses at factories, using original design rich in individuality, like making many woodblock prints from one set of blocks. Any reproduced house may be regarded as identical with the prototypical house, just as prints are like the original. [...] Moreover, if the designer limits the output [that is, does limited editions], he can control the relationship between the value of individuality and the value accruing from rarity”. 135

His proposal is actually disconcerting, or naïve, in which he acknowledges that, by his method, houses can be produced ‘from one to infinity. When the number is one, the house built is identical with a custom-built house. When the number is infinite, the built houses are the same as mass-produced’. 136

In reality, what interests Shinohara is not to devise a system or a technique to provide cheap housing, however well-designed. What he is after is to convince the industry of adopting unique designs, replicate them and, interestingly although probably illogically, incorporating the skills of construction craftsmen who are “alienated from the housing industry”, thus ensuring the personalized result albeit being a replica.
Besides the two full-scale prototypes, Shinohara showed at the exhibition three more projects: an initial proposal for Setsu Asakura’s House, which would be finally built differently, a third unbuilt prototype square in plan and using standardized modules, and the Black Space model, which we will deal at length with when talking about House of Earth.

The brochure of the exhibition featured the 8 projects built by Shinohara to date, with the double intention to promote himself, and to illustrate what sort of variations on domesticity he was proposing with his prototypes.

ABOUT DOMESTICITY

Most of the theoretical and practical work of Kazuo Shinohara revolved around the house. The interiors he designed are remarkably comfortable and, one would add, homely, in ... manipulations of space and transgressions of conventional attitudes towards the domestic that he applied in his projects.

Nevertheless, it is quite startling to realize that he never wrote directly about these issues of domesticity, or pledged for certain characteristics of usability of the house that would make it an advancement for contemporary inhabitants, like we can find in so much of the literature of the fifties, a decade when, after the war, domestic space needed, and was given, a restatement.

Instead, Shinohara’s writings about the house are typically self-centered in the process of their design, which is understood at large as an abstract procedure, the realm of the artist, a personal endeavor that has to help the architect to ‘create’ a significant, and own, space, regardless of other conditions.

See by way of example several instances in one of his earlier texts, “Theory of Residential Architecture”, which, under the subtitle ‘To carve eternity in spaces’, starts with the strong assertion that: “I would like the houses I design to stand forever on this earth.” And continues: “If a house is outstanding in spatial terms, then it should be granted a longer existence. That is my basic thrust.”

And precisely about the idea of comfort he writes:

“When I say that I want to create a conceptual space, certain questions naturally arise: ‘Whose concepts? The resident’s? The architect’s?’ The issue is also bound to arise whether the attempt is even necessary. And it is perfectly reasonable to respond that, on the premise a house need only be comfortable to live in, any added concept may suggest that the architect is overstepping his bounds. I have never felt securing comfort in very small spaces to be a especially difficult task. And particularly not nowadays when high standard of design are so easily attainable. In this day and age, I believe an architect is hardly needed just to satisfy...

139. 2G p. 246.
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Thus, according to Shinohara, the legitimacy of the architect arises from his/her capability to give beauty and emotion or, to put it in his own terms, to ‘carve eternity’ into space, because: “unless today’s residential design creates spaces of high aesthetic quality, our raison d’être will be diminished.”

In 1971 Shinohara is invited as judge for the 1972 edition of the then internationally famous Shinkenchiku Residential Design Competition, to be delivered in March 1972. The theme Shinohara chooses is, tellingly although perhaps a bit redundantly given the title of the competition, ‘The Home’.

In a loose leaflet included in the magazine, he delineates a general account of his purpose with the theme, gives meticulous directions on how to present the proposals, ... never been republished although it illuminates very clearly some of the attitudes of Shinohara towards domestic design.

In the presentation of his guidelines for the competition he is very direct:

“It seems likely that conditions around use will become more severe, and I am convinced that the only spaces that can possibly serve as models for the modern house of the new age are ones firmly rooted in the individual architect’s assurance of an ability to give expression to his own ideas.”

Still, why ‘The Home’? He finishes his article explaining it:

“When a competition has a theme like ‘The Home’, it should deal with the large question of housing projects and communal dwellings. But this has been handled often in the past; besides, it is a problem with which I have no experience. As far as I am concerned, your entries may be limited to the independent individual house. Pay no attention to caviling to the effect that the independent house is no longer a source of interest. I have heard that several times, but I have been doing, and am continuing to do, this kind of design. I an age when conditions are poor for the creative process, if there is still even a little concern with the inexhaustibly fascinating subject of “The Home”, such interest must be cherished. For that reason, do not believe unconditionally that the house is of necessity a concentrated architectural expression. It can only be triumphantly so dubbed when we architects have, with our hands, created good houses.”

One of the main pursuits along Shinohara’s career, based on a fundamental contradiction, is to build a coherent, autonomous body of work while at the same time catering for the specific needs of clients in discrete and somehow disparate designs.

In this article he gives this issue an explicit expression, and recognizes this is a key question if the architect wants to create significant spaces:

“Small residential spaces are ideally suited to realizing an architect’s spatial ideas and methodologies; however, the task of perpetrating and intensifying those ideas in the world is by no
means easy. Since the conditions surrounding a space that the architect finds ideal from this standpoint are likely to suit the needs of the owner at that moment, the architect rarely has an opportunity to expand and continue his arbitrary thoughts on any given case. The question of the immediate needs of the house under consideration are of basic importance, but of equal interest is the problem of giving continued existence to the actualizations of those needs. 146 [AE]

But he has warned,

“The problem has more aspects than this, however. The fresh expression of the architect’s personality almost invariably invites a head-on collision with the owner of the house. […] Creativity is not born automatically of an accumulation of day-to-day experiences. Instead, it is a discovery of ways to revolutionize the accepted day-to-day way of living.” 147

The client, attached to his/her condition of having only day-to-day experiences, is unable to see beyond and “revolutionize the accepted day-to-day way of living”. But this warning also applies to the architect, who could consider the resolution of the “immediate needs” oh the client the primary goal of his work.

It is even more difficult to keep researching for what Shinohara calls an “anti-day-to-day position”:

“Although it is true of other kinds of design too, it is often the case that the freshest and strongest works in an architect’s career appear in his early attempts. Maintaining the strength to create an anti-day-to-day position in the face of the fearsome power of the ordinary is difficult. […] An architect’s ideas and methods recede as a result of the pressure exerted by facts.” 148 [AE]

To avoid this process of decadence of the architect’s ideas or performance, he proposes to “discover new anti-humdrum things [sic]; and we must not forget to calculate for the sake of their continuous development”. 149

So the idea of residential design in Shinohara can be said to have to a good extent an anti-domestic drive. 150 This drive, of course, is not an isolated effort and shares a nearly-universal tendency towards a requalification of the house, especially after the Second World War, which in fact brought about the possibility of realizing many of the ideas put forward in the 1920s and 1930s. 151

In fact, it could be argued that avant-garde residential architecture of the 20th century found its raison d’être attacking the bourgeoisie domesticity defined in the previous century, when it established itself as the residential ideal. As Christopher Reed puts it, “Ultimately, in the eyes of the avant-garde, being undomestic came to serve as a guarantee of being art”. 152

One of the most radical of these anti-domestic argumentations of the house, contemporary to Shinohara’s, is Reyner Banham’s “A Home is not a House”. 153 Based in one of Banham’s most cherished dichotomies, that of Old-Europe vs. New-America, the English historian deploys in this article a
complete strategy to get rid of all sentimentality -and in so doing, get rid of the monumentality it is attached to- regarding what a home is. His article famously starts with a radical question:

“When your house contains such a complex of piping, flues, ducts, wires, lights, inlets, outlets, ovens, sinks, refuse disposers, hi-fi reverberators, antennae, conduits, freezers, heaters -when it contains so many services that the hardware could stand up by itself without any assistance from the house, why have a house to hold it up? When the cost of all this tackle is half of the total outlay (or more, as it often is), what is the house doing except concealing your mechanical pudenda from the stares of folks on the sidewalk?”

This ‘mechanical invasion’, as he later in the article calls it, is not sufficiently accepted by the profession though, and Banham mentions two main reasons for the mostly negative reactions that architects have against it:

“The first is that mechanical services are too new to have been absorbed into the proverbial wisdom of the profession: none of the great slogans -Form Follows Function, accusez la structure, Firmiss Commodity and Delight, Truth to Materials, Wenig ist Mehr- is much use in coping with the mechanical invasion. The nearest thing, in a significantly negative way, is Le Corbusier’s ‘Pour Ledoux, c’était facile - pas de tubes’, which seems to be gaining proverbial type -the mechanical invasion is a fact, and architects-especially American architects- sense that it is a cultural threat to their position in the world.”

Both reasons are actually not that different, and both are of a cultural nature, because the ‘mechanical invasion’ represents a cultural threat to established ideas about what is and what is not architecture, how it is imagined, and who decides it.

Banham’s somehow sketchy plan to embrace the mechanical invasion and get rid of the house once and for all is based actually on the acceptance of the inevitability of the mechanization of our lives. And the pioneering example of the American Way of Life (a cliché well understood by Banham) shows the way to go -a way of ‘not making architecture’:

“Left to their own devices, Americans do not monumentalize or make architecture. From the Cape Cod cottage, through the balloon frame to the perfection of permanently pleated aluminum siding with embossed wood-graining, they have tended to build a brick chimney and lean a collection of shacks against it.”

But differently from such attempts to separate ‘house’ from ‘home’, based in the technicisation of domestic space, Shinohara wants to depart from the mechanist view that understands a house as a disposable good and, as we have seen before, ‘carve eternity into space’ -into domestic space, that is. But he will do so with a machine.
MAKING THE ART MACHINE

Even though the goal of creating emotion in the house was devised and defined by Shinohara right from the start of his career, the ways in which he achieved it were diverse in materials, in elements, and even in generated emotions.

But there is a constant throughout his oeuvre, which is the qualification of space as a generator of emotions. As we have seen, this quality that for a Westerner might be obvious is in reality foreign to the Japanese tradition, and in this sense as well Shinohara has to be seen as an heterodox.

Of course nowadays this is a common trait among architects all over the world, including Japan, but in reality, the very notion of space is quite recent in European architecture as well.

As Peter Collins points out, “it is a curious fact that until the eighteenth century no architectural treatise ever used the word, whilst the idea of space as a primary quality of architectural composition was not fully developed until the last few years”. 157

This qualification, or materialization, of space has also in Shinohara an evolution that goes from the utilization of extraordinary elements, like a pillar or the interior of a roof, to the juxtaposition of disparate systems, to the final embodiment of space as an envelope of experience.

In the first case, like in Umbrella House, House in White or the sacramental interiors of the ‘Second Style’, the observer is put in a passive position of awe, and the emotion is generated by the empathy and the resonances that those elements generate, in a process of recalling of memories and experiences.

Here the materialization of space relies on the capacity of the elements of creating by themselves the whole ‘atmosphere’, and Shinohara draws from tradition and its stock those components with more emotional feelings attached, like earthen floors.

In the second case, the observer is put in an intriguing position of which he or she has to make sense of the space, which is not at once understandable, and which requires the active participation of the observer to be understood, like in Tanikawa House or House in Uehara.

In these cases, the awkwardness of the situation, and the subsequent qualification of space, is generated by elements out of scale or out of place, in combination with ‘normal’ elements like a roof or a domestic space pierced by structure.

In the third case, finally, the observer is prompted to feel with his or her body following the clues that the space provides, chromatic or of views towards the exterior, following a dynamic path of different, concatenated experiences. House of Earth or House in Yokohama are epitomes of this case.
In all these cases the generation of emotions by means of a compositive device, via elements or via envelopes, can be called the product of a space machine, in the sense already mentioned of Le Corbusier and his *machine à émouvoir*.

Perhaps Shinohara wouldn’t disapprove of this comparison, although he surely would point out vigorously that his machine is different from those of the modernists.

He would have a point considering the last part of his career, when he theorized more openly about the architectural machine, as we will see with House in Yokohama.

In that last notion, ‘machine’ is mostly understood as a procedure of montage, drawing from examples of high-tech technology, in a parallel not too different of the formal metaphors of the 1920s, but developed in a stylized way, more conceptual than physical.

That assemblage of the last part of his career, tellingly enough, marks a recognition of the outside, i.e. the city in his stylized terms, departing from the enclosure of most of his projects and the certain disdain towards the context in which they occur.

The great assemblage is the urban body, understood as the result of multiple instances interacting among them and functioning as a single device. The interest of such urban body for Shinohara lies in one of its main attributes, vitality:

“Vitality is in a sense synonymous with urban freedom. A city that is ceaselessly generating such vitality is mankind’s greatest, unintentionally created machine.”

And the ultimately vital, urban machine is Tokyo.

The conurbation of Tokyo is an extensive metropolis, the biggest urban agglomeration in the world.\(^\text{159}\) It has been the largest or one of the largest globally since ancient times,\(^\text{160}\) but this complex organization of activities, fluxes and lives has been done historically with no planning determining its form, unlike the case of Kyoto, which is based on Chinese traditional models, regular and hierarchized.

It has been, rather, the result of a different, quite organic approach to urban functionality. Not being based on form, it is based in the interaction of different forces and in the optimization of their relationships, to assure a precise, clockwork mechanism serving millions of people.

When occasions for its redesign appeared, like in the wake of the Great Kantō Earthquake of 1923 or after the devastating incendiary bombings of WW2 in 1945, the efforts of those proposing a comprehensive urban planning were quickly overcome by urgent necessities and limited resources, high-speed dynamics of the city, and lack of sufficient political and social backing to implement such schemes.

Tokyo epitomizes the Japanese city in many respects. Morphologically it is the result of several overlapping processes and actions, at different speeds, at different moments and with different goals. The peculiarity of Tokyo is that this processes and actions don’t cancel the previous ones, but end up coexisting in an ever-increasing layered result.

Not having a hierarchically defined form, they are at the same level of relevance. Infrastructures such as railways (of key importance in Tokyo and elsewhere in Japan) or the highway system built after 1959 and in full operation for the 1964 Olympics, for instance, are laid over existing urban tissues, neither imposing their logic nor being affected by preexisting urban patterns. The result is a sort of awkward, or unformalized, coexistence of systems mutually accommodated.

It has to be said, though, that there are very strict urban regulations governing edifices in Tokyo. They mostly refer to a certain awareness of the context, in the sense of assuring their abovementioned accommodated coexistence. The most common in different wards of the city are minimum separations to neighboring sites, and setbacks ensuring, at least on paper, an adequate insolation.

But they all refer to the individuality of the architectural object, not to the ensemble, which is basically regulated by different sorts of zoning. In fact, Tokyo has grown following very rudimentary, or unsophisticated, guidelines, like those of a
medieval town: higher buildings along the main roads, low buildings the rest.

But the result is not exactly village-like. It is a vibrant metropolis, concentrating a significant portion of the world’s wealth, with close to hundred universities and colleges, at the highest level of technology, and connected to, and influencing, global interactions in many respects ever since Meiji Restoration of 1868.

Moreover, its cityscape has been for decades a test bed for the application of advanced mass-communication technologies, superimposing yet another layer to the physicality of its urban structure.

This result, made of non-hierarchical systems occurring simultaneously, will deeply influence Kazuo Shinohara since the early years of his career. If there is a Shinoharian theory about the city at all, it is because of Tokyo as it is.

In one of his last major articles, “Towards Architecture”, Shinohara points out that “For me, the city must be considered with Tokyo as a starting point.”

Tokyo as a starting point, as tradition was a starting point early in his career. Arguably, current city is the real tradition, mixing old and new, East and West. Tokyo is the result of such mixture, creating the new standard conditions for the complexities of contemporary Japanese life.

If this new condition is true for most parts of the world today, which is becoming really global while rapidly becoming urbanized to the point that even countryside lifestyles are urban, it is a characteristic that certainly has Tokyo as an epitome. It is in Tokyo where we can witness these multiple processes shaping the city.

The only possibility for an architect, now clearly seen although for long time intuited, is to embrace this ‘new’ Japanese city and what it represents in order to build his or her own architecture.

It is the new context of referral. This is what Toyo Ito would also say, with a strong Shinoharian accent:

“As Japanese architects, we are compelled to deal with the difficult problem of designing buildings in an urban context […] where nothing is immutable or steady enough to trust, where everything is relative. The only thing we can do is recognize the mechanism of Tokyo for what it is and attempt to evolve architectural models to suit it.”

Or, as he would express even more directly ten years later: “I believe [that today’s] architecture must reflect the city called Tokyo.”
Shibuya ward, Tokyo
The city called Tokyo is, as explained before, a lively and bizarre amalgam of signs, buildings and infrastructures. It works smoothly, but it makes everybody agree, for a chaotic view.

Disagreement starts on how to consider this visual chaos. Now it might seem quite a cliché to appreciate the sunny side of chaos, but it was not always the case, much less right after WW2, a hell of a chaos in itself.

Probably this recent recognition of Tokyo’s reality has to do with a process of self-reassurance in many aspects of Japanese society, which is nowadays in less need to turn to Western models than it did before.

Kazuo Shinohara starts writing about the urban chaos of Tokyo as early as in the 1960s, and what constitutes his originality is his appreciation of the chaotic Japanese city developed after WW2 as an inspiring value for architecture and, ultimately, for bringing emotion into the house.

Based on this positive appreciation of chaos and the possibility of finally bringing together house and city, he would develop in the 1980s his theory of ‘progressive anarchy’, which again were shocking words in the times of Reagan and Thatcher:

“No, I am developing my ‘progressive anarchy’ concept simultaneously in my house and urban design. My house design is no longer divorced from urban problems. It can criticize city situations. The opposite is also true. Thus each informs and tempers the other.

This urban chaos should not be avoided; it cannot be. Rather, it should be valued as an expression of the contemporary city - an expression which embodies one of its true beauties.”

That sort of independent position was not new in Shinohara. He always painstakingly tried to establish his own field of operations, as opposed to existing predominant trends. Going against mainstream currents was for him a way to establish his personal standing ground.

Very often it seems like his own theoretical proposals, and his highly idiosyncratic readings of accepted concepts such as tradition, machine, etc., are born out of, or need, a willing confrontation to contrast his figure off a general background.

This attitude can be readily understood as a liberating move from conventional wisdom, but it also obliges Shinohara to make his point clear, causing him often to go to excessive lengths to demonstrate his points and often burdening his texts with minute explanations.

Shinohara refers to his idea of ‘chaos’ indistinctly as konran or as kaosu. The first term is a Japanese word composed of two characters, kon, or ‘mixture’, and ran, or ‘disorder’. The second term
Yasujirō Ōzu: Tokyo Monogatari. The train, bigger than the house, menacing the house.
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is the Japanification of the English word, and was used by Shinohara more often in the last half of his career.

Konran conveys an image more akin to the actual physicality of Tokyo, while kaosu is more abstract, related with science and mathematics theories. Their use reflects the evolution from a notion grasped from experience towards an intellectualized idea.

In one of his first accounts of a positive understanding of chaos, at a moment when Shinohara is starting to depart from tradition, he states:

“Contemporary capitalist society is not the feudal community of villages. It can be said that the beauty of villages of the past was the result of a unity, in terms of construction methods, under customary or community constraints. [...] What contemporary cities express is not a harmonized beauty but, why not, a confounding beauty.” 164 [AT]

Understanding the “confounding beauty” of chaos is one of Shinohara’s main contributions to a reevaluation of Tokyo and, in extenso, of cityscapes elsewhere. But he was not the first detecting this chaos.

In other register, and belonging to the group of those concerned, or commenting, on the effects of the modernization (aka westernization) of Japan in the pre-war period, the noted philosopher Tetsurō Watsuji already wrote between 1928 and 1935 about the clashing between the mobile machines of the time, cars, streetcars and urban trains, and the fragility of the Japanese house.

Their “disproportion compared with the houses and the streets produce a very unique impression” not unlike the “vision of a wild boar lurking among the rice fields.” 165 [AT]

On one hand, this is due to the fact that, imported or imitated from the West, the urban train (or cars, for that matter) “is taller that the one-story high houses, and higher than the portal itself; if it were to charge against them, it would destroy them, and the fragility of their wooden structures could do nothing to prevent this.” 166

For Watsuji, this “lack of proportion that we discover as the true condition of the Japanese city, was undoubtedly inherent in the chaos and lack of unity which I had already felt, since long ago, as a main characteristic of modern Japanese civilization.” 167 [AT]

The city that Shinohara appreciates in the 1960s and later is different from the city described by Watsuji in the 1930s, but it also contains it. After the rapid economic development started in the late 1950s, the landscape of Japanese cities, and Tokyo in particular, was to change beyond recognition. But not canceling completely the preexisting city.
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This transformation was not done by a process of substitution, but by a process of addition, superimposing disparate layers and elements to the previous urban milieu - very much, in fact, in the fashion described by Watsuji in the 1930s.

Chaos in the city is produced by the enormous number of interactions overlapping in the same urban space, which makes it impossible to design, let alone to be defined by a single architectural gesture. In fact, no matter how large the building, the city as a system is unlikely to be affected by it in any significant way.

Shinohara developed this idea more consciously in one of his last fundamental texts, “Toward a Super-Big Numbers Set City.” In a contemporary interview with the architect Hirohisa Henmi he states:

“As in the recent situation in Tokyo, if the hardware and software which make up this phenomenon become very large in number, the character of the ‘big number’ itself begins to determine the outcome. This is what I call ‘Super-Big Numbers Set City’. Here the power of an individual becomes negligible. Whatever is done architecturally will not bring about any change to the city itself. It’s not accurate to say that architecture will be engulfed in such a city but that it becomes elements to enhance the vitality of the whole. Even if one were to make a large building, the city will not be transformed by its emergence.”

Henmi comments about the pertinence of Shinohara’s approach, as opposed to other approaches about the Japanese city:

“Shinohara’s unique approach involved a continuous observation of a particular phenomenon in Tokyo over time to derive a series of concepts. He would then test their validity against the phenomenon of Tokyo as a whole. It has so far proved effective in uncovering an essential quality of Tokyo.”

But recent developments in Tokyo, where big corporations are integrating large parts of the multiplot, fragmented city into single developments, might prove Shinohara, and his confidence in the ‘natural’ processes occurring in a city, wrong in the 21st century.

In 1998 Shinohara went further in his analysis of the city at a world level. He engaged several of the members of the so-called ‘Shinohara School’ to write about several cities in the world, under his perspective.

But this endeavor was not meant to spread the idea of Tokyo’s chaos as a model, much less as the only model:

“I have maintained that ‘chaos’ as seen in Tokyo is a positive quality, from the concept of ‘beauty of chaos’ to ‘super-big numbers set city’. However, this does not preclude my stating that the quiet scenery I encountered in cities in such areas as Peru or Morocco, where time seems to be absorbed into space, is also worthy of note. Appreciation of ‘chaos’ must not mean repudiation of Peru or any other situation. Without the other, the world cannot


170. “Anarchy and Beyond: An Interview with Kazuo Shinohara”, A+D magazine, 09-10.2003, p. 35.
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172. The book containing these contributions is “Shinohara kazuo keiyu Tōkyō hatatu Tōkyō-ron” (‘A Discourse On Tokyo; From Tokyo, Via Kazuo Shinohara’), Tokyo: Kajima Shuppankai, 2001. The fax sent by Shinohara to those members is included as Annex 1.3, pp. 292-293.
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Rather, it was a way to state diversity and, above all, to extract some sort of methodology, Shinohara way. That is, stemming from observation, and prove it valid for different cities around the world:

“The discourse should deal with the issue of architecture and the city as it approaches the new century. However, I am not interested in broad, general statements. I would prefer issues raised from observations of concrete examples of an actual city. Just as I had focused on Shibuya, if the area is deemed to be a concentrated expression of a particular feature of a given city, one can by all means pick up on an area even the area is foreign to architects from abroad. By limiting the conditions or areas of observation, one can sometimes capture a vast view beyond one’s expectations. What is expected here is not in any way related to the stereotypical tendency prevalent in Japan to ask foreigners about how they view this country. The difference is clearly indicated in the title - in the words ‘via Kazuo Shinohara’.”\textsuperscript{174}

KAZUO SHINOHARA vs METABOLISM

In his voluminous “S, M, L, XL” Rem Koolhaas comments that the metabolist movement represents the “first time in over 3000 years that architecture has a non-white avant-garde”.\textsuperscript{174}

After that first admired acknowledgement, Koolhaas will go on and in 2005 will launch a series of interviews and research that will constitute the core of yet another voluminous book, “Project Japan”,\textsuperscript{177} in which he aims at reconstructing “the history of Metabolism, the last movement that changed architecture.”\textsuperscript{177}

Exaggerations aside, his declared goal is to learn from the survivors of that movement.

The notion of Metabolism in architecture and urbanism was developed by the Metabolist Group. It was a loose, unformalized gathering of several Japanese architects, designers and critics of roughly the same generation of Shinohara (b. 1925):

- Fumihiko Maki (1923)
- Masato Otaka (1923-2010)
- Kiyonori Kikutake (1928-2011)
- Kisho Kurokawa (1934-2007)
- Kenji Ekuan (1929-2015) - designer
- Kiyoshi Awazu (1929-2009) - designer
- Noboru Kawazoe (1928-2015) - critic\textsuperscript{178}
- Kenzo Tange (1913-2005) was the mentor of the group, although he acted somewhat from a distance.\textsuperscript{179}

The occasion to unite different people in a ‘movement’ was propitiated by the “World Design Conference” held in Tokyo in May 1960,\textsuperscript{180} which made the momentum of uniting Metabolism Group. The Group published, during the conference period, the proposal report titled “METABOLISM/1960: Proposals for a New Urbanism”, composed by contributions of each member.
Arata Isozaki, not directly a member of the group but a close friend and collaborator, and one of the chief architects at Tange’s office at the time, writes somehow detachedly:

“The Metabolists proposed bold technical innovations and, by means of their proposals for cities of the future, attempted to break the current architectural thinking. In the 1960s Japan experienced miraculous economic growth, consequently cities were rebuilt and expanded. Metabolism’s ideas and methods accurately reflected prevailing circumstances, making it the leading architectural ideology of the time. Metabolist architecture celebrated an industrial society. These architects believed that architecture was a durable consumer item. Consequently, their use of exterior capsules, units, and panels was not necessarily a solution founded in theory but lauded the industrial society by displaying mass-produced elements and indicating the ways in which they could be replaced and altered.”

Belief in the technical capabilities of Japan was all the rage. As Yann Nussaume puts it: “The ideas and theories of Kenzo Tange or the Metabolists were all based on the faith that technology alone can solve human problems. They believed in Japan’s ability to tame and to appropriate it.”

But Tange, who had fuelled such ideas and their application at a great scale with his “Tokyo Plan: 1960”, was aware of the limitations of a technological society, though. In a text that presents at the international conference in 1960, he expresses his reluctance:

“When I look at the social problems generated by technological developments, I am forced to conclude that when technology progresses in a certain sense, in another sense it tends to move away from humanity more and more.”

In truth, the pervasive tag usually attached to the Metabolists, that of their blind faith in technology and its corresponding megastructures, should be taken less for granted, at least as a common umbrella for the group.

For instance, Fumihiko Maki, a prominent member of the group educated in the West, had always a contextual approach that prevented him of proposing grand projects drawn on blank slates.

As early as in 1967 he wrote against “raw renewal, which displaces, destroys, and replaces, in that mechanistic order.” And he would frown upon megastructures: “If the megaform becomes rapidly obsolete […] it will be a great weight about the neck of urban society.”

And megastructures mean planning for the masses. What for Koolhaas makes these “architects exciting […] is that they do not avoid, like their European contemporaries, the central issue of quantity -the masses- that had propelled the prewar modernists”.

He seems to forget the many big-scale projects, most of them realized, that sprang in Europe right after WW2. Actually, the reconstruction of Europe
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on both sides of the Iron Curtain was based on such schemes, arguably at a scale far larger than in Japan, where small-scale operations ended up being predominant.

But what is indisputable is that this connection with the rapid flows of society, and the belief in the transformative capabilities of architecture spoke of an optimism that was widespread in Japan, as in the developed West at that time, finally leaving the postwar years and their miseries behind.

Koolhaas’ admiration, willingly or not, fails to see that the ‘optimism’ of the metabolist movement was in fact a pessimist or negative reaction against the reality of the urban Japanese environment that was taking shape very dynamically in the 1960s.

The instant, and to a large degree spontaneous, resurrection of Tokyo after WW2, might be seen as a proper urban metabolic process, somehow fitting Metabolist emphasis on changeability and renewal and its correspondence with Taoist and Japanese visions of a Universe in permanent change.

In reality, though, their approach was significantly different. It was an intellectualized abstraction of the notion of metabolism, not based on the observation of the actual processes taking place in Tokyo. Their proposals were meant to create a counterpart to the existing city.

Starting with Kikutake’s “Ideas for the Reorganization of Tokyo City” of 1959, presented by Tange at CIAM’s Otterlo meeting that same year, and Tange’s own project for Tokyo Bay, a rather long series of projects would ensue.

Perhaps out of despair, they would find new grounds to be implemented, rather than proposing a transformation of urban reality in Japan. ‘Grounds’ as a metaphor, because they were for the most part based on water or air as recurrent ‘sites’.

As such reaction, it was based in ‘designing’ the city. In fact, it ‘architecturalized’ urban planning by proposing huge ensembles, or megastructures, that promised to be better than the city they were effacing, or avoiding.

The fact that the discourse of the Metabolists is based in design for a constant change is in itself a contradiction, not only confirmed by the high speed of reality and technology and the subsequent difficulty of implementing changes, but in a conceptual level as well: design change is a sure way of missing the point, because change is by definition unpredictable.

The Metabolists’ movement had a peak, Shinohara would say a demise, in the Expo ’70 in Osaka, which was planned starting right after that city’s nomination in 1965. The architects Kenzo Tange and Uzo Nishiyama (Osaka 1911-1994) were appointed to produce the master plan for the Expo, and Tange invited his Metabolists protégées to develop several...
Shinohara was very critical of its development and outcome, and he wrote in 1971:

“The new stage of societal development called ‘informational society’ has already begun to show its ugly aspect. At Expo ’70, where an enormous amount of capital was invested, many Japanese designers and artists tried to preoccupy this ‘informational society’ and take the initiative in design and in art. From the outset, however, their activities were exposed to weathering by the very character of informational society. Their expectations that strong stimuli would shock visitors to Expo ’70 and greatly change their way of living and their consciousness were disappointed by the masses, who had already acquired the tough-minded attitude of never being shocked by anything - a skill necessary for life in informational society.”

Shinohara saw that much, already in the early 1960s, when he talked about the beauty of urban chaos. Embracing reality, accepting the dynamics constantly happening in the city, Shinohara is actually acknowledging that urban processes are not to be designed.

One of the key moments in the career of Shinohara is 1967, when he publishes “Theory of Residential Architecture” to accompany the joint presentation of several works built in the previous years.

At that time Shinohara is 42, has just defended his doctor thesis at Tokyo Institute of Technology, and has built just over a dozen of rather small houses, including the two designed and built in 1966, the House in White and the House of Earth, which mark a turning point and which we will later discuss in detail.

He starts this very long essay with a bold statement: “I would like the houses I design to stand forever on this earth”.

It is a statement that not only departs from the received wisdom that domestic architecture in Japan, and for that matter any other sort of traditional Japanese edifice, is materially fragile and ill-equipped to resist the passage of time, to the point that its endurance is only possible through reconstruction.

It also confronts the major discussion led at that time by the Metabolists, for whom livable spaces themselves were disposable, changeable, just something to be attached to the supposedly...
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permanent pylons of roads, structure and ducts through which the juice of life endlessly ran.

As they stated in the text of their presentation to the world: “We see human society as a vital process—the continuous formation and development of the Universe.”

By establishing this opposition, Shinohara is able to create a personal standing point from which to develop his own intuitions. These, though, are related to the very same contemporary reality that the Metabolists were seeking to confront, and they constitute an alternative reading of this reality.

“I am not seduced by creating articles of consumption. This is the sole reason why I chose the path towards the creation of eternally lasting spaces”, Shinohara writes further in the same article.

And the basis for this choice is allegedly a moral one, as he ascertains few years later: “I have adopted the militant viewpoint of trying to discover what things, when expressed in the small spaces of the house, will give spiritual support to the residents in the face of the terrifying growth power of contemporary technological society.”

Thus Shinohara sees a necessity to provide for spaces in which human beings can detach themselves from the vertigo of modern life. Such detachment though, as we have seen, is neither complacent nor easy in Shinohara’s houses, since it inevitably calls forth an active awareness or a state of mind on the user’s part.

At any rate, the opposition Shinohara is establishing can be termed quite simply as the opposition between functionality and beauty.

The preeminence of the former will scuttle the latter. And conversely, only the preeminence of beauty, or emotion, can ensure the permanence of architecture and, in so doing, reinforce the role of the architect:

“I do not trust the type of planning that places function at the forefront. Regardless of whether what you build is fated to destruction, the incentive to build is quite another matter. When a space possesses superior beauty, its right to a longer life will be self-evident.”

Self-evident or not, he acknowledges that he might be quite alone defending that, whatever the efforts of the architect “to touch the hearts of as many as possible”:

“Still, the frenzied society in which we live is indifferent to such imperatives. It destroys all things in consuming them, while continuing to produce huge quantities of goods, with thorough indifference to hopes for eternity such as mine.”

In another instance in 1971, Shinohara insists in the inadequacy of the Metabolist approach and ideals, especially in its Expo ’70 manifestation in Osaka, while he is pledging at the time for a new understanding of ‘function’:
“The optimistic expectation, entertained by the leading Japanese designers at Expo ’70, that in the future human feelings will be satisfied by combinations of gigantic or novel technologies, has nothing to do with the [functional] space I have just been discussing. I want to repeat that the functional space is based on a technological system that needs coordinates [a ‘theme’ or idea] to realize the system of emotions.”

His standpoint is not antitechnological or nostalgic. Although he frequently warned against the “terrifying growth power of contemporary technological society” and the “violently changing world” it created, his aim is to assign a right role for technology, while affirming individual creativity:

“Technical progress and the overall increase in industrially produced goods can only represent a natural and inevitable development. The question is not even whether this is good or bad for society - rather, we need to focus on human endeavor, all the time admitting that technology is not the whole story. In other words, the designer must realize his unique expressive talent to create spaces that by highlighting raw human emotions will save architecture from becoming a unitary model. That is to say, spaces that incline toward the irrational, yet somehow remain at the heart of today’s vast flood of material production.”

His stance is clearly a claim that the logic which a technified society seems to impose upon the individual must be countered so that “technology is not the whole story”. Thus, his claim for ‘irrationality’ is parallel to his aim at obtaining “raw human emotions” which will “save architecture from becoming a unitary model”, letting it cater for a diversity of interests or goals.

Still, this proposal doesn’t, nor wants to, address urban structure as a whole. But for that proposal to work, it needs the freedom that a loosely regulated, in form terms, city like Tokyo provides. Only in that sort of context may a variety of designs appear.

For all his admiration for the Metabolists, though, it is very telling that Rem Koolhaas, when given the chance in 1990 to invite other architects to his scheme in Lille, chooses Shinohara, and no other Japanese, to design a hotel tower.

Sadly enough, Shinohara’s project was rejected by the second owner of the building rights. Koolhaas writes quite melancholically:

“Shinohara’s hotel was the first tower that demonstrated the potential of our ‘boring’ blocks. It was beautiful […] Shinohara’s hotel was a great loss: it would have been the most important Japanese building in Europe.”

Or, we might say, a lost chance to visualize a
Japanese architecture that, not based on Western topics, could have brought in the heart of Europe a different, renewed understanding of urbanity and the city, just what Koolhaas had probably hoped for.

“STREET WITH HUMAN SHADOWS”

But Kazuo Shinohara was not an urbanist. Although at the end of April 1985 he is invited to participate as a member of the jury of one the planning competitions for the new town of Melun-Sénart (since 1997 called Sénart), in the outskirts of Paris, he half-jokingly refers to that invitation, in which he “was given the title of architect-urbanist, but that’s an exception”.

He did not try to propose the city of the future or analyze the city of the present, but he is vividly interested in it since the beginning of his career.

His approach to the city is from his standpoint as an architect designing houses, not from the abstractions of city planning:

“[…] even when one designs a small house of 60 m², the image of the city exists, the house refers to it both directly and indirectly. In this context, in such occasion, I’d like to design the city that appears through my own project, not through an approach from the general theory.”

He studied the old towns of Japan, nonetheless, in two series of field work done at TokyoTech with his students (1965-1970 and 1973-1980).

That research, though, is centered around the morphology of discrete and concrete elements forming the city, not about systemic and abstract relationships. In this sense, he takes old towns as case studies from which to extract, or confirm, his own intuitions about architecture, not about urbanism.

His regard, especially in the second series of field studies, is focused in the urban reality of towns formed at the end of Edo era, that is, a transitional period between tradition and modernization/westernization which, even if largely effaced, actually formed the conditions on which post-war Japan emerged:

“Leaving aside some exceptions like Kyoto, there’s almost nothing left of medieval buildings or of modern times as one can see in Europe. From the violence of that fracture results current chaos. In those places where this chaos reaches paroxysm, it acquires conversely a unique expression; but it is not the result of a plan, it is the expression of an ‘spontaneous town.’”

This ‘spontaneous town’, as opposed to ‘planned’, and its driving vitality, will be Shinohara’s main interest in his urban theorizations, although it needs to be stressed that Shinohara never speaks about the city in abstract.
Kazuo Shinohara: Images from "Street With Human Shadows"
His comments are always based on personal observations gained through personal experiences. He doesn’t speak of what he hasn’t seen or lived, or of cities where he hasn’t been to.

The closest that Shinohara ever got to an overarching urban theory was his formulation of the city as a complex multiple-function mathematics operation, first stated in 1967 and sustained until the end of his career. In this vision, this abstract system will be "a sort of algorithm capable of analyzing even the chaos of present-day cities as a single cross-section".

It is important to note that Shinohara understands this idea of the ‘Mathematical City’ not as a compositional or planning device, but as a tool to make some sense of urban complexities.

The city, for Shinohara, is not as much an urban system but a human result. And, as such, not something to be planned, but something to be experienced and to learn from. Whatever ‘abstract’ its structure might be, it has to have a ‘concrete’ image:

"It should be possible for the abstract structure of the future city to include, by its very nature, varied partial spaces. Needless to say, technology will be an important characteristic of the future city, but the future city must also be a city of emotion. A scene I myself once saw must be able to appear in the future city. The city of which I cannot envision a vivid image is no future city for me." [AE]

When referring to ‘the city’ in Shinohara’s case, it is more appropriate to talk about ‘urban landscape’, or even ‘urban form’ than about other aspects usually related with the study or design of cities.

As we have noted, the city in Shinohara is, beyond being a context, inspirational. City became his new ‘tradition’ from where to extract elements for his designs.

One of the most personal accounts of the relationship of Shinohara and the city, understood as an engaging backdrop for life, is his book “Street With Human Shadows”, the last one he devised.

It actually consists of two small volumes, 15 x 21 cm, in a slipcase, each containing different material, photos and texts, in both Japanese and English, published respectively in 2006 and 2007, after his death.

The thicker volume contains a selection by Kazuo Shinohara of near 100 photographs from his personal archive, which consists of over 10,000 images taken in Japan and during his trips to cities in Europe, Africa and South & North America in the 1970s and 1980s.

Most images in this volume are double-page, and all are in color. This graphic selection is complemented by a text based on what ended up being his final public lecture in November 6th, 2004, the closure...
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210. Held between October 31st and November 6th, 2004 Participants included, besides Kazuo Shinohara, Shin’ichi Okuyama, Masashi Sogabe, Christian Kerez, Ma Qingyun, Didier Faustino and Sou Fujimoto.


212. At Kitakyushu there were actually two exhibitions of his photographs at CCA Kitakyushu Project Gallery: The original one in 2004, ‘Street with human shadows’, and the second one ‘Street with human shadows 2’ in 2010, in occasion of the publication of the book, divided in its turn in two parts: Part I October 12 - October 23, 2010 and Part II October 27 - November 10, 2010. The forty small size prints were exhibited in the ‘Discovery Award’ exhibition of Les Rencontres d’Arles, 2010. In November 2010 the show traveled to The Garage Center for Contemporary Culture, in Moscow, where Shinohara’s photographs were exhibited as a slideshow.

213. See for instance the signs in English in Paris, or the French signs in Cologne.

of the symposium developing the CCA-LAB Program “City and Architecture: Streets with human shadows”. 209

The second volume conforming “Street With Human Shadows”, called succinctly ‘Selected Works’, consists of a selection of 12 houses and 2 articles presented chronologically. 210 Pictures and drawings in this volume are the standard presentation images of most of Shinohara publications. But presentation texts are somewhat different from those canonically used in most publications.

Many are based on Toto’s monograph texts, and tend to be more reminiscent of the specific context of the works, either biographically or in terms of their commission or their location. They become more revealing of the person designing them, showing therefore another facet of the projects’ reality.

In many ways they recall the texts that Shinohara used in his two first compilation books, “16 Houses & Architectural Theory” (1971) and “11 Houses & Architectural Theory” (1976), which were meant to create a sequential narrative, trying to build the general conceptual frame for his designs, rather than explaining the specific motivations for each project.

In ‘Street With Human Shadows”, however, texts benefit from the added value of time, of a reflection that has freed itself from any constraint due to the necessity of establishing a stronghold in the architectural discussion. Without contradicting previous statements, they are conceptually more nuanced, reinforcing from other perspectives the original ideas.

The numerous photographs he keenly took of Japan and the parts of the world where he travelled are indicative of his curiosity about cultures and peoples divergent from those of his own upbringing. He did believe in the universality of human feelings, however diverse or unfamiliar its manifestations.

Although his photos featured in several exhibitions around the world, 212 Kazuo Shinohara never actually considered himself as a photographer. But seeing the selection of his photos on the whole, it is quite evident and to a certain point surprising that he photographed with a consistent and particular regard a variety of situations in which people, architecture and the city were together in a ‘scene’, to use a word he frequently used.

To the point that the series of photographs, except perhaps those of West Africa, becomes an account of a global town in which images would be interchangeable, were it not that the inevitable street signs are written in different languages -and even in this case the languages in the signs not always correspond to the city’s main tongue and may be misleading. 213
Exhibition at Kitakyushu Center for Contemporary Art, 2005
That is: it is perfectly possible for Shinohara to understand these foreign cities' experiences as a single phenomenon out of which take coherent clues for his architecture. But that occasion came rather late in his life.

“Street with human shadows 2” consisted of two parts; firstly the slideshow as shown in Moscow, with an additional twenty-five images to the original forty from Arles. In the second part, all the prints from Arles are displayed.

In 1972, aged 47, Shinohara makes his first trip overseas. He has already built several of his well-known houses, his reputation is well established, and finds himself in a turning point. It is at that time that he will abandon his ‘Second Style’ and its interiorized stylizations and make a jump in his oeuvre towards an incorporation of the city and its complexities.

His account of his first vision of foreign land is quintessential Shinohara, at the same time self-referential, naïf and grasping the importance of a moment. Flying over a residential area just before landing in London he writes:

“At that moment I took away a marvelous scene that’s hard to express in words: This is a town, this is a place people live.”

And that primordial experience of a banal cityscape became for Shinohara a central ‘space’ of his experience abroad, its epitome:

“[…] strangely, it was that town near Heathrow airport, lit by the yellow light of sodium streetlights, that became for me the point of origin for overseas cities.”

There will be other epiphanies. But a vulgar neighborhood under a vulgar light becomes the focus of his attention and, as he states later on, “what would always come to mind was a dialogue with that sight grasped at several hundred meters in the air.”

What Shinohara is confirming, actually, is his own vision about the city built from his observations in Japan. Reenacting this vision in European cities, turbo-charged with art and history, he is putting at the same level heritage and vulgarity while enhancing urbanity as a lived experience.

A good example of his non-hierarchical understanding of cityscapes is given in his last lecture in a recollection of an old experience of his:

“But the whitewashed wall around the farmhouse just along the road that ran off just to one side, crippl bling here and there to reveal the clay beneath, the glimpse of this typical sight of old Nara, was even more intense. The majestic sight of Byakugō-ji, an epitome of classic Japan, was no match for one corner of a crumbling farmhouse. Perhaps this is because, while one was a temple, the other was a village. A village, a place where people come...”
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But, as we may imagine of Shinohara the aesthete, it is not vulgarity *per se* what interests him in his urban observations. It is the lively result of multiple and coexisting spontaneous actions, however humble, that he appreciates. That is, the humanity and intensity expressed in the resulting composition, like that of Tokyo.

As noted before, Tokyo functions with the precision of a Geneva watch, but has not Geneva’s elegance. That elegance, for Shinohara, was somehow putting him off:

“Boarding a plane in Accra, the capital Ghana, in the morning, I arrived in Geneva while it was still light. The orderly streets of this city, one of the cleanest and loveliest in Europe, had a slightly stifling effect on me as I walked them. In contrast, the capitals of the several West African nations I had been visiting had seemed lively and bustling.”

Because, for Shinohara, "vitality is in a sense synonymous with urban freedom." His notion of anarchy, or non-hierarchy, acknowledges just that much, but it needs a combination of factors:

“The greatest probability for anarchy to produce vitality and liveliness occurs when buildings designed and produced on the basis of the most advanced technology of the age and replete with totally decorous beauty are submerged in the planless of the street.”

Hyakunen Kinenkan (1984-1987), or Centennial Hall, is Shinohara’s first project in which an explicit relationship with the city is a main concept to shape the building.

It was, literally, “produced on the basis of the most advanced technology of the age and replete with totally decorous beauty [...] submerged in the planless of the street”.

And it was received by the general public as such: it was quickly nicknamed *Gundam*, “the name of a then-popular robot-hero in science-fiction movies for children in Japan. The children’s observation, though naive, substantiates my ideas about cities and architecture”.

It was built to commemorate the 100th anniversary of the foundation of TokyoTECH, and in fact it is a mediator between the city and the campus, a sort of built commitment of the University with society.

It is placed at the main gate. Its upper half-cylinder, housing a meeting area for faculty and guests in a single, spaceship-like space, is oriented both towards the main train station of Ōokayama and towards the core of the campus.

Originally, Shinohara had envisioned a simple linear half-cylinder, but at a later stage of development of the project decided to bend it to match exactly the two directions, in a move simultaneously acknowledging the importance of the city and making of the half-cylinder an effective filter of the...
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relationship between the two. He states it clearly:

"Centennial Hall faces a typical Tokyo cityscape. The disorderly visual landscape was accepted as a reality. The given site, the central open space of the campus, and the entrance to the nearby station are related in an accidental, random manner, and by bending [...] the half-cylinder, I acknowledged and made manifest this relationship." 221

Hyakunen Kinenkan is a strict contemporary design of House in Yokohama, and both share a similar approach based on the idea of an ‘urban machine’ made of casually interrelated parts.

Both are built as the embodiment of the anarchic visual chaos of Tokyo as a driving inspirational force, and beyond their disparate scales, both are capable of conveying deep emotions by acknowledging the city’s vitality and bringing it to the core of their spaces.

Because, ultimately, ‘just as modernism went from house to city, in this new age the complex structure of the city is bound to affect the design of houses’. 222

House in Kugayama

House in Komae

Repeating Crevice

Shino House

Ukiyo-e Museum K2 Building

Tenmei House

House in Tateshina project
3.01 INTRODUCTION

Or, Why These Five? A research work such as this one, which has as one of its aims giving as broad an account as possible of Shinohara’s architecture, needs nonetheless to limit the field of operation in order to bring forward the specific perspective on which it is built, and the way this limitation is decided is very important and needs an explanation.

In order to make clear the idea that Shinohara’s long quest was to bring together house and city, and that this quest can be traced as a progressive development starting in his first writings of the 1960s and fulfilled in House in Yokohama (1982-1984), I have deliberately left aside four groups of his projects.

The most obvious group is the non-residential designs, ranging from the Ukiyo-e Museum (1980-1982) to the K2 building in Osaka (1987-1990) among those realized, since I focus on Shinohara’s ideas about the house, which was his main concern in the period I study.

A second group is composed by those projects designed and built before House in White and House of Earth, commonly referred to by Shinohara as the “Japanese tradition” period (or ‘First Style’).


Lastly, I presume that the most controversial decision I have taken is to do without, at least directly, with an entire set of projects, those classified by Shinohara as his ‘Second Style’. That is, the rather short period of buildings ranging from Uncompleted House (1968-1970) to House in Higashi-Tamagawa (1971-1973).

Even acknowledging the individual and collective value of these projects, the reason for that exclusion is in several ways the core of this work. In my understanding of Shinohara’s quest for bringing Shinohara’s oeuvre, however crucial they are as a starting point for many of Shinohara’s reflections.

The two first were designed at a moment when Shinohara Atelier was busy with big-scale, non-residential commissions and in my view they are but a confirmation of the explorations of House in Yokohama; and the third one, designed over a prolonged period after the dismantlement of Shinohara Atelier, was never built. However interesting these projects are, they don’t add anything relevant to the main hypothesis sustained here.

And to which I would add, like Shinohara acknowledged, the House in Karuizawa (1974-1975), designed and built after Tanikawa House (1972-1974).
Kazuo Shinohara: House in Higashi Tamagawa and one of his pictures of Andalusia.

Path of evolution of Shinohara's houses [AD]
together house and city, present -if more implicitly than explicitly- since his first essays from the 1960s, this set represents a sort of dead end of his endeavors, a path that needed a reconsideration or a cancellation in order to move forward and cope with the issues of chaos and uncertainty that Shinohara took from the city and wanted to deal with in his domestic designs.

Shinohara understood this set of projects as a derivation of the quasi-religious symbolism or House in White, that is, their emotional charge can be ascribed to the solemnity present in that seminal project, albeit in a different fashion:

whereas House in White can be seen as the abstract sublimation of 'things Japanese', his 'Second Style' is based on other... possibility of a breakaway with tradition, the possibility of an independent path for Shinohara's designs. As he puts it:

"It was during my search for a non-divisional process of design224 that I discovered the fissure, and for that reason the word ‘fissure’ means to me not only a crevice dividing a house in half, but also a break between myself and the spaces I designed during my long confrontation with Japanese traditional architecture."225 [AN]

This space, with 'fissure space' as its main component, seemingly takes its clue from urban-like elements such as streets, although Shinohara was never explicit about it.226 ‘Fissure’, in this sense, is a space between solids, relating them as much as separating them, quite in the way that buildings are related in the typical Japanese city.227

Especially in the House in Higashi-Tamagawa, this fissure space brings inside the house an urban sense of the connecting space (or fissure), and the masses that it traverses are treated as urban façades, with windows and accesses like those of a street. These ‘façades’ are significantly similar in function and shape to some of the spaces that Shinohara photographed in Europe, notably those of Southern Spain.228

But I think that this attempt to include the city in the house, which is either monumental or metaphorical, proved to be a dead-end for Shinohara. David B. Stewart and Shin-ichi Okuyama seem to give a nod in that direction in their introduction to the “Second Style”, writing:

“The Second Style is the briefest of all the four styles, with the exception of the Fourth Style (which was equally short in terms of residences, but open-ended to further development).”229

But, and this is the key point, it is anti-urban in nature since it is absolutely interiorized. That is, does not relate to the exterior, nor seeks any clue from the exterior (the city) to be produced or sustained. It is, after all, a continuation of his former line of design in which the house was seen as a protective realm against the foes of the mechanistic society devolving in Japan after the World War II.230

We can thus draw a possible evolution in Shinohara’s designs by which this ‘Second Style’ represents a boucle or detour that has its own starting and end,
but cannot bring forward all of his own intuitions about the significance and complex relationships of contemporary society, expressed in the city.231

And it could not have provided the adequate tools to cope with the non-residential designs that, years later, were to constitute his main body of work. How else to understand the projects for Hyakunen Kinenkan, the K2 building, the Yokohama Pier or the Helsinki project, for instance, if not taking into account the physical, urban context in which they were designed? Even though the possibility of these projects was obviously not to be foreseen in the 1970s, my point is that their development was only possible because of Shinohara’s abandonment of his Second Style and opening his interiors to the outside world.

The five houses I have chosen to analyze in the light of an overarching understanding of Shinohara’s development span over 20 years of his career: the tandem formed by House in White and House of Earth (Tokyo 1964-1966), Tanikawa House (Naganohara 1972-1974), House in Uehara (Tokyo 1975-1976) and House in Yokohama (Yokohama 1982-1984, demolished).

Within Shinohara’s oeuvre, consisting almost exclusively of individual houses, these five houses represent three turning points, three points of arrival and departure that summarize previous experiences and anticipate further developments.

The first tandem (House in White and House of Earth) closes a cycle of direct referral to Japanese tradition and the last work (House in Yokohama) opens a period in which residential design will have a secondary role in the work of Shinohara, who will deal from that moment on with projects of different programs and scale.

These five cases, like all the work of Shinohara in general, represent very clearly some of the modern aspirations to define the terms of a new architecture through a new domestic space. Shinohara understands domestic space from the outset as a field of exploration of the possibilities of architecture, and he pursues his goals often away from the main currents of the moment.

Since his assertions that “house is art” and “house should be eternal” in the 1960s, in the midst of the Metabolism and ephemeral architecture boom, to his idea of chaos in the 1980s postmodernism period, his research was independent of fashions, and coherent and faithful to his central intention to configure a moving, meaningful space.

His goal was to understand the house as an aesthetic experience capable of deploying new or unexpected meanings. In this sense, of understanding the house as an exploration of human emotional abilities, and to construct it as a critique to culture.232

Each of the five houses studied develops in different ways, in different materials and in different situations this ultimate objective of making of the

---

231. See Shinohara’s account of the city as a social expression, as seen in Chapter 2.4.
232. As seen in Chapter 2.3.
house a moving machine, but they constitute a sequence of steps configuring a traceable genealogy of development of Shinohara’s fundamental idea to place emotion at the heart of the domestic space.
3.02 HOUSE IN WHITE AND HOUSE OF EARTH: A FOUNDING TANDEM

The year 1964 was going to prove one of the most important moments in the career of Shinohara. We have already seen how the exhibition of two model (or prototype) houses at Odakyu Department Store, however short lived, marked a moment of intense reconsideration of his own path and, above all, the confirmation of the architect as an artist, devoid of briefs or constraints.

One month after the exhibition Shinohara receives two commissions that he will develop in parallel for a year and a half, two houses different in size and conditions that will be in many ways, as we will see, antagonistic to each other and will be the starting point of two very different lines in his work thereafter.

But yet they share some common traits, forming part as they are of a moment in which Shinohara was just departing from tradition as a source of inspiration. They represent in this sense a turning point, the last ones of a series and the first ones of a new development, and can be seen as a tandem in constant dialogue, or discussion.

Both are conceived with a single theme as their conceptual basis, stemming in each from Shinohara’s interest in tradition and his extraction of fundamental, or primordial, notions from the Japanese built stock, either folk or religious.

House in White is built around the notion of the pillar and the different meanings it conveys, while House of Earth is built around the notion of the cave (or ‘black space’ as we will see later), as a further development of the idea that Shinohara had shown at Odakyu exhibition.

Both also share a certain disdain towards their respective locations, a fact not uncommon in Shinohara’s designs, and actually one that he even theorized about at the beginning of his career. They express this inexistent relation in two opposite ways to assert the same autonomy of the house from its surroundings.

House in White is a volume shaped in a pure, autonomous solid form on an irregular site, while House of Earth, conversely, is an irregular volume in a more regular site that wouldn’t need this distortion. An imposed distortion, then, that establishes again the house as an autonomous body.

But here stop the similarities between the two. And starts a whole range of dissimilarities that make of this foundational tandem an inextricable set of oppositions that shared the drawing board of Shinohara for a long time and would prove to be two disparate attempts at embodying his conflicting ideas about the house as a work of art.
166

「白の小屋」

Jōdō at the Jōdoji, Ono.
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HOUSE IN WHITE: TRANSCENDENT SPACE

In a residential district of Tokyo, almost at the outskirts of this endless city, the House in White still stands today behind high bushes, barely aware of the drastic changes occurred in its surroundings or, for that matter, to itself. 234

It is, like most houses by Shinohara until the mid-1970s, more oriented to the inside than towards the outside. Its external appearance, using materials and forms commonly used in residential construction in Japan still today, doesn’t make it stand out. Only its proportions and the careful detailing denote from the outside a qualified and willing hand behind its design.

 Barely 100 m2 in plan, it consists of one large space and two smaller spaces one of top of the other, all enclosed in a single volume topped-off by a pyramidal roof, giving an overall impression of a classical Buddhist pavilion, like the Jōdodō (1194) at the Jōdoji in Ono, near Kobe, which Shinohara had commented in The Japan Architect special issue about traditional Japanese architecture in June 1964.

In House in White, even if the materials and shapes are conventional, the proportions of this pyramidal roof are an innovation, a sort of architectural displacement akin to that done by Palladio in the Villa Rotonda (1570), which employs a ‘sacred’ cupola to cover a residential building.

This “abstraction of the prototype” 235 is the first clue towards an understanding of dwelling in terms that are not conventional, which will be fully developed in its interior, revolving around a polished cedar log acting as the main pillar, 236 and the main protagonist, of the construction.

It is significant how Shinohara describes the house in a way similar to recalling the design process, explaining the pillar like the trunk of a tree that branches out upwards:

“On top of a 10x10 meter plane there is a cube with a height of 4.3 meters and on top of this there is a simple oblong pyramidal roof. A single pillar in the center of the perfect square leads to the peak of the pyramidal roof. Braces lead from the point at which the pillar enters the ceiling surface to the median points of the four ridge lines of the roof. The composition of this space is formed by the addition of supporting struts to these.” 237

This passage seems to indicate a certain organic approach on the part of Shinohara towards structure or materiality. But, even though he talks in some of his texts how he “discovered nature” 238 in this project, it is not in literal terms. Koji Taki described avant la lettre this process of abstract appropriation of natural elements:

“[...] during his work on the White house [sic], Shinohara moved to formalized spaces, and from natural materials to abstractions of the materials themselves. He evolved a system in which materials, nature, and humans [sic] existence are the molecules of space and in which planning consists in arranging

234. House in White was moved from its original location to a new site, also in Tokyo, in 2007-2008. See Shinkenchiku 06.2008 for a detailed account of this relocation, pp. 111-124 and p. 197.
235. David B. Stewart & Shin’ichi Okuyama, presentation text for House in White, 2G p. 76.
236. As noted before, throughout this text ‘cedar’ and ‘cypress’ will be indistinctly used to refer to this pillar, because in English the Japanese sugi tree (Cryptomeria japonica) is often called ‘Japanese cedar’, though it is not related to cedars but cypresses. In Shinohara’s literature both uses are found.
237. “Kazuo Shinohara”, Berlin: Ernst & Sohn, 1994, p. 26. This description is not substantially different from the one written for the first publication of the house, Shinkenchiku 07.1967 (with an English translation in JA 10.1967) or other publications thereafter.
House in White: photo of reconstruction. The hidden and the visible.
FIVE FORMS OF EMOTION

It is important to note the importance given in Shinohara’s description to a structural element that is not visible: the braces that help support the ridge beams. If the “beautiful” cedar pillar, expressed in its naked, abstract shape, is visually the most compelling element in this otherwise very simple composition, how come Shinohara doesn’t center in it his explanation?

In this sense, what is seen is as important as what is unseen. The pillar is as important as the braces, and one cannot exist without the other. The perfect white cube that serves as spatial enclosure to the wooden pillar is as important as the imperfect darkness in which bracing is encased, very much like a jewel—or a god.

But Shinohara can only acknowledge one of them, focusing all attention in the cubic white space. Even the name of the house favors this space and overlooks the pillar and the meanings it deploys, explained as a liberating moment after some hesitation:

“...When publishing an article on this house in a magazine, I had difficulty in deciding on its name: which image should I emphasize—the polished Japanese cedar log standing in the center of the house or the box formed by the white walls? I chose the latter. And at the same time I came to the turning point of my development as an architect.”

This double condition of House in White has been more apparent with its moving and reconstruction. Photographs of the space without the ceiling express very powerfully the opposition between the two spaces, and the impossibility of their coexistence: one had to be cancelled in order to render the space as abstract as possible and move forward from tradition and its imagery.

This two opposites can be termed abstract, the cubic white space, and concrete, in the sense that Lévi-Strauss gives to the term in The Savage Mind and that Shinohara will borrow years later in connection with his idea of atavism in House in Uehara, which will be discussed later.

COSMIC PILLAR

The pillar, belonging to the structural system of braces and beams, has to be then seen as an intruder from another dimension, the dimension of materiality and the senses, piercing the rational purity of the cube, and in Shinohara’s mind necessary to balance the observer’s emotions.

Of course such a powerful element like the highly polished cedar log and the emotions it conveys has little to do with primitivism and a lot to do with a cultural construction. And as such, it is not...
FIVE FORMS OF EMOTION
KAZUO SHINOHARA AND THE HOUSE AS A WORK OF ART
Izumo Shrine

Traditional Japanese interior (photo by Kazuo Shinohara)
optimized for its mere function (it is thicker than necessary and bracing is not set at the optimal place). This pillar is devoid of any structural expression to assume a purely symbolical role.

This cultural construction is explained at length by Mircea Eliade and his notion of the cosmic pillar connecting heaven, earth and the underworld in several mythologies. In Japan it even constitutes the origin of the archipelago and its people, and is materialized in Shinto shrines all over the country, with Izumo Grand Shrine being a most ancient and revered example, with an inordinate pillar in its center.

The pillar states itself as the center of all movements. It defines the tone of the space and, hence, the tone of how to behave in it, how to use it. If the white cube defines a state of mind, the cedar log imposes the solemnity of the gestures.

That much was recognized by Shinohara years later when talking about the difference between the symbolic use of structure in House in White and its mere functionality in Tanikawa House:

“The single cypress log in the middle of the living room as in House in White [...] has a meaning that surpasses its structural importance: it has the responsibility of giving meaning to the space.”

This “responsibility of giving meaning” has to be understood not only as the obvious reading of the material beauty of the cedar log and the awe it produces in the observer.

In another deep sense the pillar, belonging simultaneously to the white space and to the system in the hidden dark space above, is a connector, both physical and symbolical, between the two worlds of the house, the conscious and the unconscious.

The hidden space hinted at by the pillar is equivalent to the Japanese oku, the ‘innermost space’ or least accessible of traditional houses, a sense of depth that is more psychological than physical, given the usual reduced dimensions of folk architecture.

Oku has its roots in the natural environment, appearing in mountains and forests as an awe-inspiring feature that embodies the mysteries and the wonders of the world. As such, it is at the same time enticing and unattainable, sacred.

In House in White that much is clear, and the whole design will revolve around this duality enticing/negating. But the process of development of Shinohara’s designs will be that of revealing the oku, getting to the core of the house, the most irrational or emotional space, and House in White will provide its own clues.
STILL LIFE WITH WINDOW

Entering House in White is as direct an act as can be possibly conceived, and very un-Japanese at that. Japanese interiors have an intermediate space, usually at street or exterior level, where people remove their shoes before going one step up to the main level.

This custom is related as much with the sort of soft paving often used in Japanese architecture as with the Shinto vision of the exterior world as being ‘dirty’, while the house, or the shrine, is the ‘clean’ space.

But nothing of the sort is provided for at House in White. Here, this action is to be performed outside, under the deep eave surrounding the house, both assessing the continuity of space of the plan in the interior and hinting at its ‘sacred’ character, as if entering in a shrine.

Once the door opens, the whole interior and its double height comes into view, and Shinohara explains this as a ‘frontality’ feature taken from Japanese tradition:

“One upon opening the door […] one immediately has a total view of the living room. This approach, which I have called frontality and which occurs in traditional Japanese architecture is both special and appealing. My recollections of early encounters with Japanese architecture are filled with this sense of frontality, of the powerful impression created when, facing the main inner wall of a room, one is able to take in at once the whole splendid composition.” [AE]

The ‘powerful impression’ intended by Shinohara in House in White is made up with a composition of four elements: the very long and tall wall in matt white, marking the biggest dimensions of the space; the cedar pillar detached from it; a receded door lacquered in shiny black; and a high window with shōji panels hinting at an inhabitable second floor and beyond: a speck of natural light coming from an invisible skylight glitters through the translucent paper panels.

All in all these elemental four elements compose a still life which is capable of creating a deep emotion in the viewer and effectively constitute the character of the main space. In order to establish this accurate composition and the impression it produces Shinohara has to perform several architectural tricks.

A TALE OF TWO DOORS

It is relevant to notice the relative position of each element of the composition in relation with the wall plane, because these positions alone are capable of giving hints of a possible movement within the house that will be ultimately negated, disorienting the observer.

As noted, the lacquered door is receded from the
The concealed door. To the main space above.
wall plane, penetrating it and encased off the interior plane of the white wall to enhance a sense of depth as if inducing to its opening towards a space beyond.

The window, conversely, projects over the main hall with its encasing protruding from the wall’s plane, as if hinting towards the act of looking downwards from above, following the body position of the viewer leaning out.

In this still life all seems prepared for bringing the observer to the upper level, from where a privileged viewing point of the main hall may be attained.

But this desirable gazing position from above is unreachable if we follow the hint of opening the black door, which in fact leads towards a secondary room with no access upstairs.

To get there we have to be in the know. Only then we can reach the master room and studio, with their lofty spaces, very unlike those of the main hall.

There is a hidden door that leads there. The detailing is too precise and too sensible as to be casual or standard. Meticulously flush with the wall, finished with the same sort of white painted cheese-cloth, and with the skirting running across it, it goes unnoticed for anyone. That is, except for those in the know.

The world upstairs is, precisely, another world, the world of domesticity, and Shinohara’s perfect white ‘cube’ belongs to another realm, to that of the quasi-religious and suffused emotion embodied in and produced by the cedar pillar piercing the white space. Downstairs is the space of contemplative emotion, while upstairs is the space of emotion by action.

It is very telling that the space of the world upstairs, with its slanted ceilings and its provision for a spontaneous behavior, resembles in many ways the spaces of House of Earth, the other of House in White and the house by which Shinohara will open a different line of development.

DOMESTIC CONFLICTS

House in White is usually understood as a design fruit of the division process explained by Shinohara as stemming from his research in Japanese traditional architecture.

As we have seen, the square plan is split in two uneven parts, and in section the main space takes the height of the two floors containing the bedrooms.

But this plan and the cubic interior that it creates are not purely shaped. Within the hall there is a one-floor block comprising the wet areas, bathroom
House in White
and kitchen, slightly off-limits from the main space.

It does not belong to the ‘sacred’ space and is pushed away from it. But how come Shinohara didn’t dispose of it altogether, leaving the white cube in its pure form? He did that in his previous designs and he will do it again in Tanikawa House. But here in House in White he seems to attest to the fact that “House is art” inasmuch as it is a house.

Within this solemn space, life happens nonetheless. No matter how off the boundaries the kitchen is pushed, it is right there, in full sight. The functions of everyday life are not hidden. They are not subject to any trick of disappearance, like the door leading up the second floor. They are exposed.

Is that a contradiction, or even a flaw, in Shinohara’s endeavor to create a space of symbols, where concrete things are disturbingly expressing their function so bluntly? Or is it instead a sign, a hint perhaps, towards an impossibility of majesty in residential design and the necessity to find an alternative?

Later on, in Tanikawa House, Shinohara will manage to achieve a truly ‘artistic’ space, devoid of any domesticity. But that isn’t the goal, either. To create extraordinary spaces in architecture is not that difficult for a gifted architect.

What is difficult, and that was Shinohara’s aim, is to create them in the house while making domestic life still possible, to bring emotion in the domestic space, to subvert the conventions of the home and render it moving, compelling beyond any feeling of complacency.

There is nothing complacent or easy in having the kitchen in the sacred space of House in White. On the contrary, it takes unusual courage to mix them both.

And it takes a gutsy intuition on the part of Shinohara to realize that in this very crude mixture lies the source for emotion and, ultimately, the vigorous power of his proposal of the house as a critique to civilization, which needs to find its own, intermediate stance:

“I believe that residential design can be a critique of civilization. But this cannot happen when the house is either deliberately harmonized with or diametrically opposed to society.”

The only possibility thereafter for Shinohara will be, boldly, to reach the uncanny that in House in White was negated, and inhabit it. And a fertile alternative is to be found in the other house he was designing simultaneously with House in White: House of Earth.
Shohei Imamura (left): still from "Insect Woman". Hiroshi Teshigahara: still from "Woman of the Dunes".

(From David Stewart, "The Making of a Modern Japanese Architecture")
It can be argued that Shinohara’s declaration at the beginning of his career that “House is Art” opened a fundamental contradiction, the improbable resolution of which took many forms and constituted, to put it simply, his life’s quest as an architect.

This quest can be said plainly: the search of an anti-domestic house. For, to make of the house the place of emotions is not exactly what domesticity is about. ... comfort, even about sentiments. But it can’t be about emotions: “I have not been interested in sentimental expressions floating on the surface of emotions.”

What Shinohara was going to do was to turn these ‘negative’ feelings, which he translates into a ‘black’ or ‘psychopathological’ space, into the leitmotiv of House of Earth, and render it a manifesto for the expression of the irrational as source of emotions. Or, as David B. Stewart puts it, “conjuring up primitive origins beneath the veneer of consumer society.”

In doing that, Shinohara is certainly in tune with many Japanese artists of the period. He shares the unrest and dissatisfaction expressed by Kōbō Abe or Kenzaburō Ōe in their novels, or by Hiroshi Teshigahara or Shōhei Imamura in their films, visualizing a zeitgeist that was moving away from postwar optimism.

**HOUSE OF EARTH: DWELLING IN THE UNCANNY**

Anthony Vidler traces a history of the uncanny in architecture that serves well to illuminate this notion, also for Shinohara’s designs. Following Freud, if domesticity is the Germanic *heimlich*, or ‘homey’, emotion belongs to the *unheimlich*, or uncanny.

These emotions, though, as expressed by Freud, are not positive but the contrary, since the uncanny was “a special case of the many modern diseases, from phobias to neuroses, variously described by psychoanalysts, psychologists, and philosophers as a distancing from reality forced by reality.”

What Shinohara was doing was to turn these ‘negative’ feelings, which he translates into a ‘black’ or ‘psychopathological’ space, into the leitmotiv of House of Earth, and render it a manifesto for the expression of the irrational as source of emotions. Or, as David B. Stewart puts it, “conjuring up primitive origins beneath the veneer of consumer society.”

In doing that, Shinohara is certainly in tune with many Japanese artists of the period. He shares the unrest and dissatisfaction expressed by Kōbō Abe or Kenzaburō Ōe in their novels, or by Hiroshi Teshigahara or Shōhei Imamura in their films, visualizing a zeitgeist that was moving away from postwar optimism.

**BLACK SPACE**

House of Earth stands in a small plot in central Tokyo, introverted among higher buildings. From the outside it is a closed and low-lying volume, as if belonging to the ground.

In fact, its pavement is made of beaten earth, or *doma*, like those of some of his previous houses. But here the earth flooring is prevalent, establishing a direct continuity with the exterior and, more importantly, prefiguring what is the most striking feature of the house, an excavated bedroom with no windows.
Plan of excavated Matmata house, Tunisia. (From Paul Oliver “Dwellings”)

Black Space, Shinohara’s proposal at Odakyu Exhibition (1964)

Unfolded House of Earth [AD]
This space is the first partial realization (and will be the only one) of his idea of Black Space shown at the Odakyu exhibition, which proposed an entire house buried, formed by independent units connected by corridors to a central space, an arrangement similar to that of buried ancestral architecture that can be found around the world.\(^\text{259}\)

In a passage explaining his House with an Earthen Floor, Shinohara is very explicit about his intentions for Black Space:

“Among the themes for the exhibition [at Odakyu] was the plan for ‘The House of the Mother Earth’ or ‘Black Space’. All of this house, about 100 square meters in size, was to be submerged under the ground. I was thinking about the space that corresponds to the unusual or hidden in man’s mind, such as his dark passions, anxieties, and sense of loneliness.”\(^\text{260}\)

In a subsequent passage commenting on House of Earth he insists on this idea, noting that “Sometimes I have the impulse to create a space which is deeply involved with the irrational parts of man’s heart.”\(^\text{261}\) Or the uncanny, which will be from then on a theme he will try to develop, however difficult it may prove: \(^\text{262}\)

“My intention to express in spatial forms various emotional phenomena -such suppressed feelings as anxiety, anger, and a sense of alienation- will not change in the future. [...] Houses cannot exist independently of man’s insatiable desires.”\(^\text{263}\)

The idea of uncanny is linked by Freud “to the death drive, to fear of castration, to the impossible desire to return to the womb”.\(^\text{264}\) Shinohara acknowledged that much of the Black Space of House of Earth, which “inevitably evokes death”,\(^\text{265}\) being buried and with its walls painted black.

If the House in White is the house of clarity, House of Earth is the house of darkness, no so much because of the windowless bedroom, but because of the overall color scheme and textures used in the formalization of its womb-like spaces.

TOWARDS DOWN UNDER

The interior of the house is defined by a strident contrast between deep red and black, an anomaly in Shinohara’s houses. Here he uses chromaticity not as decoration addition but with an architectural intention: its “strong colors [...] express forcefully the process of descent underground.”\(^\text{266}\)

Shinohara explained this movement in detail as a linked sequence:

“I used strong colors for the first time in this house. The ceiling painted black joins the red wall, which in turn meets the red carpet, which in turn leads to the underground bedroom, with its black walls.”\(^\text{267}\)

This account is like a verbal okoshi-ezu (“fold-up drawing”), the traditional Japanese technique by which plans and elevations of a space are all
Yukio Mishima: still from "Yokoku"

House of Earth: Cross section showing diagonal beam.

House of Earth: Living platform
drawn on the same plane in relation to each other, allowing to form a paper model after folding it.

This accompaniment of this descent is most notably reinforced by the shape of the roof, which is in itself an extraordinary engineering trait if we consider the modest size of the house: a concealed main beam crosses diagonally the whole volume defining a strong direction, further enhanced by the slanted triangles that form the roof.

With its higher point near the street, it marks a direction leading towards the *oku*, or ‘occult’, which this time is recognized and is rendered approachable and inhabitable, unlike the occult in House in White, which existed in its own complexity as a necessary support for the majestic purity of the white cube of the main hall, but was visually negated and uninhabitable.

This diagonal virtually divides the house in two parts. The overall plan resembles the one of the Odakyu house, this time with two right-angle dihedrals rotated from each other over the diagonal of the main space.

This configuration of a non-orthogonal plan is the only one in this period of Shinohara’s built work, and will only reappear at a later stage, after the ‘Second Style’, making of House of Earth also in this respect a precursor for the later development of Shinohara’s œuvre.

In this non-Cartesian space, where the perspectives are distorted by the ceiling and the angled walls, anti-cubic and therefore opposite to the main hall of House in White, the inhabitant is compelled to act freely, and Shinohara will provide for that freedom to take place.

**SPONTANEOUS GESTURES**

The two opposite right-angle corners of the plan mark two distinct functions of the house, living and cooking, while the two-colored, slanted ceiling marking the main diagonal of the house defines two areas within the single-space main room.

In this main room two furnishing elements provide, in two very different ways, clues as how to use this space. Both are very unconventional, each in its own way.

A ‘living platform’ (or bed-sofa) is provided for, elevated above the earth floor. Although resembling the raised tatami areas very common in Japan, it is actually an innovation more linked to free-love than to tradition, being carpeted, soft and big.

It is the main element of the room, and the most open to different uses. In a short movie by Yukio Mishima of 1965, *Yūkoku*, a very similar element is the sole piece of furniture of the Noh stage in which the movie-play takes place. On it, the two
House of Earth: Foundations for table and chairs
characters make love before the final act in which Mishima commits seppuku.

In this sense, the platform for casual and open leisure in the main space of House of Earth is the opposite of the underground bedroom which, for all the extraordinary qualities of its space, is conventional in its furnishing.

This interplay between rigidity or conventionality and its opposite is to be found in the table and chairs set designed by Shinohara and provided for in the space. Their formalization is rich, overlapping different sorts of wood in a sort of primitive pattern. They look like carved out of a lush tropical log, and their name 'Mushroom' reproduces such sort of natural origin.

But, surprisingly, they are fixed to the ground, immovable but for the turn of the chairs. That was not a small feat to do in the humble and weak earthen floor, and the heavy foundation needed to support them attest to this fact.

For all its special design, the table represents a sort of conventional domesticity, but this domesticity is questioned and perverted by fixing it to the ground. Just like with the raised platform, a new domesticity has to be explored and defined by the users.

The different ways in which House in White and House of Earth are furnished is revealing: while House in White uses conventional furniture placed like the elements of an altar, House of Earth is like a stage in which the purpose-designed pieces of furniture act as props that need the action of the users to get their whole sense, very much in the way we will see in Tanikawa House. They represent two opposite ways of living.

In this sense, the contrast between House in White and House of Earth is also of poses, gestures and elicited behavior: the space of House in White imposes a formality on the dweller, asks for certain movements that are more paused or elaborated, more ritualistic.

On the contrary, House of Earth promotes a behavior aside or outside of conventionality. Entices the occupant to perform a non-codified use of the space and gesturality, opening the capacity of architecture to generate meaning through use.

**FERTILE EARTH**

As we have seen, the founding tandem of House in White and House of Earth are two sides of the same quest for an emotional space in the house, and that much was acknowledged by Shinohara when he stated, noting that they were designed simultaneously, that "Perhaps I intended to penetrate into two opposite kinds of space once I had confirmed my idea of basic space and the limits
Uncompleted House
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In this sense, we can understand how a line of development unfolds from House in White, opening what he termed 'Second Style', consisting in houses with interior and exterior cubic forms, derived from the House in White's hall, with a highly ritualized, almost sacred, atmosphere enhanced by top skylights.

However powerful, this development proved short and ultimately a dead-end because, in order to be produced, a systematic operation of negation, cancellation and repression had to be performed: negation of the city, cancellation of diversity, repression of the range of human feelings.

That was not what Shinohara was going after. He didn’t want to negate but to integrate, to achieve a convergence between his idea that domestic space could convey emotions and his idea that emotions not only lied inside human soul, but also outside.

House in White is widely regarded as one of Shinohara’s masterpieces, and rightly so. But its descendants were few and sterile. House in White was not the ground on which to build the future development of Shinohara’s work.

That ground was provided for by the humbler and somehow less celebrated House of Earth, a fertile ground on which the next masterpieces by Shinohara, residential or otherwise, took root.
Tanikawa House
3.03 TANIKAWA HOUSE: THE NATURAL ILLLOGICAL

On a forested area in Karuizawa, one of Japan’s most favored vacation resorts, stands a silver hut hidden behind very tall trees. Its shiny roof contrasts both with its wooden-boarded walls and the dark tones of the soil and the trees, seeming to float over the gentle slope of the site, its eaves almost, but not quite, touching the ground.

Tanikawa House is a holiday retreat for the renowned Japanese poet Shuntarō Tanikawa, a long-time friend of Shinohara. Fifteen years earlier Tanikawa had commissioned Shinohara his third design, the first Tanikawa House (1957-1958, no longer existing), a one-story small house in Suginami-ku, a residential area west of Tokyo center, where, by the way, Shinohara had designed his two previous projects (House in Kugayama, 1952-1954; and House in Kugayama 2, 1956-1957).

In the first house for Tanikawa, expansive despite its reduced size, program is divided in two separate volumes, a smaller one including bathroom and kitchen, and the main body, only separated by sliding screens that don’t reach up to the roof, which acts as an umbrella covering a unified space.

This house is built in wooden structure unlike its two predecessors, and although from the outside it looks as if made of mechanized or prefabricated components like so many conventional Japanese houses, the central pillars and truss of the main body are made of un-mechanized tree-trunks with exposed knots and uneven geometry.

Both this sort of naturalism, contrasting with the smooth perfection of the other finishings of the house, and the exposure of structure in the domestic space, will become recurrent themes throughout Shinohara’s career.

MULTIPLE DUALITIES

The separation of the two bodies is further reinforced by the attachment of new, functionally ambiguous spaces that work as relationships between them or to the exterior: a fully-glazed gallery between the two main bodies; and a large raised deck, like a viewing platform, a bit awkwardly off-axis, but thus stating its autonomy.

Perhaps this basic dualist separation of functions of his Tokyo residence helped shape Tanikawa’s commission of a second house in the mountains. According to Shinohara, his client handed him down a piece of paper with a sort of a poem, very much in Tanikawa’s favored epigrammatic fashion, with

270. Shuntarō Tanikawa (Tokyo 1931) is a poet and translator from English. Very popular in Japan and translated into many languages, he is recurrently named as the next Nobel Prize in Literature. In the sixties he formed the Wakai Nihon no kai (‘Japan Youth Association’), with Kenzaburō Ōe among others. In addition to his poetry, he has written scripts for radio, film and television. Critics have connected him to the Beat Generation and his poems have been interpreted in Japan since 1985 by the DIWA group in a jazz-like style.

271. House in Kugayama is built in steel and House in Kugayama 2 in concrete.
Tanikawa House first sketch

Sea Stairway

Tanikawa House plans
the house’s brief:

“Winter house or pioneer cabin (house)  
Summer space or church for a pantheist (need not be a house).”

But in Karuizawa Shinohara takes this dualist program to the opposite direction of that of the first Tanikawa House. Instead of working around separate volumes, he brings the different parts of the brief under a single roof, generating a unified volume under the trees, but separating both realms sharply.

In the only surviving design sketch of this house we can read the client’s brief quite literally, and understand that the process to get to the final single volume was gradual. In fact, in this sketch the ‘house’ is again divided in two with an intermediate space that acts as entrance like in the first Tanikawa House, and is radically separated from the ‘church’, which features a stage.

In the Japanese original of Shinohara’s essay “When Naked Space is Traversed”, there is a paragraph, not translated in the English version of few months later,274 where he comments on Tanikawa’s poem as a series of dialectical oppositions: ‘summer’ and ‘winter’, ‘house’ and ‘church’. And he adds one of his own: ‘urban’ vs ‘rural’ lifestyles.275 To explain these oppositions he uses the Japanese expression zure, ‘misalignment’ or ‘dislocation’, which he takes as one of the main themes in this house.

The final plan of Tanikawa House in Karuizawa is a basic rectangle divided in two uneven parts, translating these sets of oppositions into a schematic form: one-fourth of it is devoted to domestic functions, placed in two stories, and the rest three-fourths to non-domestic, in a single, extraordinary space with a steep slope.

The plan strongly recalls the proportions and duality of the Sea Stairway project (1969-1971), completed one year before Tanikawa’s commission, in which the main part is devoted to a painting studio, with a small domestic area attached to it.

In the text for publication of Sea Stairway, Shinohara explains an interesting shift in the process of its design, from initially separate volumes generating an intermediate space towards a unified volume:

“In the original floor plan, the living room and the atelier faced each other across a small inner garden, and the space linking them was amalgamated with a long stairway leading down to the street in front. The section was somewhat more complicated, but not very different from its final form. [...] Just as the cost estimate was completed and construction work about to begin, I discarded my original idea in favor of a simplified rectangular cube, or rather a box resembling a warehouse. The living room thus became part and parcel of the atelier, or vice versa, depending on how one chooses to see it.”276

In Tanikawa House this shift towards a unified
volume comprising the different parts of the program is already the starting point for its design, but in what is a significant change: whereas in Sea Stairway domestic and non-domestic functions are intimately interwoven and share the space, in Tanikawa they are radically separated.

Only a high and wide triangular opening on the second floor of the domestic area connects visually both realms. It allows for the vision of the complete series of posts and braces and hints at the existence of a single space or, rather, a unifying roof, thus recomposing in the experience of the interior the external unified volume.

BARN MACHINE

The volume “resembling a warehouse” of Sea Stairway is a clear hint to what Tanikawa House will be about: Shinohara repeats the same idea describing Tanikawa, a house “which looks like a large barn”, but this shouldn’t deceive us into believing that it has anything to do with folk architecture.

It is built, on the contrary, with highly sophisticated detailing and unconventional materials, at least for a countryside location. The finishing of the façades, with their refined 45° wall planking; the use of very large, undivided, glass panes; the roof “[…] covered with silver-sheet roofing, which gives off a hard, but pleasant light”: all are choices departing from the popular. But it is true that, beyond this elegant sophistication of design, the house exudes a directness by which the elements composing it are bare and simple. Shinohara will term this no-frills approach “nakedness”, and constitutes for him a major theme:

“[…] I expect the supporting posts to express nothing more than their function as posts; the walls, nothing more than their function as walls. The linking of the structure, which is carried out principally in terms of 45° and 90° angles, is intended to enhance the expression of the nakedness of physical objects.”

In fact, he relates this idea of nakedness to a major concept in his designs since the 1970s, that of “machine”, initiated in this house:

“I am talking about putting together spaces from naked objects which, like the parts of ordinary machines, have no meaning of their own. My idea is that such a space will produce vital meanings as in the past [of his oeuvre], but the mechanism for production is different. […] By erasing the meanings of the past and moving in the direction of naked objectivity, I have induced a structure of movement that I had not foreseen. This structure of movement is what I call a machine.”

Leaving aside the obscurity of the last sentence, which in a typical Shinoharian way mixes disparate categories (structure, movement, machine) in a personal turn (or his “own brand of logic”, as we have seen), this paragraph clearly delineates the
Tanikawa House: joinery of pillars
idea of machine as the meaningful combination of meaningless parts.

It looks like a barn from the outside, and it is built quite like one, but given its main characteristic of having a large room with a sloping floor, “a person entering it experiences the birth of accidental meaning.” This ‘accidental’ meaning is provided by the juxtaposition, or ‘misalignment’, of both systems:

“I intended the joining of the structure, executed principally in terms of 45-degree and 90-degree angles, to enhance the expression of the nakedness of physical objects. But since the structure encounters the natural ground slope, the result is a meeting of two spaces of different order. Experiencing a sense of imbalance and uncertainty, people begin to walk about in an effort to resolve it. There are many ways of traversing the space, and consequently an array of various potential meanings can be said to accrue.”

This ‘productive’ quality of the barn is what prompts Shinohara to call it a “machine”. The barn is thus “transformed here into a productive device, that is, a machine. The performance potential of a machine is determined by the halite and quantity of meaning it produces.”

‘Traversing’, thus, is the result of the isolation of movement as an architectural element. That is, a movement without purpose or function which nonetheless gives meaning to a bare space. Or, to put it in another words, its purpose or function is only to make sense of the bare space. By traversing it the observer can appropriate this irrational space, and make it his or her own.

That much was understood by Tanikawa. In the above mentioned Japanese version of “When Naked Space is Traversed”, Shinohara explains a telling discussion with Tanikawa about the name of the house. Shinohara wanted to call it jūtaku (‘residence’), as he had did with all his projects after Shino House (1969-1970), called until then ie (‘house’). But Tanikawa objected: it should be called a house, because a residence is an empty space, and it becomes a house when people live and move about it.

A CONSTRUCTED NATURALITY

Despite Shinohara’s opposition between ‘rational’ structure and ‘natural’ slope, the resulting barn machine depends on sheer artificiality to exist. Unlike what can be presupposed from Shinohara’s
Tanikawa House: sequence of approach
words, the ‘barn’ is not exactly deposited on the ground, thus creating a clash of “orders”.

The idea of ‘placing’ or ‘depositing’ the house on the ground, with minimal earth-work and leaving the natural slope as originally existing, can be clearly found in the House with an Earthen Floor. There, the slope at the entrance is the same as in the back, with the house levels acting as mediators. This is certainly the way folk architecture, with limited resources, was traditionally produced.

At Tanikawa House, instead, and given the steep slope of the location chosen by Shinohara (and we will go back to it later), this possibility would have meant a serious difference in levels to accommodate the residential quarters, which would have created a further difficulty of connection with the ‘summer hall’.

Given Shinohara’s wish to leave the slope in its more-or-less original state in order to create a big, single space acting as the ‘pantheist church’ of the brief, a rather heavy modification of the site is required for the three levels of the house itself, as can be seen in the construction drawings.

This can be retraced in photographs reconstructing the approach to the house, where it is clear that, past the detached small volume meant to park a car, the slope is in reality very gentle.

Only getting close to the house the slope increases. Another location could have been chosen by Shinohara indeed, but then the dramatism of the summer hall would have diminished significantly and his idea would have lost a lot of its appeal.

Checking the construction drawings it is also evident that a certain earth removal was done to get the perfect, horizontal, ‘depositing’ of the barn on the ground. Indeed, there was a longitudinal slope that had to be taken into account as well in order to place the house in its ideal position, parallel to the upper ridge of the hill.

This artificiality of construction of a ‘natural’ setting doesn’t diminish the value of the idea or of its realization in the least. On the contrary, it is the ‘natural’ embodiment of the idealization, or abstraction, of nature into a single element which is mensurable, and as such, reproducible, as the degree of slope of the hill.

But the ‘natural’ qualities associated with earth and the feelings they deploy remain intact: its smell and moisture, its softness and muffling effect, its fertility and color; they all evoke a primeval material connecting the observer’s feeling with the occult of House of Earth: “The dark quality of the
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soil may be an abbreviation of the Black Space that I feel is latent in me.”

And they all converge to produce, in contrast to the other man-made part of the machine, that is, the roof, the fundamental paradox that will prompt the observer to try to make some sense of it all and move about.

A HALL, AND A HOME

It is by now clear that the main strategy governing the whole design was not of a practical nature, but instead depended on finding, or creating, the right conditions for Shinohara’s idea to flourish, in a sort of detachment from the specific circumstances of the site.

A further sign of this detachment comes from the orientation of the house. It could be expected that, in the cold and damp conditions of the site even in summer, a greater exposure to the sun would be desirable and searched for.

The residential part is, as the brief demanded (“a pioneer’s cabin”), compact, cozy and warm, opening a mansard in the upper level towards the south, meant as a small study, and a large window opening towards the warmest west sun for the dining and living spaces.

But the main hall opens its large windows to the north, downhill, and provides just a narrow strip of fenestration to the south, uphill. This serves well the purpose of enhancing the contrast between the roof and the slanted floor, but does little to make the place comfortable.

It was not meant to be. As a “pantheist church” it could have been anything, a rock or a tree, or a cave. It “needed not be a house”, and a house was not. But its construction as an ‘illogical’ barn enveloping a house questions the rapport between domestic and non-domestic in several ways.

The relationship between the ‘unfunctional’, or hall, and the ‘functional’, or home, is ambiguous and direct at the same time. The entrance to the home is through the hall, directly from the exterior. The continuity between the soil outside and the soil inside render this transition all the more ambiguous, and the whole hall acts like a covered outdoors vestibule of the home.

Several years after the completion of Tanikawa House this transition was ‘domesticated’, introducing a flat concrete platform to act as effective entrance to the home, thus breaking the continuity with the exterior soil and that of the hall.

But the relationship between hall and home remained: a single, standard door xx cm wide is the only mediator between one and the other.
Sea Stairway
‘naked’ door that is just a door. In the plan used by Shinohara in the first publication of the house, this entry is heavily marked with arrows. We may assume that, otherwise, it might have gone unnoticed that the two realms are connected. For all this duality, Tanikawa House, unlike House in White, is not simply produced by the division of a single volume. It is produced more casually, adding volumes to a main body, very much in the organic way that folk architecture is produced, as a gradual appropriation of an existing structure: dividing where necessary, occupying the space where possible.

But a cover-all roof and a systematic structure hint towards an original single space. Another clue is given by a big triangular glazed opening (not exactly a window) of the second floor of the domestic quarters, which connects both worlds -hall and home- providing a sense of unity under the same roof. A unity made visible by the tree-like structure.

**NAKED STRUCTURE**

As noted before, in House in White the central pillar has a structural function but it is not completely optimized, attesting to a formal or symbolical role, not to a functional or technical one. It conveys a solemn overtone and a clear form of emotion in which the viewer is exposed to a completed narrative which he or she is not expected to question or change.

At Tanikawa House though, Shinohara couples a radical structural optimization with a radical emotional effect. The juxtaposition of purely technical devices such as the optimized wooden pillars and their struts, against a natural element such as the slanted soil on which the house stands, generates a more sophisticated emotion, based on an uncompleted or distorted narrative that moves the viewer to question, and try to answer, its very meaning.

In this sense, in House in White the dweller is taken as a passive spectator, while in Tanikawa House is asked to be an active agent that needs to move around the place in order to try to understand it, following in the steps taken in House of Earth and its heart of darkness.

But as we have seen, despite its apparent clarity or simplicity, House in White has also got a dark heart that escapes rationality, closed-off but crucial for the existence of the house. It is a hidden core made of the technical, which is expelled from the symbolical realm.

At Tanikawa House, on the contrary, it will be the complete exposure of the structure, and its purely technical dimensioning and design, which will become the protagonists of the summer hall. Here nothing is hidden, even the composition of
the whole volume is understandable through the triangular window.

What this space will require, though, will be an active user, a questioning wanderer who, bringing along a whole world of personal experiences, fears and laughs, will be able to complete the story posed by the main hall, projecting his or her own emotions onto the space, as a product of this moving machine.

STAGE WITH PROPS

If we retrace the path from arrival to the domestic spaces we can revive the sequence of emotions that Shinohara intended: walk up to the house under the dense canopy of tree-leaves; enter an interior space resembling that of the outside, with a steep earthen floor and a structure that looks like simplified trees; smell the space, listen to its unusual, muted silence, feel its grand dimensions; see the slope reaching beyond the hall; try to make sense of it all.

If we go back to the original brief for Tanikawa House we can see how a quasi-religious inclination on the part of the client is clearly expressed by asking for a "pantheist church", undoubtedly inspired by the sheer presence of nature in the site. Pantheism is still permeating every aspect of Japanese society, and it specially accounts for the famed (although some might discuss its consistency) Japanese relationship with nature.

In its formalized form, in Japan pantheism became Shintoism, a religious form that is not religion, an institution that has no hierarchical structure, being as it is a collection of myths, sometimes contradictory, gathered as a compromise to preserve the specific traditions of the various clans that constituted pre-unified Japan. Sokyo Ono, after stating that unlike other religions, "Shinto has neither a founder [...] nor does it have sacred scriptures", explains that

"In its general aspects Shinto is more than a religious faith. It is an amalgam of attitudes, ideas and ways of doing things that through two millenniums and more have become an integral part of the way of the Japanese people."

Unlike Buddhism, Shinto doesn't have a literature...
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worth speaking of as such, nor it has had any influence in the visual arts, being as it is an imageless faith. But it has had a great impact in architecture and music, specially dancing.

Dancing is part of one of the founding myths of the Shinto cosmogony: it was dancing that the kami ('heavenly gods') could entice the Sun Goddess Amaterasu out of the cave where she hid in after her brother Earth God Susanō had committed many outrages, causing “the heavens and earth to become darkened.”

If Shinto can’t be fully explained (“it is impossible to make explicit and clear that which fundamentally by its very nature is vague”), it can nonetheless be experienced, and performed. Or, as the Shinto priest in one of the stories of the mythologist Joseph Campbell puts it: “We do not have ideology”, he said. “We do not have theology. We dance.”

This abstraction of feelings making up the play takes place in its turn in a highly abstracted stage with few and simple symbolic properties. To be completed, a play actually depends on the audience’s active imagination and in its knowledge of its circumstances, so props can be just like sketches or hints.

The actual movements of this dance-play are not brisk or hectic, but they are on the contrary controlled and sedate, often performed like closely hovering over the stage. In fact, in Japanese language Noh dance is distinguished by being called mai rather than the usual odori, which conveys a sense of leaping or jumping usually ascribed to dancing, while mai conveys a sense of circling.

Noh movements are highly fixed by the author of the play, or consolidated by tradition. Noh professionals usually learn the chant and movements of dances and plays mimetically, i.e.
through physical instruction from and imitation of their teachers. For apprentices and amateurs there are charts giving schematic indications on how the actors should move and chant, amounting to a movement diagram.

Upon entering Tanikawa House’s summer hall people move about aimlessly, seeking to make sense of the space, not unlike in a Noh stage in that they can’t make brisk movements, but with the difference that there are no directions how to traverse it. If we traced their movements about, they would register something like a Noh diagram.

This space has got two props to help people create some sense, or ‘meaning’ to use a Shinohara expression. There is a ladder and a bench, placed as hints as how to use it, as integral parts of the space. As we will see, one prop for looking inside, another one also serving to look outside. The care shown by Shinohara in designing these elements is a clue at their importance in the overall scheme.

Shinohara succinctly explains how the ladder is a borrowing: “Proportions for the ladder were taken from a photograph of Cézanne’s atelier”\(^\text{296}\), although more than a transposition of “proportions” as he suggests, it is a quasi-direct copy.

As such, like in the case of Cézanne, it is the place to contemplate ‘the work of art’ from above, a privileged position or vantage point from which to gain a totaling perspective, a possibility of meaning.

The ladder’s steps are placed in a linear mathematical progression, 5 cm closer to each other the higher they are, up to a total of 3.69 m. This way, they hint towards an endless climbing, an infinite perspective further enhanced by the convergence of the main posts, making it appear higher than it actually is.

The ladder represents, and allows for, the possibility of inhabiting the height, the only verticality in this otherwise unified space. This idea of climbing up, perching on top the ladder or the pillars, like inhabiting a tree top, will be the leitmotif of House in Uehara.

Likewise, the bench located in the lower part of the hall facing the huge window (380x251 cm, non-partitioned fix glass) open towards the landscape offers the possibility of a fixed viewpoint, either outside or inside. It is the only horizontal in the slanted space, the only conventional place for a person to be. But it is not even a sure place. As Shinohara recalls:

“A poet who visited the house spoke of the insecurity he felt in walking over the soft black soil. But it may be this very feeling of insecurity that keeps people walking. In front of the large glass window on the north is a platform 3 m long. The same poet said that this platform seemed to offer something to rely on. But, being like a boat afloat on a deep swamp, the platform actually offers very little reliability. For this reason, people usually leave it and continue

\(^{296}\) “KS2: 11 Houses”, p. 171. Photograph caption for pages 136-137.
When Shinohara first published this work in Shinkenchiku in October 1975, he added a set of pictures very uncharacteristic of his publications. Not only did they show people (the first and only time that he did so) in the summer hall, but people were behaving very freely, seemingly aimless.

These pictures show some people up and down this space, someone perched on the ladder, fuzzy figures conveying the sense of movement. Better grasped possibly as a cinematic experience (one person of the group seems to be filming, but it is unknown if such movie exists), the layout in the magazine is clearly cinematographic, a sequence of parts of a play in the pantheist’s stage.

Interestingly, this layout showing the interior activities is mirrored for the exterior pictures of the house, a cinematic traveling of sorts, thus conveying a sense of continuity between inside and outside, a continuity clearly existing in the path of the visitor arriving to the house and entering it.

Of course this hall, with its earthen floor following the hill’s slope, is all but conventional, being more an interiorized exterior than a living room. But given its prescribed use as an ‘inspirational space’ those pictures were a statement in favor of alternative behaviors, what Shinohara calls ‘illogical functions’.

The hall in Tanikawa Houses hall is purportedly a sacred stage in which to represent an informal ritual that ends up creating another way of experiencing space and of living free of conventions, something that will be further developed, and to a far extreme, in House in Uehara.
3.04 HOUSE IN UEHARA: URBAN TREE DWELLING

House in Uehara (1975-1976) is located in a well-off neighborhood in Central Tokyo, consisting of single-family detached houses no more than three-story high. It is a densely packed semi-commercial district of rather small plots along streets with no sidewalks, a very common situation in Tokyo and elsewhere in urban Japan.

It was the urban residence for the photographer Kiyoji Ōtsuji, for whom Shinohara had designed some twelve years before the House with an Earthen Floor (1963), a very small holiday dwelling in Nagano Prefecture, not far from Tanikawa House, made of wood, paper and earth.

At Tokyo it was going to be very different. Building regulations demanded either a setback from the front property line, giving the possibility of rising up to three storeys, or keep a five-meter maximum cornice height if facing directly the street.

Given that the site is rather small (barely a 10x10 m plot), a setback was not really an option for the required program, and therefore the house stands right in front of the street, five meter high, occupying almost all the plot available.

When the design was virtually finished the client found additional financial resources and a third-floor minimal addition was included. This new volume keeps the required setback and is deposited as a light-weight structure over the flat roof slab of the previous design.

Shinohara explains this restriction matter-of-factly, as the primordial (and somehow inevitable) condition that sparked the whole design as it is:

"Because of building restrictions, the height of the side facing the street was limited to 5 meters, but the use of the beamless slab made it possible to provide adequate ceiling heights."

CONSTRUCTION AND SPACE

But this condition alone doesn’t seem sufficient to explain the final result and all the construction options adopted in this house, which are many and quite unconventional.

Even allowing for the primordial choice of the flat roof slab to get the maximum headroom, it is quite evident from the construction drawings that it is not ‘beamless’ in a strict sense: the six pillars constituting the vertical structure are connected by way of beams embedded in the slab and that are roughly double its thickness, protruding underneath.

All these structural elements, though, are
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concealed by a continuous white gypsum-board ceiling concealing the insulation. The total thickness of the roof system is 29 cm, plus almost 4 cm more for the roof waterproofing, indeed a slender dimension overall. The final headroom of the second floor is a mere 2.42 m.

Moreover, the choice of a different construction system for the intermediate flooring, doesn't seem very effective in terms of gaining headroom: it consists of a wooden structure made of planks measuring 23.5 cm, 3.8 cm thick, placed at 30 cm, supporting a double-plywood floor 2.7 cm thick, and totally measuring about 26 cm, which is roughly the thickness of the roof slab system, and certainly thicker than the slab itself, which measures a mere 14 cm across.

Besides, in order to have an adequate height in the first floor, with a headroom of 2.5 m, Shinohara excavates the plot and places its level some 40 cm below the street level. It seems clear that other structural or construction choices could have been considered and they would have been at least as effective as the solution adopted by Shinohara.

Shinohara always explained the structure of House in Uehara as the best possible technical solution given the conditions of the site and the low budget. But his insistence in this issue is all the more suspicious if we realize that, in fact, those conditions are the common rule in urban Japan. Conversely, there may be reasons why only one House in Uehara has been realized and its construction system has not been widely adopted. These reasons hint at a less-than-rational approach to the effectiveness of the method devised by Shinohara.

Moreover, if we follow the sketches of the process of design we’ll realize that, at an advanced stage, the shape of the house is already defined by the bracing system of the structure supporting a flat roof.

But this system takes different configurations in different drawings, hinting not only that it was not inevitable and there were choices to be made, but probably that the shape of the structure was not a given condition by the structural engineer, as it would have been expected from a structurally optimized system (and then it would have inevitably referred to a preexisting, probably conventional model), but rather the opposite.

Or, to formulate it in a different way: Shinohara’s quest for bringing into the house a non-domestic emotion was the main guide to go along, pursued in complete intellectual freedom, to which construction system and calculations were subordinate. That much is clear when he speaks of the “wildness [spontaneity] I felt in the actual design process.”

The non-domestic emotion looked for by Shinohara is provided in the House in Uehara by the structural...
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elements, a series of tree-like pillars and bracings like those of Tanikawa House, this time in rough concrete finish, not unlike the traditional shibui taste. Comparatively, their dimensions are extraordinarily big for a house, out of scale, belonging more to the world of the road infrastructures built in Tokyo from the mid-1960s on than to the domestic realm.

Their dimension is in this sense more public than private, a first nod towards the influence of the ‘city’ in the design of the house. But there will be many more, making of this project the first in which such relationship is acknowledged:

“In a typical small-scale residential street not too distant from Shibuya Station—which […] had long been the point of departure of my urban theory- I designed House in Uehara in 1976. And here I introduced in a new design theme the task of establishing a direct relationship with the surrounding cityscape.”

This cityscape is taken not just as an abstract background, but as an inspirational source to provide the house with emotions, so that it responds “in earnest to the ambient non-uniform situations”. It provides both with a conceptual frame -that of overlapping, chaotic encounters- and with a tactile atmosphere to respond to: “There is a public bathhouse behind the house, and the smoke from its chimney finds a place in the landscape.”

“WHAT IS OBSCENE IS WHAT IS HIDDEN”

House in Uehara stirred many comments when it was first published, centered around its ‘violence’ -and it is still viewed nowadays as a wild interior, although we have all grown accustomed to strong emotions in the meantime.

Certainly it has the great care for detail and material qualities like any of the houses ever designed by Shinohara, but none of their conventional comfort, elegance or asceticism.

Many of the frames of the Japanese film director Yasuhiro Ozu could serve to indicate the quiet mood for Shinohara’s previous houses, and in fact this relationship has been noted in several occasions. But from House in Uehara on they no longer serve to explain them.

To find the wilderness and freedom of design that House in Uehara conveys we should retort to the movies of Nagisa Oshima and their “need to question social constraints, and to similarly deconstruct received political doctrines”, as seen in his line of films starting by “Death by Hanging” (1968) up to “In the Realm of the Senses” (1976).

When questioned in court about the unsimulated sexual scenes of “In the Realm of the Senses”, he “formulated a defense that could apply to almost all his work: ‘Nothing that is expressed is obscene.
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By the 1970s the zeitgeist for individualism was already global, and reflected at the same the disillusionment with the failures of the revolutionary dreams of the late 1960s and the necessity to state personal freedom.

This can be seen very crudely in the French film Themroc (1973), dubbed in several countries as ‘The Urban Troglodite’ or ‘The Urban Caveman’. Directed by Claude Faraldo and starring Michel Piccoli, it was made on a low budget with no intelligible or meaningful dialog, thus enhancing its 'sauvage' tone.

It tells the story of a French blue collar worker who rebels against modern society, reverting into an urban caveman. The film’s scenes of incest and cannibalism earned it adults-only ratings, but this fact didn’t prevent it of becoming a cult movie still now regularly shown at universities and cine-forums.

In one of its most memorable scenes, the main character opens a big hole in his flat by hammering the façade to pieces, carving it out like if it were a cave, opening the interior to the outside world, for all to see: what is obscene is what is hidden.

At the same time it generates several sorts of relationships with its immediate surroundings, using different compositional devices:

It cantilevers part of the second floor generating a void that takes in the exterior space, and protrudes a volume above the roof line pointing upward; it opens it up the main rooms of the house towards the street, albeit in a suffused or indirect way through the triangular windows, wider on top and narrower below; it gazes outside from the third floor eye-like openings, that resemble a creature inhabiting the top of the tree-like structure underneath, and in fact refer to the act of looking of the inhabitant inside.

But for all these mechanisms, House in Uehara is in reality one more step forward towards recognizing the city or, more precisely, the urban landscape, as a reference for the domestic designs of Shinohara.

In previous projects we can see a progression towards this opening to the city. Notably in House in Higashi-Tamagawa (1971-1973) where the interior recalls urban landscapes photographed by Shinohara in his overseas trips [photo of interior plus photo of Granada].

And in the extension of the same house, the Higashi-Tamagawa Complex (1980-1982), the lessons of House in Uehara will prove valuable: here Shinohara employs again a cantilever, and explicitly uses it as a compositional device to connect both

What is obscene is what is hidden."

House in Uehara: construction of the shell, and finished result.
buildings, using the void and the projection of the volume as clues to a virtual unity.

The space within this cantilever, a studio cum library for the client, is referred to by Shinohara as an opening framing the exterior. What matters here is how this relationship with the exterior takes place in this project: the domestic interior needs to be ‘alienated’ by distorting its conventional horizontality, and only then can be capable of establishing a tête-à-tête interchange with the exterior.

THE CONSTRUCTION OF AN IDEA

It is true, though, that the structural system and, even more importantly, its construction on site, were meant to be innovations to be replicated, and in that sense House in Uehara has to be seen as a prototype, however unconventional and difficult to serialize it might be.

The concrete shell of two storeys was poured in one go, creating a single volume that was later on subdivided with a wooden structure, thus forming the second floor like a sort of inhabitable platform perched on the branches of a tree.

This method is akin to the subdivision method used at House in White, where the whole volume was divided both vertically and horizontally. The main difference, though, is that in House in White the ‘third space’, the hidden unconscious of the house, was to be in House in Uehara precisely the main living space.

Living in this space is not exactly easy: one revolves always around the recurrent presence of the structure in the relatively small plan, calling for constant attention on the part of the dwellers, getting literally in the way and actually conditioning life inside the house.

Even arranging the plan and giving appropriate passage to the inhabitants called for some compositional awkwardness, most clearly evident in the nook provided to give access to the bedrooms.

Shinohara sees that as somehow natural that needs not further reworking: “I solved the problem of this brace simply by according a detour around it. This should not be regarded as a compromise, but rather a direct recognition of fact.”

If the ‘misalignment’ between structure and plan recalls the operation of Tanikawa House of superimposing two different systems, the ‘naturality’ of the recognition of fact in House in Uehara goes one step forward reaching what Shinohara terms ‘savagery’, borrowing the term from Claude Lévi-Strauss.

For Shinohara ‘savagery’ is the plain acknowledgement of crude juxtaposition as a basis...
for design, resonating with the way the chaotic city outside is produced, “[...] responding in earnest to the ambient non-uniform situations [of the chaotic cityscape that is Tokyo].”

Only when Shinohara is capable of introducing ‘savagery’ as a key concept in his designs, is he capable of dealing with the city and, more precisely, with the urban landscape, and develop further his ideas.

**THE COCOON AND THE TRANSGRESSOR**

Many of the instances in which juxtaposition plays an emotional role in Shinohara’s work involve the contrast between a private interior (the cocoon) and an external figure (the transgressor) that apparently does not belong there.

More often than not the role of transgressor is given to structural elements that pierce or occupy the cocoon, seemingly regardless of its inhabitants. From this chance encounter or misalignment, of possible Surrealist roots, a new meaning is derived, a new expression of domestic space is achieved, and a new consciousness or awareness of the fragility of contemporary life and its many tolls on the aesthetical experience is attained.

Even when not being a transgressor, structure always played a critical role in the definition of Shinohara’s works, to the extent that he regularly engaged structural engineers as consultants, even for the smallest of his houses. Although adhering to conventional techniques at the beginning of his career, when the spaces of his houses were characterized by structural elements directly related with traditional Japanese architecture, Shinohara’s ‘tour de force’ with structure was part of an effort to go beyond traditional construction methods and carry structural possibilities to the limits.

But the examples taken by Shinohara from Japanese architecture in his first period are not the traditional, light-timber and fragile houses, even though his designs are built like them. Instead, the interiors of houses such as House with a Big Roof (1960-1961) or House with an Earthen Floor (1963) recall old farmhouses or sake breweries, or the heavy wooden structures of temples and shrines.

The role of these structural elements in these earlier interiors is, in spite of their big scale, reassuring by evoking past spatial experiences, fixing domestic life beyond the passage of time, but becoming a presence that will only grow bigger in time.

Linked to the structural experiment of House in Uehara, and close nearby, is the quasi-contemporary House in a Curved Road (1976-1978). It presents itself as a shell-like interior pierced by huge structural elements capable of erasing any
House with an Earthen Floor: table and benches

House in Uehara: table and benches as the sole furniture

Claude Faraldo: stills from "Themroc". Getting rid of TV and all furniture - and the debris of civilisation.
complacent domestic feeling of the house. The original pictures of this house published by Shinohara show some Thonet-like chairs inhabiting this space, representing the maximum fragility of human life confronting the permanence and solidity of the concrete structure.

**ANTI-DOMESTIC HOUSE**

Even if Shinohara’s interiors are for the most part remarkably comfortable, domesticity in Shinohara’s work is never complacent or banal, but is rather a challenge to conventions, both practical and intellectual, a challenge that demands an active response from the inhabitants of his houses.

In another memorable scene of “Themroc”, Piccoli throws all the furniture of the house through the newly opened mouth of the cave. There is no space there for conventional domesticity, and all props of civilization must go.

At House in Uehara, there’s no furniture at all, except for a long table with benches, very similar to those of the holiday retreat of the family at the House with an Earthen Floor. All life revolves around these very basic and neutral pieces of furnishings, and in the mind of Shinohara there’s no need of other props.

**REACHING HIGH UP**

In Shinohara’s designs there is always a hint towards verticality. Be it a simple ladder reaching up, or a skylight, or just a double-height hall, the vertical dimension is present in many of his projects, remarkably in the smallest ones.

We can read the evolution undergone by the projects of Shinohara, from House in White to House in Yokohama, as an aspiration, or reaching, towards height. More precisely, towards the inhabiting of the highest point.

In House in White height builds the symbolic role of the central pillar, which rises above standard domestic heights towards an abstract, flat ceiling, marking the maximum visual dimension of the house. But the real height of the house is negated.

In Tanikawa House the potential of reaching high is explicitly acknowledged, not only by leaving the tree-like structure exposed and accessible, but specially by incorporating as a main prop of the spatial experience of the meditation room a free-standing stair that acts as hint on how to move or dwell vertically in this space.

These first dwellers of the highest point of Tanikawa House will literally be taken as the inhabitants of House in Uehara. The permanent residential space in it will be the tree-platform, and its inhabitants...
House in Uehara: the city through its eyes.
will need to negotiate permanently their way around the concrete branches where they live.

In House in Uehara there is yet a higher point than the inhabitable platform: the path continues above towards another room, very distinct from the lower floor: it is a self-supporting shell, rounded like a tree canopy and with views opening towards the exterior. Above the trees, the vision of the forest.

It will be this newly found shell, with its main characteristic of being visually un-structural and its malleability to configure shapes and create relations that will be the basis for Shinohara’s final synthesis in House in Yokohama.
House in Yokohama: A silver hut and a black wooden studio.

House in Yokohama: Computer drawings (1985)
3.05 HOUSE IN YOKOHAMA: REACTIVE EMOTIONS

Perched on an elevated plot in the bushy suburbs of Yokohama we could find another silver hut, now sadly demolished. An unconventional volume with even more unconventional fenestration, it seemed like a space-age excrescence of a black old house in wood, to which it was attached.

To those having been at the other silver hut, Tanikawa House, the scene somehow resonated in several ways: the abundance of wild greenery, the smell and touch of the wooden house, the shininess of the metal. Only this time there didn’t seem to be a willingness of unity, rather the opposite.

It was Shinohara’s residence, although he had initially published it as his daughter’s, undoubtedly to distract attention. At the old house, contrastingly painted matt black, there was the Shinohara Atelier, the studio that he had founded after retirement from TokyoTECH.

This ‘displacement’ from a 40-year routine was not to last very long, though, since Shinohara could only live there for ten years before he had to dismantle the studio, sell the house and move somewhere else, to a rented apartment.

But this brief period of existence of the house was enough to reestablish Shinohara as an avant-gardist for architectural design and, along the way, disorient both his followers and his detractors, who fell short of words or clues to pin this built manifesto down or to categorize it.

After the crude wilderness of Uehara House and the strong reactions that it generated, nobody thought that Shinohara could surprise anybody yet again, not of course in the turbulent bubble years of the 1980s, when so many crazy proposals were made and built, in a perpetual state of awe. But he did, astonishing everybody.

This astonishment was augmented by the bold use of computer drawings to explain the design, at that time a very rare innovation that required large computers (like those of TokyoTECH) and a good analogue camera to take long-exposure pictures of the screen, given that color printers were not yet available. These drawings, although linear, were far removed from the clean style favored by Shinohara.
More importantly, the house marked the apex of a long-standing and converging quest of Shinohara to make of the domestic space an emotional, moving machine resonating with the rhythms, the diversity and the chaos of the city.

But few people were prepared for this bold move on the part of an ‘architect of houses’, as he had often described himself. Borrowing a term from electronics, he called this resonance ‘random noise’, and the house was its embodiment:

“Each form and each volume corresponds to a different function, and all are joined abruptly -as in an assembly of machine parts. This abruptness results in the expression of ‘noise’ -and discreetness [a previous formulation of this disassociation of parts], at this extreme, has been metamorphosed into visual cacophony, or what I call ‘random noise’.”

This ‘visual cacophony’, a term he had employed before referring to Tokyo’s cityscape, has a purpose. As the computers drawings hinted at, the house was a collection of volumes apparently connected at random but functioning like a single device.

But it was not a mere composition of parts. Instead, it seemed also to react to its environment, and smaller elements protruded from it, reaching beyond its limits and establishing direct or virtual relationships with the surroundings.

**MULTIPLE PERSONALITIES**

It is not by coincidence that structure in House in Yokohama doesn’t play any role in the configuration of neither space nor emotion, unlike his previous works: space and emotion are defined, once and for all, in their own terms, by the creation of relationships between inside and outside, by the design of the relations among parts or elements instead of charging them with meaning.

The form of House in Yokohama can be said to have a double personality: one behavior towards the black house, another one towards the open plot. On the side facing the atelier, it is meticulously dependent of and very attentive towards the wooden black volume. The location of the new house also respects the natural conditions of the site, and this multiple care for preexistences is explained in detail by Shinohara:

“There would have been adequate space around the upper part of the steep slope where this house stands, but in order to spare the trees, I decided to extend the older wooden house on the lot into a portion of its former garden, but only in such a way as not to deprive the already existing structure of any sunlight. This is one reason for the adoption of a quarter-cylinder profile as a formal motif for the new structure. Only a single aperture of the older house had to be sacrificed at ground-floor level, where the original structure and this new wing abut, near the southwest corner of the older unit.”

The way this relationship was established, though, was not lineal or easy from the start. On the contrary, it can be viewed as a determined struggle.
House in Yokohama: working sketches. The staircase as a articulating device between old and new is one of the prominent concerns shown in these drawings.

House in Hanayama n.4: Connection with the old house. General axonometry.
to find the best possible solution. It is very striking to realize how ‘natural’ seems the built version compared with the different possibilities tried and retried for almost two years of design process.

We can trace in Shinohara’s sketches for House in Yokohama many variants to locate the new wing in relation with the old house, mostly draw in plan and focusing on the position of the main axis of the house and how to get to the upper floor from the entrance level, linked to the question of how to enter the house.

In a previous design, House in Hanayama no. 4 (1977-1980), Shinohara had encountered a similar problem of relating a new body with an existing house, South House in Hanayama, or Hanayama 2, designed also by him. He will recurrently encounter this situation in the last part of his career, but only in that occasion the project was realized.

At Hanayama 4, both the new extension and the old house share the same entrance point, which is produced as an intermediate body connecting, yet detaching, both volumes as independent units. It also serves as an entry point to the open air terrace on the new house, in a sort of exterior passage protruding from the main body.

But the main function of this small module connecting the two houses is to properly adjust the diverse geometries of the two houses, prompted by radically different site conditions. At Yokohama though, after trying several possibilities of an intermediate body, Shinohara opted for the potential of using the gap (the famed Japanese ma) between the two houses as a connecting space, or threshold.

This direct, tactile, relationship between the old house and the new is carefully accounted for in the construction drawings detailing the canopy covering the ma, although this threshold only serves in this case as an entry to the new building.

PERISCOPE HOUSE

If, as we have seen, on the side facing the old volume House in Yokohama is produced aware of its presence and relating rationally and in a restrained form to it, on the side facing the site it is produced without any restraint or rationality, like a liberation from any constraint and an opportunity to have the ‘irrational side’ unleashed and explored.

Two previous, quasi-finalized versions of the project assess to the fact that the exploding of the house towards the exterior was something discovered along the way: both versions feature closed volumes that yes, have respect for the old house, but are incapable of establishing any dialogue with it, nor with the site.

In the final version though, the house is conceived...
Houses with balconies: House in Kugayama n.2 (left) and House in Komae

House in Yokohama: the balcony-to-be
to have at the same time interior relations, however ‘abrupt’ as a result of its composition in disparate parts, and relations with the outside, in a significant move on the part of Shinohara to recognize the exterior as an influence to design the house.

This move towards the outside had its first conscious step taken at House in Uehara, where the tight conditions of the site and its regulations triggered the final result and propelled Shinohara to recognize the city, albeit in an idealized form, open the house to it and finally reconcile both.

The ‘city’ in the case of House in Yokohama is, again, an idealized version that comprises the adjacent house and the greenery of the site, quite large for Japanese urban standards. It thus becomes a sort of ‘urban connector’ that projects multiple relations around it. It is simultaneously an appendix of the old black house, and a multiple periscope taking in the various views that its elevated position can afford.

This relation with the outside, though, is never ‘natural’ or direct. On the contrary, it is always mediated by Shinohara’s architecture and its shapes, which become a lens through which see the world.

But only seeing it: for all its privileged natural setting, and the care that Shinohara had in keeping the original vegetation of the site, the house never allows for a life outside or opens frankly to it, unlike the first houses of Shinohara. The house is a sort of closed observatory, like a moon-landing module deposited in a hostile environment, an image we will later comment on.

The sole possibility of being simultaneously in the house and in the site is a very small deck on top of a tatami room, high above the street and with no rails, putting the resident in a precarious situation, as if hinting to the insecurities of the exterior.

This accessible but non-secure place, unusable on the other hand for an outdoors function even though it’s got a small canopy covering it, is further idealized as a connection to the site by taking the shape of steps that, in reality, don’t reach the ground. Here, like in a Noh play, action or movement are just adumbrated.

But the multiple directions to which the windows open are the embodiment of the movement of a person landing at the upper level and wanting to see what is around the house, in a sequence that hints again, like at Tanikawa House, towards the verticality of the space and to the generation of unexpected relations:

“I expected a relationship between the interior and the exterior that might go beyond the usual. Thus, counter-contextual movements by people and changes of light do arise quite unexpectedly here.”

Interestingly enough, House in Yokohama cannot be

House in Yokohama: sequence of openings of upper floor

House in Yokohama location plan: own and ‘borrowed’ trees, all drawn in the general plan
understood in section. Its cross sections are not a
telling document of the constitution of the house,
like they weren’t for House of Earth, another shell-
like construction.

The complexity and fluidity of its spaces can only
be grasped by moving around, more like a sequence
of impressions, of turns of head and body. Its
experience is less mental, or abstract, and more
physical, or concrete.

Movement at Yokohama is of a diff
erent kind of
those movements of Shinohara’s previous designs,
but an evolution of sorts can be traced: at House
in White movement was limited to circumvallate
the ritual pillar; at Tanikawa House it was free but
still interior; at Uehara it had the double condition
of a forced movement around the structure and an
opening beyond the limits of the façades and the
roof.

At House in Yokohama, instead, the observer has
to move around with different turns of head and
body, peeping out, gazing far and looking up, in a
sequence that could be told or drawn as a dance
score:

Upon arrival at the upper landing one sees the
city mediated by a triangular window like those
of House in Uehara, a continuity of sorts in the
way Shinohara establishes a relation with the built
environment.

Seeing openly the sky at first, the view closes down
gradually to the lower street and houses lining
it, but is limited by the triangular shape, with its
horizontal side on top and pointing downwards,
thus creating a sort of privacy filter.

Next in sequence, a double sliding window, meant
as an interior deck next to the table, bends
towards the longest diagonal of the site, borrowing
the next plot’s forested scenery in a classical
shakkei fashion, thus visually enlarging the
reduced dimension of the room, and enhancing
this perspective effect by the very geometry of its
perimeter on the inside.

And finally, one large fix glass literally focuses on
the tree tops like a telescope gazes the sky, looking
upwards and giving a sense of verticality that the
small house can’t provide for.

This spatial sequence can be drawn with a single
movement of the head: first down the street, then
horizontal towards the far view, later up to the
sky. The last window of this space brings us back to
where we came from, opening to the opposite side
in a sort of low nook, reestablishing an intimate
relation with the black old house and the site
beyond.

This sequence, or traveling to use a cinematic
expression, which deploys many different feelings
and relations in a very reduced area in a very short
time, has an origin in the way one arrives at this

323. Shakkei (‘borrowed scenery’) is
the principle of incorporating background
landscape into a garden’s composition.
House in Kugayama (left) and House in Yokohama at same scale

House in Yokohama: handrail detailing
level, an initial movement that was already tried and used by Shinohara before as a compositional device that both separates the observer from the previous experience and prepares him or her for the new spatial surprise.

House in Kugayama, Shinohara’s first built design, shares with House in Yokohama, one of his last, a similar volume composition with a smaller part in the first floor and the main body at the second floor. More relevantly, the same kind of movement is designed to get to the second floor. At Kugayama one accesses the upper level through a steep stair of open steps with no handrails, marking the separation between the two parts, like entering a new world. This separation is further enhanced by a sharp 180° turn required to access the room upstairs, which appears in full view, as in surprise.

At Yokohama a similar separative device is set in motion, in a sequence of experiences that are meant to disassociate the perception of both floors: after entering a minimal vestibule, the stair leads upstairs and another sharp 180° turn is required.

But here the whole volume of the landing, a quarter of a cylindrical shell, helps direct the visitor towards the main room. In fact, the handrail, creeping over the shell, hints at this fluid turn, carefully accounted for in the construction drawings.

This minimal detail may seem anecdotic or casual, but in reality a similar accompaniment of the person towards an emotional finale was already consciously present and provided for, as we have seen, in the design of the ceiling of House of Earth as an accompaniment to the underground bedroom.

**MONTAGE BIZARRE**

Oddly enough, for all this care in the interior composition, all the accounts by Shinohara of House in Yokohama focus exclusively in the exterior and in the house as a compositional result or montage, but never mention the qualities of the interior or his intentions to make this montage livable.

In this sense, it is like if House in Yokohama is a sort of inevitable machine that has to become inhabitable, like a moon-landing module or a jet fighter of which, after having managed to put together and optimized all the required functions, there is just the space for a pilot to fit in, anyhow.

Shinohara had already referred to such awkward-looking high-tech vehicles resulting of montage as a source of inspiration for his idea of machine, but always from the outside and didn’t refer to their interior qualities, which of course are practically inexistent, nor to their advanced technological features, à la Buckminster Fuller. Shinohara was aestheticizing what is in reality a
NASA lunar landing unit

USAF jet fighter

NASA lunar landing unit

House in Yokohama: Landing unit
standard engineering procedure, in order to make a point based “in visual analogies to exemplify the relationship between form and function”, like Le Corbusier had done sixty years before, and with the same intention of reestablishing a conceptual basis for the production of form.

This time, though, not admiring the standard streamlined aircraft that discouragingly “recalls an ornamental water fowl afloat on a pond”, but the “image of an intrepid bird in flight” produced by the clumsy connection of parts “so that each could perform its functions with maximum efficiency”.

Of course ‘efficiency’ in terms of program in a house, however small, is hardly a key technical problem as to produce in itself the whole form of the building, not to mention a distinct form, and it is not what Shinohara is after in his ‘visual analogy’.

What he finds inspiring is that those machines, and specially the clumsily clad moon-landing module, “totally lacking in elegance, from an architectural standpoint […] was extremely refreshing for me to behold and made me wonder if a similar architecture did not exist”.

Modern technology, tending towards the minimal and the invisible, is no capable any longer of providing a linear relationship between form and function: “Half a century of technological development has altered the conditions for this fundamental architectural theme”.

But it is still capable of providing images of a relationship, in an epoch in which that relationship was questioned by the prevailing post-modernist or, more precisely, anti-modernist, approach: “New products resulting from novel technology have a freshness of shape that nourishes the theme of function and form”.

Surely Shinohara’s visual, not to say superficial, approach to the subject of form and function, limited to his understanding of a montage of highly specialized pieces resulting in an appealingly bizarre object, shares with his postmodern contemporaries many conceptual traits, which I will not develop here.

Yet it manages to assert itself as a differentiated standpoint, exposed contentiously like so many of his argumentations before, trying at the same time to stress the originality of his vision and the inevitability of its application.

FURNISHING PLEASURE

But even though Shinohara never wrote or commented explicitly about the qualities of the interior of House in Yokohama, as we have seen he took great care, as always, in defining them, this time with a renovated intention toward how the spaces are used.
Hyakunen Kinenkan half-cylinder, inside and underneath

Kazuo Shinohara at House in Yokohama
The construction in Yokohama of an irregular shell as the result of human movements and their relations with the exterior, marks an approach to the body and its gesturality as generator of meaning in the space which, as we have seen, can be traced back to House of Earth.

In House of Earth, like in Tanikawa House, the generation of this meaning is facilitated by the furniture, which always was one of the main concerns of Shinohara. He was very conscious of the role of furniture in his houses and in every project he used famed designers’ models or provided his own.

At Yokohama, a whole set of diverse furniture (all the more surprising given the tiny dimensions of the house) was designed by Shinohara as propitiator of use of the space. A use that is meant to be ludic and open like the ‘living platform’ of House of Earth, and which speaks of an erotic dimension to be found throughout his architecture, albeit in different forms, beyond its most obvious sensual character.

In an article written at the time of House in Yokohama completion, and published together with it, “The Context of Pleasure”, Shinohara elaborates on the relation between eroticism and pleasure and tells how he finds

‘[...] it pleasant to look at the science fiction images in which almost naked bodies surrounded by mechanical equipment walk around transparent interiors, wearing minimal metallic clothes. [...] What I find interesting is the achievements of balance between the pleasant scenario of SF images and the almost naked human bodies suggesting a primitive situation. [...] I appreciate the straight hedonism to be seen in the interaction of naked human bodies and the futuristic mechanical space.”

The insistence on nakedness as a ‘primitive’ condition and its contrast with the ‘futuristic mechanical space’ gives a hint on how we might imagine the users and interpret the spaces of House in Yokohama, a futuristic mechanical space in its own right, with a white interior of disparate geometrical forms not unlike those of SF movies.

The utmost expression of this ‘futuristic’ sort of interior will be the half-cylinder of Hyakunen Kinenkan, with its space-ship metaphor that is visible as much as in the inside as under its belly, hovering in mid-air like a zeppelin.

This article deals as much with the city as it does with furniture, and Shinohara relates both, through a somehow naïf but very interesting connection nonetheless, by means of the idea of ‘no memory’.

Though the argumentation of the connection is weak (Japan has no memory of chair design, so he finds freedom, and therefore pleasure, when designing it. The Japanese city is made out of the freedom of its lack of memory, and that state creates the pleasures of the metropolis) it brings
House in Yokohama: long section (left) and cross section

House in Yokohama: earth works

House in Yokohama: underground and earth lookout
about the relationship between no-memory and primitivism, which is of special relevance here.

However bipolar in its relations with the environment as noted before, in fact it could be said that the House in Yokohama has three behaviors, so to speak: the two mentioned before, which amount to a public expression of personality, and a third one which is the realm of the intimate and is practically buried in the ground, not unlike House of Earth.

This new iteration, however idealized, of the Black Space, roots the house with the site and brings into its spaceship-like interior the immemorial relationship with Mother Earth, as he had originally called the Black Space. But although this relationship is straightforward, it needed some preliminary adjustments.

The whole site conditioning to situate the house meant a serious earth-removal, a real carving of the ground to make the platform on which it stood. This carving, left untreated, that is, ‘natural’ as if it were a preexistence, is where the living quarters open unto, effectively constructing another ‘black space’ of the genealogy started in 1964.

One semicircular window belonging to a tatami room the size of a chashitsu, or tea house, had a rather long view towards the bare-earth quasi-vertical cut in the ground, and from a low sitting position afforded a view of few tree trunks and some branches.

But in the other sleeping area another window, triangular like that of the street façade upstairs, opened directly towards the bare-earth cut, towards the covered passage surrounding the house. All in all, the view afforded by this opening felt more like an interior than like an exterior, increasing the sensation of closeness and protection.

This realm of the intimate and protected is seen by Shinohara as a necessary balance for the freedom and openness of the upper part, and this balance is enough to render both realms in tune:

“...A two-tatami Japanese-style room with a ceiling profile dictated by the stepped structural form of the porch overhead is one of elements that allows for an unpremeditated conjuncture among different contexts. It stands in apposition to the larger living space above it, whose arcuate surface is integral to the overall profile of House in Yokohama. Even, now, when used as a genuine tearoom, I do not experience this space as any kind of logical contradiction.”

TOWARDS A TRANSCALAR ARCHITECTURE OF EMOTION

The fact that the texts by Shinohara about House in Yokohama are scarce and don’t try to unravel specifically its meaning or significance, unlike his previous major designs, is very telling of his final
shift of attention from the house to the city, having finally fulfilled the merging of the two.

Most of the last texts by Shinohara revolve around the idea of chaos and anarchy, always taking as the ultimate clue the urban condition of Tokyo as an epitome of the city.

But for him this final step, the final synthesis of his ideas about the house and the city, would have not been possible without first testing its validity in the house.

The quasi-simultaneous design of House in Yokohama and the Centennial Hall for TokyoTECH allows for a single reading of intentions at two different scales.

Certainly Shinohara is aiming at bigger projects, naturally toning down his residential designs, although acknowledging their importance. In a long interview he exposed:

"I am now working simultaneously on the House in Yokohama, one of the smallest works I have done (70 m²) and the Centennial Hall for the TokyoTECH, my largest (2,700 m²). Perhaps some change of conceptual method will occur in the larger work. But, to my mind, these works, smallest to largest, are the same in original principle. In both, a method of juxtaposition is present. I believe aspects of the Centennial Hall were influenced by juxtapositions first explored in the smaller project. New developments exist; but I particularly wanted these two works to have continuity." 

From House in Yokohama on, Shinohara will devote his major efforts to non-residential buildings, always in complex settings and responding to them, simultaneously expressing their belonging to the place and their autonomous condition of moving, compelling machines.

"Beautiful beyond all logic or reasoning", capable of raising the souls of human beings and generate deep emotions. That was his constant quest, the long and persistent motivation of his work as an architect.
Shinohara managed to establish a coherent and readable path by means of a series of houses that, by their very nature, are random and disparate commissions, in different locations, sizes, programs. In fact, it can be said that it was these disparate occasions what allowed Shinohara to explore new developments of his ideas.

That these developments generate such different built results only attests to the fact that Shinohara, by his method of regularly moving out his established comfort zones, could take each commission as a starting point, instead of imposing a style regardless of the specific conditions of each project.

But beyond their apparent dissimilarities there is a Shinohara style nevertheless, not based on shapes or materials but in the way he details his designs to achieve the main goal of creating emotion in the house.

That so much can be said about a handful of rather small houses is very telling of the intensity of intentions used, and of results achieved, by Shinohara in their design.

This thesis is an attempt to solve a puzzling confirmation that has accompanied me since my first encounter with Kazuo Shinohara’s work. Were it not a shared perplexity, it would be no more than a private matter. But the fact is that it constitutes one of the most talked about, and discussed issues, on Shinohara’s designs, specially his residential oeuvre.

The first project by Shinohara that I came to know was House with an Earthen floor (1963), as published in a technical German book on wooden house details. A very small, single-space holiday house divided in two areas, earthen- and tatami-floored, and built essentially of wood and paper. But it was not the typical contemporary Japanese-style house that we were coming to know in Europe at that time, 1984.

This work somehow managed to express in its black and white pictures a sort of spatiality that, beyond its traditional materiality, I then sensed as being quite un-Japanese, more open to other meanings or interpretations. Besides, its plan was of such clarity that was almost universally prototypical.

A few months later I encountered by chance a monograph on Shinohara, the January 1979 special issue of Space Design, which included all his works up to that time. It was shocking to see his latest designs in comparison with the earliest.

But still, didn’t projects like those mentioned
House in Yokohama: first publication in L'Architecture d'Aujourd'hui, 10.1984
here or House on a Curved road, or Cubic Forest, or Prism house, appear to retain and develop the qualities I found so captivating and distinctive in House with an Earthen floor?

This feeling of surprise still lingers and arises more than 30 years later whenever I glance at SD7901 again. I believe it will be shared by most people approaching Shinohara’s work, and surely constitutes one of the reasons for the appeal of his designs.

When the Architecture d’Aujourd’hui issue of October 1984 first featured in its cover one of those computer-generated wire-drawings in full color depicting what seemed at the time very advanced 3D renderings of House in Yokohama, I was prepared to accept them as yet another step in a peculiar career that somehow managed to be coherent despite being formed by wildly disparate projects.

All shared such traits as being comfortable, and elegant, and well-built, and above all being essential and clear. And all had the common goal of inducing deep emotions to their dwellers or observers, something that could be sensed from photographs, beyond cultural barriers.

When I joined Shinohara Atelier in January 1987, he had just retired from TokyoTECH and set up office in a rebuilt wooden building attached to his House in Yokohama, where he lived. In this nondescript black house we worked in the construction of Hyakunen Kinenkan and other projects of a scale and program that, with the single exception of Ukiyo-e Museum, had never been part of his curriculum. It was a moment of many changes at the end of Shinohara’s career.

At 62, his spirit remained actively in search of new ways of expressing emotion through architecture, or better ways to address, albeit in the limited form of an architectural design, those problems posed to man by contemporary society.

As Hiroyuki Suzuki explains, Shinohara “[…] believes that he can reach architecture through the house and humanity through architecture. Each of his few works has been undertaken as part of this great quest. Understanding the nature of this quest is the way to understand his houses […] and of the distinctive characteristics of Shinohara the architect.”

His commitment to and his criticism of all aspects related with the inhabitation of the world created a valid framework for his designs to thrive and become meaningful.

Not only did Shinohara stubbornly seek a materialization of spaces capable of moving their dwellers and of bringing them to new levels of consciousness, but he did so uncompromisingly, beyond fashion or concessions.
In a moment so full of uncertainties and open possibilities such as the present, when there are so many ways of approaching, thinking and doing architecture, the figure of Kazuo Shinohara can be both an example and a reference, and his work still meaningful and still compelling.

Up to here the account of the search of an expression of the emotional qualities of the house, as understood and pursued by Kazuo Shinohara. This search constitutes in fact a process from the occult to the evident -or, to put it another way, from the unconscious to the conscious. It is a journey to the heart of darkness to render emotions visible in the house. It is an approximation to the very core of mystery.

This journey can be seen as a transit from the very interior to the very exterior, from the original atom of the house to the urban universe, in a sort of big bang that takes the heart of the house inside out to become city:

“When I wrote 20 years ago that ‘The contemporary city may be expressed through the beauty of chaos’, I could not find any direct correspondence between my designs and my theory of ‘city’, even though these two themes were complementary to each other. But at the same time my main residential theme at that moment for space composition was centered on the tranquility and completeness of Japanese traditional architecture. Thinking about this early manifest of mine, I can trace its development up until the present moment. Now my residential design is developing parallel to the concept of the metropolis of no-memory. Pleasure as the main theme in architecture actually came to function in my theory of the metropolis.”

It is this very process of eclosion that explains the interest of Shinohara, an architect of almost only private and individual residential designs, in the urban space, in its chaos, in its potential for emotional space. And it also explains the genesis of his non-domestic designs, all but one done in the last quarter of his career.

Besides his non-residential designs, this thesis, as explained in the introduction, has intentionally left out several parts of Shinohara’s works in the assumption that it was necessary to explain as clearly as possible what I consider, and hope I have succeeded in showing, the main driving force behind Shinohara’s persistent research: to make of the house a machine to convey emotions, a moving machine, and thus render itself, and the work of the architect designing it, useful in the sense that a work of art is useful -to make ourselves aware of our own existence.

Several other developments of Shinohara’s studies can be done, and it has been my intention here to open up possibilities rather than limiting the scope of this work. Many issues about Shinohara’s oeuvre and ideas merit a concentrated focus in order to fully ascertain his position and his legacy.
Besides in-depth studies of single projects or groups, like the case of the 5 buildings he did in the same site in Hanayama (Kobe) over 30 years, other perspectives of his work may be considered: his use of structure, his understanding of tradition or monumentality, or his view on the material qualities of architecture are but a few of the most obvious themes that deserve a deeper study.

But there are others that are equally interesting to study in order to form an adequate image of the kaleidoscopic figure of Shinohara, a diversified sample-list of which might be his ideas on industrialized housing, his relationship with Western philosophy, his use of colors or the role of furniture in his designs, the subjacent theme of eroticism in his designs, or his incursions into the uncanny aspects of human minds.

Nevertheless, they are beyond the purpose of this thesis, and it stops here. It has traced a movement of continuity that spans 30 years of residential designs by Shinohara. The projection of this movement beyond that will have to be traced in another occasion, but I certainly believe that, once triggered, it will follow the same direction, like a bullet, unable to change its trajectory.
ANNEX 1: 2 TRANSLATIONS & 1 UNPUBLISHED TEXT

INTRODUCTION

In this Annex I include three texts that are not yet available in English, either because they have not been translated until now, or have remained unpublished. They belong to two extreme periods in Shinohara’s career, and deal with two different issues.

On one hand, “The House is Art” (1961) and “Subjectivity of Residential Design” (1964) belong to the moments of consolidation of Shinohara as a public figure, and deal with the house and its circumstances.

“The House is Art” and “Subjectivity of Residential Design” are typical of the period in which Shinohara was consolidating his position as a public figure, and his writing is often characterized by a strong sense of poeticism. His language, especially in his texts until the 1980s, is somewhat overdone or tending towards the poetical. He prefers to go around a concept rather than trying to pin it down, and it makes his texts difficult to read even for Japanese people.

On the other hand, “A Discourse On Tokyo; From Tokyo, Via Kazuo Shinohara: An Objective” (1998), on the other hand, represents the sort of preoccupations that Shinohara had at the end of his career, after closing Shinohara Atelier, centered around the notion of city.

Shinohara’s language, especially in his texts until the 1980s, is somewhat overdone or tending towards the poetical. He prefers to go around a concept rather than trying to pin it down, and it makes his texts difficult to read even for Japanese people.

His later texts, though, tend to be complicated by using concepts extracted from high-end physics or mathematics. In any case, they seldom make for an easy read.

The 1998 text presented here is an exception, probably because it was written in English, of which Shinohara had, compared with most Japanese people, a fairly good command, but which was nevertheless limited.

Whenever I felt a conflict existed, I’ve preferred to keep the literal translation in the text and to add notes that clarify the meaning.
A1.1 "JUTAKU WA GEIJUTSU DE ARU"
THE HOUSE IS ART
Kazuo Shinohara

English translation by Sakamoto Tomoko and Enric Massip-Bosch.

A NOTE ON THE TEXT

The text by Kazuo Shinohara "Jutaku wa geijutsu de aru" ‘The House is Art’ was first published in the magazine Shinkenchiku 05.1962, and has never been published in English before. The Japanese version used for this translation is the one published in the book Jutaku-ron, Tokyo: Kajima shuppansha, 1970, pp. 79-85, a compilation of Shinohara’s articles published to the date.
KAZUO SHINOHARA AND THE HOUSE AS A WORK OF ART

FIVE FORMS OF EMOTION

THE HOUSE IS ART

Kazuo Shinohara

The house is Art. We are at a point where I should make this statement even at the risk of being misunderstood and rejected.

It means that the house has to be separated from the territory of architecture. It has to be moved into the realm of Art, where painting, sculpture, literature and others belong.¹

Our work designing a house - that is, responding to a commission from a family, devote ourselves in designing it in limited conditions, and supervise the construction to the last details to finish it - is completely out of proportion in any sense as an architectural production. The capacity of architectural production urged by high economic growth in Japan was remarkably developed in recent years. From the point of view of the main current that the building production belongs to, designing a house might sound like making a small bubble floating on it. No matter how hard an architect tries to struggle, it seems that it is impossible to change these production activities in our society.

This is why house authors feel alienated. It is often said that the reason of their anxiety is because they cannot find any more new solutions in designing a house, but it is not true. It is absolutely unnecessary for a house author to give any credit to such a situation. Now, it is very natural for any of us to recall the sense of satisfaction in designing a house right after the war. But that situation was not caused only by the feeling of exploring an uninhabited territory,¹ but also by the feeling of being in a mainstream because there was at that time no other architectural production than designing houses. History never repeats itself, though. House design will never be in the mainstream of production, but it doesn’t need to, either. House design by architects may be just a small bubble in contemporary building production, but it doesn’t have to be a small bubble in design activities. We know the path this modern machinist civilization is taking.² It is nonsense to have a pusillanimous understanding of our age in front of this oncoming harsh situation.

Thus, right now, we need to squarely put the light spot on the house and the essence of house design, and assess precisely its current position. And here I claim that the house is Art, in order to establish its coordinates and the direction it has to go. This is not an escape from reality where you feel that you are just making small bubbles, but it is an attempt to go deeply into this inevitable reality created by contemporary society.

It would seem that the vast field of mainstream architectural production would not be affected³ if the small bubble-like production of houses were to jump out from it. But the independence of the house would certainly cause a movement with a clear direction. Because, in the mainstream, art becomes just useless,¹ and it will be gradually

¹. This seems paradoxical, but is one of the key points of the essay: to claim that house is art, but not architecture. It is generally assumed that architecture is one of the arts, and that a house is architecture. The Japanese word kenchiku used by Shinohara covers the same epistemological field as ‘architecture’, so it is not a matter of cultural or linguistic difference. What Shinohara attempts to point out, and expands later in the text, is at characterizing ‘architecture’ as heavily connected with economic, political or social power, beyond its intellectual or aesthetic values, which may actually mask its true nature as art.

². In the original honryū, literally meaning ‘a main course of water’. Hence the fluvial metaphor Shinohara uses later in the paragraph. Further in the text Shinohara uses the word shuryū, which literally means mainstream.

³. Shinohara uses the Japanese expression jūtakusakka, literally ‘author of houses’, instead of the standard jūtakukenchikuka, ‘architect of houses’. This way, he stresses the link with art instead of the more conventional understanding of an architect’s role.

¹. Mujinkyō also has the sense of ‘virgin territory’. Its Japanese literal meaning is ‘a frontier land with no people’.

². Gendai kikai bunmei, literally ‘modern machine civilization’.

³. Or ‘where it is heading to’.

¹. Or ‘would not change’.

¹. Man yo yokumino tatamai, literally ‘not being useful for anything’. In this sense, ‘Art is useless’ for the mainstream because the mainstream’s main goal is simply production.
dominated by the simple law that the strongest always wins. Therefore, an architect who still dreamt of making something artistic would be a loser. In parallel to the fact that house authors had an inferiority complex about the powerful mainstream building production, there was also in the mainstream a complex about Art. Which in fact goes against its basic principle, since the mainstream is the mainstream; in other words, it defines the rules of architectural production in our society. Therefore the modern factory will gradually become the leader in this field. The contemporary objects represented by factories and the organizations like factories that control them, are guaranteed to be a brilliant mainstream in this contemporary society of machine civilization. But in this case some new problems would appear. Being in the center of activities today does not assure a central position tomorrow, because there is always a superior organization trying to be the next leader. Superior organizations are not defined by the number of architects belonging to an office, but by their connections with some superior institutions in this economic society, a fact that you cannot perceive if you only see organizations and individuals. We can see this symptom not only in architecture, but in the whole of Japanese industry.

Last autumn, I saw the huge pylons of Wakato Bridge in Kitakyushu, about to be completed, rising over the crowded city. I was overwhelmed by the power of these dynamic forms and dramatic spaces, a power beyond the reach of any office building in the city. The bridge, though, was a mere assemblage of technology to go over the sea, and it visualizes the concrete image of the factory I mentioned before. This mainstream of architecture will be officially qualified as the leader of modern civilization when a dynamic movement made of cyclical dissolutions and reunifications begins towards its true goal of realizing a contemporary factory. And precisely at that moment the house will also be officially approved as Art.

The house enters into a new situation when it is confronted against the factory. Now, you will fully understand the intention of what I claim here, that the house has become Art. From this claim you can read that the factory design is engaged directly in the matter of production and participates in the creation of civilization, and the house design is engaged directly in the matter of human being and participates in the creation of culture. The more the factory design develops the more important and valuable the work on our side becomes.

Let’s confirm here that even if the factory and the house confront each other, they do not deny each other. So that the coming situation will be harsh, but not dark. The situation might be even preferable for the house design itself. And I wish that the house design, when is free from that unnecessary complex, will be developed unrestrictedly in this new territory.
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Once we have confirmed that the house is Art as the design standpoint it shouldn’t come as a surprise to see the flashy trends of -isms or strange shapes.16 And once we recognize that house design has nothing to do with social production, we don’t have to worry to be hindering the progress of society.17 At the same time, the establishment of a design standpoint must promise the freedom of direction to design. Any experiment is allowed to house authors who are free from unnecessary complexes. Here ‘freedom’18 appears in front of us. This is the main purpose of this essay. It makes us clear that we have two issues: one is the architects’ attitude in front of a situation; and the other is the question of creation.19 Here, the question of design shifts towards the issue of ‘freedom’. Strange shapes, for example, are one way to express freedom. But the real freedom we should reflect about from now on has nothing to do with this. Personally I think that what is most necessary in house design is free-spirited imagination, but this has nothing to do with superficial novelty of form.

Or there could be the following type of freedom. To seek the revitalization of humanity in the primitivism of housing, criticizing the modern machinist civilization. We could deny modern installations and build a house using pre-modern materials. But I have to point out that this artistic lifestyle has no direct relation with genuine Art or with the issue of freedom. This is why I said before that the factory and the house confront each other, but they do not deny each other. We have to understand these complex20 and sophisticated relationships of objection and compensation that include both confrontation and cooperation.

It is difficult to make generalizations about methods of house design or the issue of freedom. It has to be demonstrated in each individual design. So here I would like to express only one thing: even though our work designing a house is characterized by the extremely unique condition of a single family, it is built in a mass modern society and I think that it can appeal to many people if we can take positively the typical human life of nowadays. It can be deeply engaged into the complicated relationships between society and family, or into the uncertain human emotions existing in the continuous movement between trust and alienation.22 This is another way of putting my idea: the house is a criticism of civilization.23 The personality of each author will characterize this analysis24 of society and human being. We will need a keen and unique imagination to fixate it into a form.

I am aware about the relationship between traditional Japanese architecture and my method, in the sense of a design standpoint. But I am making an effort to look for more efficient ways to approach it. I believe that we have to reevaluate Japanese architecture of wooden frames as a possible precious way to move beyond this situation, rather than leaving it cast a faint25 shadow on hypermodern factories. As I mentioned in another article here a while ago,26 I expect to use ‘something sym-
bolic’27 of Japanese architecture as a good weapon to design from now on, but I am sure that it should be realized and vitalized in the struggle of social situation. We shouldn’t forget that any method -like surrealism or romanticism- cannot be effective if it is not related to its situation. So we have to be aware that extreme functionalism28 can also regain new vitality one day. It sounds like this discourse has returned where it started, but we should think that we have reached to a higher level of designing.

The aim of this essay is to put the spotlight on the source of house design, and give a clear image as a direction to go forward, because it is necessary for me to be prepared for the new situation. A strong will is needed to keep standing on this position and confront this harsh situation. I know that there is a long way ahead of us to reach genuine Art, but we just cannot stop.

27. Shōchōteki narumono, Shōchō (‘symbol’) teki (‘similar’) narumono (‘thing’). Between kōgikakko (the equivalent to quotation marks) in the original.

28. Kiwanetekiteki narumono, literally meaning ‘something extremely functional’. As opposed to ‘artistic’, thus becoming culturally relevant even if it doesn’t have an artistic goal.
A1.2 JōTAKU SEKKEI NO SHUTAISEI
SUBJECTIVITY OF RESIDENTIAL DESIGN
Kazuo Shinohara


A NOTE ON THE TEXT

The text by Kazuo Shinohara "Subjectivity of Residential Design" was first published in the magazine Kenchiku 04.1964, and has never been published in English before. The Japanese version used for this translation is the one published in the book Jōtaku-ron, Tokyo: Kajima Shuppankai, 1970, pp. 158-177, a compilation of Shinohara’s articles published to the date.
住宅設計の体系性

いかなる都市デザインをもつべきか、あるいは問題の解決法が存在しないという批判は、住宅設計を前提にした都市計画がなされているという事実を否定するものではない。住宅設計における体系性が欠如していることが指摘されているに過ぎない。しかし、住宅設計における体系性の欠如が、都市計画の達成を阻害しているわけではない。住宅設計における体系性の欠如は、都市計画の達成を阻害しているわけではない。住宅設計における体系性の欠如は、都市計画の達成を阻害しているわけではない。住宅設計における体系性の欠如は、都市計画の達成を阻害しているわけではない。住宅設計における体系性の欠如は、都市計画の達成を阻害しているわけではない。住宅設計における体系性の欠如は、都市計画の達成を阻害しているわけではない。住宅設計における体系性の欠如は、都市計画の達成を阻害しているわけではない。住宅設計における体系性の欠如は、都市計画の達成を阻害しているわけではない。住宅設計における体系性の欠如は、都市計画の達成を阻害しているわけではない。住宅設計における体系性の欠如は、都市計画の達成を阻害しているわけではない。住宅設計における体系性の欠如は、都市計画の達成を阻害しているわけではない。住宅設計における体系性の欠如は、都市計画の達成を阻害しているわけではない。住宅設計における体系性の欠如は、都市計画の達成を阻害しているわけではない。住宅設計における体系性の欠如は、都市計画の達成を阻害しているわけではない。住宅設計における体系性の欠如は、都市計画の達成を阻害しているわけではない。住宅設計における体系性の欠如は、都市計画の達成を阻害しているわけではない。住宅設計における体系性の欠如は、都市計画の達成を阻害しているわけではない。住宅設計における体系性の欠如は、都市計划
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SUBJECTIVITY OF RESIDENTIAL DESIGN

Kazuo Shinohara

It is free of any urban design

If you think that, without creating a previous urban design, it is not possible to get an image of the house, so be it. But that idea doesn’t explain the essence of how to create the house. Even though, no matter how, a large, regular city may be built in the future, it is not possible. It is the condition of our time. Individual houses designed by architects should face the city, and should not adapt to it or be designed by its influence. Even if there were a strong urban design, it would be enough reason in itself for the appearance of houses of attractive and individualistic forms and concepts.

This situation is very similar to the past, when they were unhappy if they didn’t add the word ‘people’ before ‘residential design’ or ‘architectural design’ in general. The same way the word ‘people’ disappeared, soon also the word ‘city’ will disappear. However, just as the architects themselves should never forget the people, I do not mean that architects who create homes can forget the great theme of ‘the city’. Since today there are so many trendy urban designs, as many as architects, I do not think anything can be fixed right from it. While lively conversations take place every day, the real city is being built, and takes strong roots, while destroying them at the same time.

The time in which the architects who create small houses only had to care for their small frames is gone. To question the social sense of independent houses of our time, we have no choice but to have a value gained through the relationship of correspondence with our rapidly changing society. No architect thinks that he wants to exhaust all his energy just in individual houses for some rich people. I cannot believe that there is any architect who did not have the urge to want to tear down the houses adjoining his project, raised with their eaves almost touching each other, and design them all together, conditions permitting. However, any architect who has seriously dealt with the issue of the house should know very well what is the meaning of the expression ‘conditions permitting’. But I am convinced that only the theory and form that are born out of the such struggle today could convince people and constitute the core of the creation of the future city.

You can use any gunpowder at your disposal to resolve this stuck situation. If you think that a form derived from a magnificent image of the city is what you have to do, you should try. However, one should not believe for a moment that it is possible to exploit the problems of the house in this way. I do not think that an idea, without a persevering search of how to bring the corresponding relationship between spatial form on one hand and Japanese society and human family today on the other, will neither serve the development of the small

1. Shutaisei, which I have translated as ‘Subjectivity’, can be translated literally as ‘independence’ or ‘individuality’, but it is a charged, and highly debated, concept in Japanese philosophy since Meiji Restoration, especially after WW2.

2. Ikanaru tōshi dezain kara mo jiyū dearu.
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When several projects based on the image of Japanese today will gather, through an architect’s work proposing a responsible way to live, sometimes in opposition, sometimes collaborating, the city of tomorrow in which we really hope will rise. We expect a city structure that is not limited by a single talent for form, but that allows for the beautiful clashes of numerous personalities.

The architects who create houses must not lose the starting point and direction. We should not escape reality by burying ourselves in the small spaces of the house thinking that the city of tomorrow has nothing to do with us. If there is a spatial composition that excites us, it should not be because it has nothing to do with the creation of the city of tomorrow, but just because we are excited about it. Even if we took into account that the house was a concentrated expression of the whole system of the thought and the form of architects in the early days of modern architecture, we would have to be convinced of the importance and responsibility of our work.

Such heritage and today’s situation tacitly require, in the work so-called residential design, a thought that is beyond the dimension of sensitive treatment. While a thought is just a thought, a force of art is not done. Therefore, a method to mediate between thought and form is always an all-important issue. So the methodological theory is merely a means. If the methodological theory of which I will speak hereafter generated strangeness in the reader, I’d invite you to follow me attentively.

The site is not a starting point for the design

If a site were not beautiful, then, would the architect be not responsible of a non-beautiful design? It is not a problem if a site is beautiful or not, big or small. Don’t start designing a house from the extrinsic characteristics of its place. In other words: house design should be independent of the conditions of its site.

A house, though, is not completely independent. It does not depend on the climate that can be controlled, but depends on fudō, the specific conditions of a territory. For instance, there is a established type of court houses in the West from Mesopotamia to Rome. But it cannot be imported directly into Japan, because they belong to certain social conditions that we don’t have. Courtyards are social connectors, and in Japan this function is done differently.

I don’t like to design depending on the site form or conditions of the context. I’m not interested in a solution method to use the characteristics of a site. My idea, always, is born and exists before seeing the site.

3. Shikichi wa sekkei no shūppatsu ten dewa nai. Shikichi means literally ‘plot’ or ‘lot’.

4. Fudō is a Japanese concept notably articulated in modern times by the philosopher Tetsuro Watsuji (1889-1960), which encompasses climate, landscape and culture. It is different from the more prosaic kikkō, which is the climate that can be controlled and quantified, and this opposition is also referred to by Shinohara in his text.
この文脈で、救急車は緊急の場面において、患者を迅速に医療機関に運ぶための重要な手段です。救急車の運転手は、正確な情報と迅速な反応が求められます。特に、交通事故や自然災害などの緊急事態では、救急車の迅速な到着が救急患者の治療に大いに役立ちます。救急車は医療機関との密接な連携も重要で、各医療機関が救急車に対応し、患者を受け入れることができる体制を整えていることが必要です。
住宅は広さ全てに優れる
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Area is the most important issue in a house
[abridged]

Let’s imagine two cases for two different house commissions. Case A is a 300 m² program on a 3000 m² site, for a family of 3. It costs 10 million yen. Case B, is a 60 m² house on a 200 m² lot for a family of 5. It costs 1 million yen. If I have these commissions, the only important information for me is the area of the house.

I would say that case B is not possible to do. I cannot understand that 5 people live in a 60 m² house. Faced with these two cases, I could only design case A, although I acknowledge that case B is very common nowadays. My idea is not kindness for people. I think that a new idea is not born out of a limited realism.

I am convinced that an architect is not meant to adapt to poor economic or political shortcomings. To design for 5 people I need 100 m², and then my idea will be kind and democratic.

じたく wa hiritsu ga subete ni yasen suru.
その住宅の問題はこのような態度でよいとも、小さな住宅における私の方法がある。

「大きな住宅の問題はこのようないくつか考えられる。それとも、どのような条件であるか、提案された条件を著者に計画していくが住宅設計の主な職業であると同時に、いかに残っていることかも知れない。これを、普通の設計とはいうべきである。私の実践は、これではどこに住むうえにもない。」
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Responsibility of design is not without limits

I was once criticized because my Tanikawa House proved to be too small after four years of completion. Originally was for a newlywed couple, but in four years the family grew to four. I was asked why I hadn’t thought about the future of that family.

I have never considered to design a 60 m² house for four people. The client should define for me the extension of his house at the beginning, or the possibility of extensions. It was not the case, and I didn’t consider any other possibilities for the house.

A discussion about the house should not be only about budget. It should be also about lifestyles or possible extensions in the future. If a house is planned to be enlarged in the future, I’d start requesting a bigger site to start with.

The term of responsibility for both client and architect depends of the timeframe decided for the design. If there is an annex planned, then this responsibility is extended until it is realized. I keep contact with the client, but it is not without limits.
They are free as how to use it

[abridged]

“So many architects designing houses try to make lifestyles simpler. But Shinohara tries to make not only simple lifestyles, but render space itself abstract. For example, he uses square plans or flat ceilings. And he always decides very precisely the position of furniture.” And a critic says: “Shinohara’s spaces don’t allow for just a normal turn around in bed.”

Real life is different from photos in magazines. Once the architect has finished his job building a house, he doesn’t have a say on how that house is to be lived.

If a client keeps the house more beautiful then, how do you feel as an architect? Do you feel a good designer, or do you praise your design considering the daily life of the client? If you feel like this, it’s wrong, because this is an achievement of the family. How the house is used does not depend on the architect.
住宅は、住宅に限らず、さらに美しく使われ、その家族の自由である。そうで、ここにひとつの示唆し、問題がある。さきほど、一人の建築家が、同じように美を追求、同じような設計方法によってつくられた住宅が、本当にあった。この理由は、「住宅」としての生活において、建築家が取り入れた、音楽、美術、文学、自然などの要素が、住宅の心地よさを高めるのに役立っているからだ。しかしそれが、住宅の美を高めるための手段であり、住宅の実質的な機能を犠牲にするものではない。したがって、住宅は、美しいものであり、同時に便利なものでなければならない。
Beautifully represents fictional space
[abridged]

Empty space is beautiful, but unnecessary objects are not beautiful. Daily life in a house does not have aesthetic value.

Mies’ Farnsworth House, for example, is amazing for many architects. But they are not concerned about the site, or how the house is used. From pictures they cannot feel the lifestyle in that house. Their emotion is direct because the house is beautiful.

The photographer has chosen beautiful viewpoints and the magazine editor has polished the pictures off and spread them around the world. They are representations of a fictional space.

The house is art. It is not only a matter of form, but also a matter of its relationship with society. The relationship between house and society must be art.
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設計はその施主者から自由である

施主はその施主のために設計してはならない。建築家はその施主者から自由でなければならない。それは言葉の通りである。しかし、私はこれに反対である。なぜなら、建築家が自由であるということは、施主が自由であるということでもあるからである。施主が自由であるということは、建築家が自由であるということでもあるからである。
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House design is free from the client

Do not design the house for the client. The house must be free from the client.

Do these words sound violent? Since I said before that is necessary to stress the importance of the starting point of the architects, which should be liberated from the city, the site, the composition of the family and everything else, it is natural to have reached that conclusion.

I have always said that the underside of each freedom is a required and appropriate responsibility of that freedom. The concept and design mode that requires complete freedom of the architect, even with respect to the client, is to show a complete responsibility of the architect to the customer, for example. And so the way to say that you should not design being attached to the conditions of the client is a way to make clear the subjectivity of the architect.

When I find an architect declaring a profound gratitude to the client’s understanding and to the faithful work of the workers, it gives me a strange feeling. It is okay to do so, actually, and if this attitude were a bit of commercialism, I could even accept it. However, if an architect is excited seriously, how will be the contents of the work named design?

If an expression like “everything good in this house is thanks to the client’s understanding” were serious, it would just be a declaration of resignation as a professional architect. It is not modesty, but hypocrisy or falsity. We must abandon such sentimentalism, which comes from the anti-modern way of working, called home making. With or without client’s understanding, with fine workers or not, the good, the bad, and everything that has been created by the house should be merit and demerit of the same architect. I think we should think about production and everything else, so we do not err the direction due to such useless sentimentality.

To finish, I will propose a house that I call prototype house, and its way of production. If there are no misunderstandings, it can be also called replicable home. The architects could create their own spaces without being captive to anything. And if it exists a company that builds the house precisely and trustfully, and if there is also a plan to industrialize precisely the parts of the house as much as possible, not on site but in a factory, that new house could be made. The new houses would be disseminated among people through various mass media. And the house should be bought only by people wanting this new life. According to that, the company would prepare a production system. Be it only a house or a hundred, does not change the meaning of that house. Architects would publish each year their original homes as they wished. We change the order, client→ architect→ construction, into architect→ customer→ factory production.
日本の機能性をOさん１次元として

とった皆さんの

ということです

では、その機能性を

どう考えられるか。

という提案です。
The value of the house does not reside in the fact that there is only one work in this world. Certainly, the method called factory production is valid for one work and for many. I hope that it is understood that the prototype house is composed by the combination of these two characters. I guess it is clear that the prototype includes the mass-produced house as one of its extreme form, but for now what interests me is the most central part. What interests me is not serial production decided in favor of the interests of a company, but, for example, the design of a “house prototype, limited to 30 copies”, limited by the same architect thinking about how many copies could exist in this world without them losing value, including their scarcity value. The artistic engraving could be a pretty apt analogy; in this sense, all the 30 houses would be original.

If it is a very personal space, the number of copies will be limited to very few. If it is more generic, a larger and fitting number can be imagined. People can find a suitable home to their land, to their family composition, and their taste. Here it begins a real current in the system: several dreams and hopes of the people living in this contemporary society would be satisfied by seeking spaces created by specific architects. When this small essay reaches your hands, my prototype houses no. 1 and no. 2 will be a reality.*

* Exhibition “Two Houses Built in a Department Store” organized by the Asahi Shimbun newspaper and Odakyu Department Store in April 1964.
A Discourse on Tokyo: from Tokyo, via Kazuo Shinohara: An Objective

In 1964, I postulated that the only kind of beauty a contemporary city is capable of expressing is that of the chaos. Consider the situation at the time: only a few architects who took notice of this remark. Immediately after the end of the Second World War, Japanese architects were generally absorbing "Modernism," which came from Central Europe of the 1930s and 1940s. The 1950s saw the climax of this unique form of Modernism, and there was no way for me to view the city as it was clearly "modern." In 1967, I introduced a concept, "Mathematical City," which postulated a highly-ordered system. This concept was totally distinct from the notion of geometry or "the spirit of pure geometric forms," which was one of the central themes of Modernism. Conversely, it had the same orientation as the concept of "complexity system," which is one of the bases of the "chaos theory," a theory gaining popularity in recent years. "Mathematical City" proposed a city structure which is at the opposite pole from the basic concepts of architecture of Modernism, which strives to achieve a single underlying structure. In 1980, I focused on the visual chaos of the area around Shibuya Station in Tokyo and coined the concept, "Progressive Anarchy." At the time, Modernism in Japan was fading, and the era when cityscapes as something which should be "eliminated" and never considered its structure worthy of serious observation. In the mid-1980s, while I was at the Technical University in Vienna, two professors, in a casual conversation asserted that Tokyo is a city, while Vienna is a village. This informal exchange ended in a pleasant tune with my note that even now, Japanese architects believed that Vienna and Paris were the real cities, while Tokyo was a village. In Autumn 1997, at a symposium following my exhibition in Tokyo, some 10,000 kilometers northwest of Vienna, I listened with pleasure to the clear statements of the Viennese architects. "Tokyo is the most attractive metropolis in the world." Immediately after my return from Vienna, in a conversation with Jean Nouvel, he remarked, "Tokyo is one of the prototypes of a 21st century city," and furthermore added, "Japan has successfully created an antithesis to the European mindset of a city." The statement I made 25 years ago has come true, and what was once a "fiction" has slowly but surely become "reality." It has been a long journey, indeed.

For those young architects who studied at Shinohara Laboratory on Tokyo Institute of Technology, enrolled at the Shinohara Atelier, or considered it to be part of the so-called "Shinohara School," I would like to call for your discourse on Tokyo, from one's own standpoint. For those who are currently being abroad, I would also like you to share your observation of the cities in which you live or work. And for those who have been at one time or another abroad, I would like an observation of the cities where you have been. The order in which the two cities are mentioned is up to the decision of each architect. The discourse should deal with the issues of architecture and the city as it approaches the new century. However, I am not interested in broad, general statements. I would rather hear issues raised from observations of concrete examples of an actual city. Just as I had focused on Shinohara, if the area is deemed to be a concrete expression of a particular feature of a given city, one can by all means pick up on an area even if the area is foreign to architects from abroad. By limiting the conditions or areas of observation, one can sometimes capture a vast view beyond one's expectations.

What is expected here is not in any way related to the stereotypical tendency prevalent in Japan to ask foreigners about how they view the country. The difference is clearly indicated in the title: 'In the words of Kazuo Shinohara.'

This issue is being realized through an understanding and active support from "GA JAPAN." "GA JAPAN" in turn, expects unique observations and insights, as well as eloquent writing, on your part. This is something which all editors of journals ask of all writers, but I want to underline that this is especially true in this particular series. This is because these are enormous potentials of the series in the future. It should also be mentioned that they are planning to publish the series in book form in the near future.

Kazuo Shinohara
A NOTE ON THE TEXT

This unpublished text by Kazuo Shinohara was written in March 1998 and sent by fax the 2nd of April of that year to several people forming what has been loosely called ‘Shinohara School’, a term referred to by Shinohara in the text.

It was meant as a guideline for the contributions forming part of the book Shinohara Kazuo keiyu: Tōkyō-hatsu Tōkyō ron (‘Via Kazuo Shinohara: From Tokyo, a Theory on Tokyo’), published finally by Kajima Shuppankai in 2001 (instead of GA, as the text announces).

The choice of words of the title of the book, or his own closing text, refer to an air-trip vocabulary conveying a cosmopolitan vision of the “world city”.

In spite of its title, the book deals little directly with Tokyo, since it is focused in a series of articles aiming at (in Shinohara’s words) an ‘observational analysis’ of different cities around the world.

Its index is the following:

Introduction: Kazuo Shinohara
London: Hideyuki Yamashita;
Berlin: Constanze Kreiser;
Wien: Ernst Beneder;
Wien: Christa Buhlinger;
Wien: Mie Lott;
Barcelona: Enric Massip-Bosch;
Amsterdam: Takeo Ozawa;
Copenhagen: René Kural;
New York: Keith Kriolak;
New York: Koichi Yasuda;
New York: Nobuo Iwashita;
New York: Kazuo Shinohara;
Los Angeles: Taku Sakaushi;
Los Angeles: Hirohisa Henmi;
Hong Kong: Leslie Lu;
Passport to Travel the World City: Kazuo Shinohara

But most of the contributions stick to Shinohara’s plan of demonstrating how his analysis of Tokyo can be applied to other urban phenomena, forming in effect a sort of testing bed of Shinohara’s ideas on the city.

The value of this English-language text resides, firstly, in the succinct explanation of his position about the city, which was finally widely embraced to become a commonplace in the 1990s and beyond. And secondly, in the clarity of exposition of the methodology fostered by Shinohara to write about a “world city”.

1. For instance, keiyu (‘transit’), hatsu (‘departure’) or the idea of a “passport” to the world city.
ANNEX 2: WORKS BY KAZUO SHINOHARA

The following pages integrate chronologically all information available at this moment about Shinohara’s architectural work, both realized and unrealized projects, residential or otherwise. It is the first time that such cataloguing at this extent is made publicly available.

The catalogue is based in several existing lists of his work, notably the appendix at the TOTO monograph (pages 406-409, without pictures), limited by his own choice of projects and by the date of publication, 1996; and the list at the end of the monograph “Kazuo Shinohara: Houses and Drawings” (pages 136-143, with pictures), augmenting the TOTO list but limited to residential designs. From this last monograph I take the basic layout used in this appendix. From the field work done for the 2G monograph, I include the state (as of 2011) of each house, assessed or suspected. The projects are ordered by date of completion.

I include in the catalogue for the first time two projects usually not included in the available listings: an unbuilt proposal for an extension for North House in Hanayama, realized in 1987 and never published before; and the exhibition layout for the comprehensive retrospective of Shinohara’s work at Le Grande Halle de La Villette, Paris, that took place in 1988.

Two graphic elements close the catalogue: first, a location of Shinohara’s works in a series of three maps drawn ex novo for this work, and to my knowledge the first time that such material is made public. They are maps at a large scale, so location is not extremely precise: although I have this information, I have decided to keep Shinohara’s wish, very often and insistently expressed, of not making available the exact locations of his private houses, of which many still currently exist, to protect his clients’ privacy.

Second, I reproduce directly from the “Houses and Drawings” monograph the valuable 2-page spread of all Shinohara’s residential designs at the same scale, originally at 1:400 (pages 4-5). Although it is not my original reworking, it serves perfectly well the purpose of visualizing how in 42 houses, very small most of them, Shinohara managed to challenge preconceptions about tradition and domesticity in different ways, while showing a consistent and very personal manière sustained in a 52 year-long career, which is one of the purposes of this work.

Finally, a collection of drawings of Shinohara’s furniture is also included, taken from the TOTO monograph, as a reference guide of an aspect of his work that is not too-well known but that always was an important part in his designs.
TANIKAWA HOUSE NO. 1

Site: Higashitamachi, Suginami-ku, Tokyo
Design time: 1957-58
Completion: 12.1958
State: Demolished
Total floor area: 91.20m²
Structure: Wood
Structure designer: Kazuo Goto
Furniture designer: Masao Matsumura

HOUSE IN KUGAYAMA

Site: Suginami-ku, Tokyo
Design time: 1952-54
Completion: 09.1954
State: Demolished
Total floor area: 62.00m²
Structure: Steel frame
Structure designer: Mitsuo Toyoshima
Furniture designer: Masaru Watanabe

HOUSE IN KUGAYAMA NO. 2

Site: Suginami-ku, Tokyo
Design time: 1956-57
Completion: 03.1958
State: Maybe demolished
Total floor area: 76.60m²
Structure: Reinforced concrete
Structure designer: Yoshiharu Tao
Furniture designer: Masao Matsumura

TANIKAWA HOUSE NO. 1

Site: Higashitamachi, Suginami-ku, Tokyo
Design time: 1957-58
Completion: 12.1958
State: Demolished
Total floor area: 62.00m²
Structure: Wood
Structure designer: Kazuo Goto
Furniture designer: Masao Matsumura
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HOUSE IN KOMAE</th>
<th>HOUSE WITH A BIG ROOF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site</td>
<td>Izumi, Komae, Tokyo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design time</td>
<td>05.1959-11.1959</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completion</td>
<td>02.1960</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>Maybe demolished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site area</td>
<td>165.00m²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total floor area</td>
<td>61.00m²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1F</td>
<td>24.30m²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2F</td>
<td>36.70m²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structure designer</td>
<td>Kazuhide Tsuge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Furniture designer</td>
<td>Masao Matsumura</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HOUSE IN CHIGASAKI</th>
<th>HOUSE WITH AN EARTHEEN FLOOR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site</td>
<td>Higashikaigan, Chigasaki, Kanagawa-ken</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design time</td>
<td>01.1959-02.1960</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completion</td>
<td>12.1960</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>Maybe demolished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site area</td>
<td>2,435.00m²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total floor area</td>
<td>235.60m²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structure type</td>
<td>Reinforced concrete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structure designer</td>
<td>Youichi Shinji, Kazuo Shinohara, Katsuhiko Shiraishi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Furniture designer</td>
<td>Kazuo Shinohara, Kazuo Shinohara, Katsuhiko Shiraishi, Masao Matsumura</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UMBRELLA HOUSE</th>
<th>ARCHETYPAL HOUSE NO. 1 (HOUSE IN DEPARTMENT STORE)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site</td>
<td>Hayamiya, Nerima-ku, Tokyo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design time</td>
<td>12.1959-03.1960</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completion</td>
<td>03.1961</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>Existing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site area</td>
<td>18720m²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total floor area</td>
<td>55.00m²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structure type</td>
<td>Wood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structure designer</td>
<td>Kazuhide Tsuge, Kazuo Shinohara, Isamu Kenmochi, Kazuhide Takahama</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Furniture designer</td>
<td>Isamu Kenmochi</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ARCHETYPAL HOUSE NO. 2
[HOUSE IN DEPARTMENT STORE]

Site      Kamitakaido, Suginami-ku, Tokyo
Design time  05.1964-11.1965
Completion  05.1966
State    Existing. Moved to new site
Building area 121.00m²
Total floor area  141.30m²
Structure type  Wood
Furniture designer  Kazuo Shinohara, Kazuhide Takahama

HOUSE IN WHITE

Site  Kamitakaido, Suginami-ku, Tokyo
Design time  05.1964-11.1965
Completion  05.1966
State    Existing. Moved to new site
Building area 121.00m²
Total floor area  141.30m²
Structure type  Wood
Structure designer  Kazuhide Tsuge
Furniture designer  Kazuo Shinohara, Akiro Osaki

ASAKURA HOUSE

Site      Yoyogihontyo, Shibuya-ku, Tokyo
Design time  11.1964-10.1965
Completion  05.1966
State    Maybe existing
Building area 89.70m²
Total floor area  87.75m²
Structure type  Wood
Structure designer  Kazuhide Tsuge
Furniture designer  Kazuo Shinohara

NORTH HOUSE IN HANAYAMA

Site     Hanayama, Kobe, Hyogo-ken
Design time  12.1964-04.1965
Completion  08.1965
State    Existing. Modified
Building area 89.70m²
Total floor area  87.75m²
Structure type  Wood
Structure designer  Kazuhide Tsuge
Furniture designer  Kazuo Shinohara

SOUTH HOUSE IN HANAYAMA

Site      Hanayama, Kobe, Hyogo-ken
Design time  04.1966-11.1966
Completion  05.1968
State    Existing
Building area 109.67m²
Total floor area  107.37m²
Structure type  Wood
Structure designer  Youichi Shinji
Furniture designer  Kazuo Shinohara, Akira Ohashi

HOUSE OF EARTH

Site      Shimosyakujii, Nerima-ku, Tokyo
Design time  05.1964-11.1965
Completion  06.1966
State    Existing
Building area 55.47m²
Total floor area  77.30m²
Structure type  Wood, partly reinforced concrete
Structure designer  Kazuhide Tsuge
Furniture designer  Kazuo Shinohara

SOUTH HOUSE IN HANAYAMA

Site      Hanayama, Kobe, Hyogo-ken
Design time  04.1966-11.1966
Completion  05.1968
State    Existing
Building area 109.67m²
Total floor area  107.37m²
Structure type  Wood
Structure designer  Youichi Shinji
Furniture designer  Kazuo Shinohara, Akira Ohashi
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>House</th>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Design time</th>
<th>Completion</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Building area</th>
<th>Total floor area</th>
<th>Site type</th>
<th>Structure designer</th>
<th>Furniture designer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>YAMASHIRO HOUSE</td>
<td>Isogo, Yokohama, Kanagawa-ken</td>
<td>03.1965-07.1967</td>
<td>12.1967</td>
<td>Maybe existing</td>
<td>226.50m²</td>
<td>128.84m²</td>
<td>Wood</td>
<td>Youichi Shinji</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHINO HOUSE</td>
<td>Tagara, Nerima-ku, Tokyo</td>
<td>05.1969-12.1969</td>
<td>05.1970</td>
<td>Existing, Interior finish</td>
<td>87.35m²</td>
<td>126.62m²</td>
<td>Wood</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUZUSHO HOUSE</td>
<td>Hayama, Kanagawa-ken</td>
<td>03.1966</td>
<td>07.1967</td>
<td>Maybe existing</td>
<td>4,600m²</td>
<td>248.50m²</td>
<td>Reinforced concrete</td>
<td>Toshihiko Kimura</td>
<td>Isamu Kenmochi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CUBIC FOREST (NOW MASAYOSHI NAKAMURA ART MUSEUM)</td>
<td>Tama, Kawasaki, Kanagawa-ken</td>
<td>01.1969-08.1970</td>
<td>03.1971</td>
<td>Existing, Annex added. Interior finish changed.</td>
<td>213.30m²</td>
<td>171.88m²</td>
<td>Reinforced concrete</td>
<td>Toshihiko Kimura</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNCOMPLETED HOUSE</td>
<td>Izumi, Suginami-ku, Tokyo</td>
<td>02.1968-06.1969</td>
<td>02.1970</td>
<td>Existing, Annex added. Interior finish changed.</td>
<td>121.00m²</td>
<td>105.84m²</td>
<td>Reinforced concrete</td>
<td>Toshihiko Kimura</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REPEATING CREVICE</td>
<td>Denenchofu, Ota-ku, Tokyo</td>
<td>11.1969-09.1970</td>
<td>04.1971</td>
<td>Existing, Annex and floor added</td>
<td>203.63m²</td>
<td>172.84m²</td>
<td>Reinforced concrete</td>
<td>Toshihiko Kimura</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
HOUSE IN HIGASHI-TAMAGAWA
東玉川の住宅

Site: Higashitamagawa, Setagaya-ku, Tokyo
Design time: 06.1971-04.1972
Completion: 03.1973
State: Existing, Heavily modified

Building area: 129.07m²
Total floor area: 219.33m²
1F: 122.20m²
2F: 97.13m²

Structure type: Reinforced concrete
Structure designer: Toshihiko Kimura

HOUSE IN KUGAHARA
久ヶ原の住宅

Site: Kugahara, Ota-ku, Tokyo
Design time: 05.1971-12.1971
Completion: 12.1972
State: Maybe existing

Building area: 72.15m²
Total floor area: 135.18m²
1F: 40.02m²
2F: 44.27m²

Structure type: Reinforced concrete
Structure designer: Toshihiko Kimura

SKY RECTANGLE
空の矩形

Site: Tamagawadennyofu, Setagaya-ku, Tokyo
Design time: 04.1970-03.1971
Completion: 09.1971
State: Demolished

Building area: 72.15m²
Total floor area: 135.18m²
1F: 40.02m²
2F: 50.87m²

Structure type: Reinforced concrete
Structure designer: Toshihiko Kimura

HOUSE IN SEIJO
世田の住宅

Site: Seijyo, Setagaya-ku, Tokyo
Design time: 02.1972-07.1972
Completion: 03.1973
State: Maybe demolished

Building area: 78.15m²
Total floor area: 134.89m²
1F: 78.15m²

Structure type: Reinforced concrete
Structure designer: Toshihiko Kimura

SEA STAIRWAY
海の階段

Site: Hayamiya, Nerima-ku, Tokyo
Design time: 03.1969-12.1970
Completion: 08.1971
State: Existing

Building area: 156.05m²
Total floor area: 173.80m²
1F: 154.30m²
1F: 19.50m²

Structure type: Reinforced concrete
Furniture designer: Shiro Kuramata

PRISM HOUSE
直角三角柱

Site: Yamanakako, Minamitsuru, Yamanashi-ken
Design time: 04.1972-06.1973
Completion: 03.1974
State: Existing

Building area: 77.76m²
Total floor area: 90.7m²
1F: 77.76m²
2F: 13.0m²

Structure type: Wood

HOUSE IN SELJQ
成陵の住宅

Site: Seilju, Setagaya-ku, Tokyo
Design time: 03.1973
Completion: 03.1973
State: Maybe demolished

Building area: 136.00m²
Total floor area: 213.04m²
1F: 134.09m²

Structure type: Reinforced concrete
Structure designer: Toshihiko Kimura

Furniture designer: Shirou Kuramata

SEA STAIRWAY
海の階段

Site: Hayamiya, Nerima-ku, Tokyo
Design time: 03.1969-12.1970
Completion: 08.1971
State: Existing

Building area: 156.05m²
Total floor area: 173.80m²
1F: 154.30m²
1F: 19.50m²

Structure type: Reinforced concrete
Furniture designer: Shiro Kuramata
### HOUSE IN UEHARA

**Site:** Uehara, Shibuya-ku, Tokyo  
**Design time:** 05.1975-08.1975  
**Completion:** 05.1976  
**State:** Existing  
**Site area:** 138.5m²  
**Building area:** 81.22m²  
**Total floor area:** 203.63m²

**Structure type:** Reinforced concrete, partly steel frame  
**Structure designer:** Toshihiko Kimura

### HOUSE IN HANAYAMA NO. 3

**Site:** Hanayama, Kobe, Hyogo-ken  
**Design time:** 05.1976-01.1977  
**Completion:** 08.1977  
**State:** Existing  
**Site area:** 498.49m²  
**Building area:** 129.50m²  
**Total floor area:** 213.20m²

**Structure type:** Reinforced concrete  
**Structure designer:** Toshihiko Kimura

### HOUSE IN ASHTAKA

**Site:** Ashitaka, Numazu, Shizuoka-ken  
**Design time:** 08.1976-02.1977  
**Completion:** 10.1977  
**State:** Existing  
**Site area:** 1,646.36m²  
**Building area:** 158.63m²  
**Total floor area:** 212.26m²

**Structure type:** Reinforced concrete  
**Structure designer:** Toshihiko Kimura

### HOUSE IN KARUIZAWA

**Site:** Karuizawa, Kitasaku, Nagano-ken  
**Design time:** 05.1974-02.1975  
**Completion:** 11.1975  
**State:** Existing, Heavily modified  
**Site area:** 290.19m²  
**Building area:** 168.17m²  
**Total floor area:** 216.52m²

**Structure type:** Reinforced concrete  
**Structure designer:** Toshihiko Kimura

### TANIKAWA HOUSE

**Site:** Kitakaruizawa, Naganohara, Gumma-ken  
**Design time:** 05.1972-03.1974  
**Completion:** 11.1974  
**State:** Existing  
**Site area:** 280.19m²  
**Building area:** 168.17m²  
**Total floor area:** 216.52m²

**Structure type:** Wood  
**Furniture designer:** Kazuo Shinohara, Akirou Dasha

### HOUSE IN UEHARA

**Site:** Uehara, Shibuya-ku, Tokyo  
**Design time:** 05.1975-08.1975  
**Completion:** 05.1976  
**State:** Existing  
**Site area:** 138.5m²  
**Building area:** 81.22m²  
**Total floor area:** 203.63m²

**Structure type:** Reinforced concrete, partly steel frame  
**Structure designer:** Toshihiko Kimura

### HOUSE IN HANAYAMA NO. 3

**Site:** Hanayama, Kobe, Hyogo-ken  
**Design time:** 05.1976-01.1977  
**Completion:** 08.1977  
**State:** Existing  
**Site area:** 498.49m²  
**Building area:** 129.50m²  
**Total floor area:** 213.20m²

**Structure type:** Reinforced concrete  
**Structure designer:** Toshihiko Kimura

### HOUSE IN ASHTAKA

**Site:** Ashitaka, Numazu, Shizuoka-ken  
**Design time:** 08.1976-02.1977  
**Completion:** 10.1977  
**State:** Existing  
**Site area:** 1,646.36m²  
**Building area:** 158.63m²  
**Total floor area:** 212.26m²

**Structure type:** Reinforced concrete  
**Structure designer:** Toshihiko Kimura

### HOUSE IN KARUIZAWA

**Site:** Karuizawa, Kitasaku, Nagano-ken  
**Design time:** 05.1974-02.1975  
**Completion:** 11.1975  
**State:** Existing, Heavily modified  
**Site area:** 290.19m²  
**Building area:** 168.17m²  
**Total floor area:** 216.52m²

**Structure type:** Reinforced concrete  
**Structure designer:** Toshihiko Kimura

### TANIKAWA HOUSE

**Site:** Kitakaruizawa, Naganohara, Gumma-ken  
**Design time:** 05.1972-03.1974  
**Completion:** 11.1974  
**State:** Existing  
**Site area:** 280.19m²  
**Building area:** 168.17m²  
**Total floor area:** 216.52m²

**Structure type:** Wood  
**Furniture designer:** Kazuo Shinohara, Akirou Dasha
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Name</th>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Design time</th>
<th>Completion</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Site area</th>
<th>Building area</th>
<th>Total floor area</th>
<th>Structure type</th>
<th>Structure designer</th>
<th>Furniture designer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HOUSE UNDER HIGH-VOLTAGE LINES</td>
<td>Nakamachi, Setagaya, Tokyo</td>
<td>03.1978-12.1979</td>
<td>04.1981</td>
<td>Existing</td>
<td>219.83 m²</td>
<td>103.86 m²</td>
<td>259.46 m²</td>
<td>Reinforced concrete</td>
<td>Toshihiko Kimura</td>
<td>Shirou Kuramata</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOUSE ON A CURVED ROAD</td>
<td>Uehara, Shibuya-ku, Tokyo</td>
<td>01.1976-10.1976</td>
<td>04.1978</td>
<td>Existing</td>
<td>146.48 m²</td>
<td>87.48 m²</td>
<td>215.65 m²</td>
<td>Reinforced concrete</td>
<td>Toshihiko Kimura</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOUSE IN HANAYAMA NO.4</td>
<td>Hanayama, Kobe, Hyogo-ken</td>
<td>03.1977-03.1979</td>
<td>06.1980</td>
<td>Existing</td>
<td>1,178.89 m²</td>
<td>134.15 m²</td>
<td>199.60 m²</td>
<td>Reinforced concrete, partly steel frame</td>
<td>Toshihiko Kimura</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOM HEADQUARTERS PROJECT</td>
<td>Köln, Germany</td>
<td>1980</td>
<td>06.1980</td>
<td>Existing</td>
<td>6,000.00 m²</td>
<td>6,000.00 m²</td>
<td>6,000.00 m²</td>
<td>Reinforced concrete bearing wall</td>
<td>Toshihiko Kimura</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UKIYO-E MUSEUM</td>
<td>Shimadachi, Matsumoto, Nagano-ken</td>
<td>03.1980-03.1981</td>
<td>04.1982</td>
<td>Existing, Annex added.</td>
<td>6,312.78 m²</td>
<td>890.57 m²</td>
<td>6,212.31 m²</td>
<td>Reinforced concrete bearing wall</td>
<td>Toshihiko Kimura</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Name</td>
<td>Site</td>
<td>Design time</td>
<td>Completion</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>Site area</td>
<td>Total floor area</td>
<td>Structure type</td>
<td>Structure designer</td>
<td>Furniture designer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>HOUSE IN YOKOHAMA</strong></td>
<td>Kōhoku, Yokohama, Kanagawa-ken</td>
<td>05.1982-12.1983</td>
<td>09.1984</td>
<td>Demolished</td>
<td>534.23m²</td>
<td>71.7m²</td>
<td>Reinforced concrete, partly steel frame</td>
<td>Toshirō Suzuki</td>
<td>Kazuo Shinohara</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CENTENNIAL HALL - TOKYOTECH</strong></td>
<td>Ookayama, Meguro, Tokyo</td>
<td>05.1984-09.1985</td>
<td>09.1987</td>
<td>Existing</td>
<td>138,149.00m²</td>
<td>2,687.02m²</td>
<td>Reinforced concrete, partly steel frame</td>
<td>Toshihiko Kimura, Akira Wada Lab, Tokyo Institute of Technology</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CLINIC IN HANAYAMA</strong></td>
<td>Hanayama, Kobe, Hyogo-ken</td>
<td>07.1985-03.1987</td>
<td>04.1988</td>
<td>Existing</td>
<td>2,912.77m²</td>
<td>2,765.63m²</td>
<td>Reinforced concrete bearing wall</td>
<td>Toshihiko Kimura, Noriaki Hanawa</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>HIGASHI-TAMAGAWA COMPLEX</strong></td>
<td>Setagaya, Tokyo</td>
<td>08.1980-03.1982</td>
<td>12.1982</td>
<td>Existing</td>
<td>443.75m²</td>
<td>170.73m²</td>
<td>Reinforced concrete, partly steel frame</td>
<td>Toshihiko Kimura</td>
<td>Kazuo Shinohara</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>THE SECOND NATIONAL THEATER PROJECT</strong></td>
<td>Tokyo</td>
<td>1986</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
HANESI COMPLEX

Site          Daita, Setagaya, Tokyo
Design time    11.1985-07.1986
Completion     08.1988
State          Demolished
Site area      276.38m²
Total floor area 356.28m²
BF 90.04m²
1F 131.02m²
2F 131.04m²
Structure type  Steel frame & reinforced concrete
Structure designer  Toshihiko Kimura
Furniture designer  Kazuo Shinohara

TENMEI HOUSE

Site          Tsurumi, Yokohama, Kanagawa-ken
Design time    03.1986-03.1987
Completion     07.1988
State          Existing
Site area      152.15m²
Total floor area 131.61m²
1F 55.60m²
2F 76.01m²
Structure type  Steel frame, partly reinforced concrete
Structure designer  Toshihiko Kimura
Furniture designer  Kazuo Shinohara

KZ BUILDING

Site          Higashinoda, Miyakojima, Osaka
Design time    03.1987-08.1988
Completion     03.1990
State          Existing
Site area      1,528.09m²
Building area  1,297.32m²
Total floor area  9,392.96m²
Structure type  Reinforced concrete
Structure designer  Toshihiko Kimura

PARIS - CIRCUS ON SEINE PROJECT

Site          Paris, France
Design time    1989

AGADIR CONGRESS CENTER COMPETITION

Site          Agadir, Morocco
Design time    1990
REPEATING CREVICE ANNEX PROJECT
同福の谷 墓林計画
Site     Ota-ku, Tokyo
Design time    1991

UNCOMPLETED HOUSE ANNEX PROJECT
未完成の家 墓林計画
Site     Suginami-ku, Tokyo
Design time    1992

EURALILLE HOTEL PROJECT
ユーラリール・ホテル 計画
Site     Lille, France
Design time    1990-92

HAMBURG URBAN VISION PROJECT
ハンブルク都市視覚計画
Site     Hamburg, Germany
Design time    1993

HELSINKI CONTEMPORARY ART MUSEUM PROJECT
ヘルシンキ現代美術館 計画
Site     Helsinki, Finland
Design time    1993

UKYO-E MUSEUM ANNEX PROJECT
日本浮世絵博物館 新館計画
Site     Matsumoto, Nagano-ken
Design time    1993

YOKOHAMA INTERNATIONAL PORT TERMINAL PROJECT
横浜国際駅舎ターミナル 計画
Site     Yokohama, Kanagawa-ken
Design time    1995

HOUSE IN TATESHINA PROJECT
夢前の家 計画
Site     Tateshina, Nagano-ken
Design time    2000-06
HOUSE PLANS AT SAME SCALE
FURNITURE
チーブル
Table
発表年—1978
制作—喜多島店
サイズ—W720×D900×H730
材質—塩化ビニール

ストローチェア
Snow Chair
発表年—1985
制作—喜多島店
サイズ—W520×D450×H750
材質—スチールパイプ

ストローベンチ
Snow Bench
発表年—1987
制作—喜多島店
サイズ—W1380×D320×H450
材質—スチールパイプ

かものこ椅子とテーブル
Mushroom Chair & Table
発表年—1964
制作—喜多島店
サイズ—H625×W408×D408
テーブル—H625×W1958×D1058
材質—木
### Books, Monographs and Collected Works

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Original Title</th>
<th>Romaji</th>
<th>English Translation</th>
<th>Original Publisher</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>住宅建築</td>
<td>Jūtaku kenchiku</td>
<td>Residential Architecture</td>
<td>Kinokuniya Shoten, Tokyo, 1964</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>住宅論</td>
<td>Jūtaku-ron</td>
<td>Residential Theory</td>
<td>Kajima Shuppankai, Tokyo, 1970</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>織住宅論</td>
<td>Zōku jūtaku-ron</td>
<td>Residential Theory, Part two</td>
<td>Kajima Shuppankai, Tokyo, 1975</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>築原—男稿自業業東京東京論</td>
<td>Shinohara Kazuo kētō tokyō hatsu tokyō ron</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>築原—1 2 の対談世紀の変わり目の「建築合同」</td>
<td>Shinohara Kazuo 12 no taiwa seteki no kawarime no ‘kenchiku kaigi’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>築原—男 築原住宅論</td>
<td>Shinohara Kazuo jūtaku zumen</td>
<td>Drawings of houses by Kazuo Shinohara</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>作品集1「築原—男・16の住宅と建築論」</td>
<td>Kazuo Shinohara, 16 Houses and Architectural Theory</td>
<td>Bijutsu Shuppansha, Tokyo, 1971</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>作品集2「築原—男・11の住宅と建築論」</td>
<td>Kazuo Shinohara 2, 11 Houses and Architectural Theory</td>
<td>Bijutsu Shuppansha, Tokyo, 1976</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kazuo Shinohara - Architecture: 30 contemporary houses</td>
<td>SADG-LEquere, Paris, 1979</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kazuo Shinohara</td>
<td>Pizzoli, New York, 1981</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kazuo Shinohara</td>
<td>Ernst &amp; Sohn, Berlin, 1994</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aphorismu Shinohara Kazuo no kukan gensetsu</td>
<td>Aphorisms of the Space Discourse of Kazuo Shinohara</td>
<td>Kajima Shuppankai, Tokyo, 2003</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>超大数集都市へ</td>
<td>Chō dai su shūgō toshi e</td>
<td>Towards a Super-Big Numbers Set City</td>
<td>A.D.A. EDITA, Tokyo, 2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>築原—男 通りと影形</td>
<td>Tori to Hitokage</td>
<td>Street with human shadows</td>
<td>CCA KITAKYUSHU, Kitakyushu, 2006</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Design Drawings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Original Title</th>
<th>Original Title (romaji)</th>
<th>English Translation</th>
<th>Original Publisher or Magazine</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>木造の構造 1 構造編</td>
<td>Mokuzō no kōzō 1, Kōzōhen</td>
<td>Details of wooden construction, 1. Structure</td>
<td>Deiteru Besatsu, Detail separate edition, February 1968</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>新建築 詳細図集 住宅編</td>
<td>Shinkenchiku shōsai zushū, Jutakuhen</td>
<td>Shinkenchiku detailed drawings; Residential building</td>
<td>The Shinkenchiku Company, Tokyo, 1969</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>住宅のディテール</td>
<td>Jūtaku no derēru</td>
<td>House details</td>
<td>Deiteru, No. 35, January 1973</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>世界建築 設計図集 1 5</td>
<td>Sekaihensinchiku sekkeizushū 15</td>
<td>Space Drawings 15</td>
<td>Dohousha Shuppan, July 1984</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Articles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Original Title</th>
<th>Romaji</th>
<th>English Translation / Other Languages</th>
<th>Original Publisher or Magazine</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>日本の風土の中から</td>
<td>Nihon no fūtō no naka kara</td>
<td>From within Japan's climate and landscape</td>
<td>Shinkenchiku, September 1958</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>住宅論</td>
<td>Jūtaku-ron</td>
<td>Residential Theory</td>
<td>Shinkenchiku, April 1960</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>原題</td>
<td>ローマ字</td>
<td>英語翻訳やその他の言語</td>
<td>原刊誌名</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>生活空間の新しい視点を求めて</td>
<td>Seikatsu kukan no atarashii shiten o motomete</td>
<td>For a new outlook on living space</td>
<td>Shinkenchiku, January 1961</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>伝統について</td>
<td>Dento ni tsuite</td>
<td>On tradition</td>
<td>Shinjutaku, January 1961</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>構築主義</td>
<td>Kinshugi</td>
<td>Functionalism</td>
<td>Shinjutaku, March 1961</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>生活があるということ</td>
<td>Seikatsu ga aru to iu koto</td>
<td>There is a thing called life</td>
<td>Shinjutaku, April 1961</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>風物について</td>
<td>Hiyage ni tsuite</td>
<td>On representation</td>
<td>Shinjutaku, May 1961</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>住宅の意味</td>
<td>Jutaku no imi</td>
<td>The meaning of the house</td>
<td>Shinjutaku, June 1961</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>現代性の一つのシンボル</td>
<td>Gendaisei no hitotsu no shinboru</td>
<td>One symbol of the present</td>
<td>Terebi Drama, August 1961</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>伝統について</td>
<td>Dento ni tsuite</td>
<td>On tradition</td>
<td>Shinjutaku, January 1962</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>人間の領域を</td>
<td>Ningen no ryokki o</td>
<td>Concerning human boundaries</td>
<td>Kindai Kenchiku, January 1962</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>基本的な考え</td>
<td>Gensei ni tsuite</td>
<td>On rationality</td>
<td>Shinjutaku, February 1962</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>住宅の芸術である</td>
<td>Jutaku no geijutsu de aru</td>
<td>The House is Art</td>
<td>Shinkenchiku, May 1962</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>構築がつくれるとき</td>
<td>Yoshiki ga tsukuraretu toki</td>
<td>When style is created</td>
<td>Design, August 1962</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>主であったものは空間の響きだ</td>
<td>Ushinawareta wa wa kukan no hibiki da</td>
<td>It is the echo of space that is lost</td>
<td>Kindai Kenchiku, October 1962</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>モダン始動—構築がつくれるとき—</td>
<td>Modan sidō - Yoshiki ga tsukuraretu toki-</td>
<td>The modern start when the order was made</td>
<td>1962</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>住宅の性能評価を評価する</td>
<td>Jutaku no seino hyoka o hyoko suru</td>
<td>Assessment of the functions of housing</td>
<td>Shinkenchiku, July 1963</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>装飾空間のための視覚書き</td>
<td>Sosha kukan no tame no oboegaki</td>
<td>Memo on ornamental space</td>
<td>Shinjutaku, November 1963</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>未来における住まいにくを</td>
<td>Mirai ni keta Sumi nikusa o</td>
<td>Into the future: Being uncomfortable</td>
<td>Sedai, February 1964</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>住宅設計の論文大成</td>
<td>Jutaku sekki no shotaish</td>
<td>The subjectivity of house design</td>
<td>Kenchiku, April 1964</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>二つの視覚空間</td>
<td>Hitatsu no genkukan</td>
<td>The Three Primary Spaces</td>
<td>Shinjutaku, April 1964</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>現代住宅設計論1</td>
<td>Gendai jutaku sekkeiron I</td>
<td>Modern house design theory I</td>
<td>Kindai Kenchiku, May 1964</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>現代住宅設計論2</td>
<td>Gendai jutaku sekkeiron II</td>
<td>Modern house design theory II</td>
<td>Kindai Kenchiku, June 1964</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1965年のための戯画</td>
<td>1965-nen no tame no kaisetsu</td>
<td>A tentative theory for 1965</td>
<td>Shinkenchiku, January 1965</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>空間の形状と構造</td>
<td>Kukan no shinsyu to keiso</td>
<td>The notion and structure of space</td>
<td>Shinkenchiku, January 1967</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>風景を知る住空間</td>
<td>Asobi o shiranai kukan</td>
<td>Spaces which do not know play</td>
<td>SD, May 1967</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>住宅論</td>
<td>Jutaku-ron</td>
<td>Residential theory</td>
<td>Shinjutaku, June 1967</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>新たな視覚と現実</td>
<td>A new fiction and reality</td>
<td>A novo vision and reality</td>
<td>Toshi Jutaku, July 1968</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>都市と住宅のためのの新たな視覚</td>
<td>A new vision of urban housing</td>
<td>Toshi Jutaku</td>
<td>December 1968</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>部分としての住宅施設</td>
<td>Bubun toshite no jutakusangyo</td>
<td>The housing industry as a part</td>
<td>Shinjenchiku, September 1970</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Original Title</td>
<td>English Translation / Other languages</td>
<td>Original Publisher or Magazine</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### Five Forms of Emotion

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Original Title</th>
<th>English Translation / Other languages</th>
<th>Original Publisher or Magazine</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Beyond symbolic spaces&quot;</td>
<td>The Japan Architect, April 1971</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Mas álía de los espacios simbólicos (1971)&quot;</td>
<td>Summarios, October 1977</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;The Home&quot;</td>
<td>The Japan Architect, January 1971</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;A new non-everyday project&quot;</td>
<td>Kenchiku Bunka, January 1971</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Judge's statement&quot;</td>
<td>Shinkenchiku, January 1971</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Preparations for New Functional Space

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title (Shinzen no kotoba)</th>
<th>English Translation / Other languages</th>
<th>Original Publisher or Magazine</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Beyond symbol spaces&quot;</td>
<td>The Japan Architect, April 1971</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Preparations for New Functional Space&quot;</td>
<td>1971</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Abstractions from the East

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title (Shinsain no kotoba)</th>
<th>English Translation / Other languages</th>
<th>Original Publisher or Magazine</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Shocho kukan o koete&quot;</td>
<td>Shinkenchiku, January 1971</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;A new non-everyday project&quot;</td>
<td>Kenchiku Bunka, January 1971</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Judge's statement&quot;</td>
<td>Shinkenchiku, January 1971</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Kiretsu no kukan no ko zo o megutte 1971&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Décor from Africa

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title (Burakkii Afurika no machi de)</th>
<th>English Translation / Other languages</th>
<th>Original Publisher or Magazine</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Beyond symbol spaces&quot;</td>
<td>The Japan Architect, April 1971</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;When naked space is traversed&quot;</td>
<td>The Japan Architect, February 1976</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Preparations for New Functional Space&quot;</td>
<td>1971</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### The Present Situation: Preparations for Collected Works

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title (Kinkyo: Sakuhinshu no ronbun junbi)</th>
<th>English Translation / Other languages</th>
<th>Original Publisher or Magazine</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Today's theme topology&quot;</td>
<td>a+u, October 1975</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;The Japan Architect, and a+u, joint edition, Summer 1985&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Towards Architecture&quot;</td>
<td>Towards Architecture, December 1980</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Towards the Zero-Degree Machine&quot;</td>
<td>Perspecta, No.20, 1983</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Reflections on the Nature of Space

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title (Imi no kukan e)</th>
<th>English Translation / Other languages</th>
<th>Original Publisher or Magazine</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&quot;The present situation: Preparations for collected works&quot;</td>
<td>Asahi Shinbun, 24 November 1975</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Towards a meaning of space&quot;</td>
<td>1975</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;The towns of the Ivory Coast&quot;</td>
<td>Tokyo kodai kuronikuru, September 1976</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Shinkenchiku, March 1975&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Abstractions with a Nationality

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title (Hitotsu to tasu)</th>
<th>English Translation / Other languages</th>
<th>Original Publisher or Magazine</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Towards Architecture&quot;</td>
<td>Towards Architecture, December 1980</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Towards the Zero-Degree Machine&quot;</td>
<td>Perspecta, No.20, 1983</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Towards Architecture&quot;</td>
<td>Towards Architecture, December 1980</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Towards the Zero-Degree Machine&quot;</td>
<td>Perspecta, No.20, 1983</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Abstractions from the West

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title (Abstractions from the East)</th>
<th>English Translation / Other languages</th>
<th>Original Publisher or Magazine</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Beyond symbol spaces&quot;</td>
<td>The Japan Architect, April 1971</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;When naked space is traversed&quot;</td>
<td>The Japan Architect, February 1976</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Towards Architecture&quot;</td>
<td>Towards Architecture, December 1980</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Towards the Zero-Degree Machine&quot;</td>
<td>Perspecta, No.20, 1983</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Towards Architecture&quot;</td>
<td>Towards Architecture, December 1980</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Towards the Zero-Degree Machine&quot;</td>
<td>Perspecta, No.20, 1983</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### A Program for the Fourth Space

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title (A Program for the Fourth Space)</th>
<th>English Translation / Other languages</th>
<th>Original Publisher or Magazine</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Beyond symbol spaces&quot;</td>
<td>The Japan Architect, April 1971</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Shinkenchiku, September 1981&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;The Japan Architect, and a+u, joint edition, Summer 1985&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Towards Architecture&quot;</td>
<td>Towards Architecture, December 1980</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Towards the Zero-Degree Machine&quot;</td>
<td>Perspecta, No.20, 1983</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Towards Architecture&quot;</td>
<td>Towards Architecture, December 1980</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Towards the Zero-Degree Machine&quot;</td>
<td>Perspecta, No.20, 1983</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Original Title</th>
<th>Rōmaji</th>
<th>English Translation / Other languages</th>
<th>Original Publisher or Magazine</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>市をつくる</td>
<td>Kami o tsukau</td>
<td>Using paper</td>
<td>Hiroba, September 1987</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>木立の上の金属質のシリンジチューブフレーズ</td>
<td>Kodachi no ueno kinkokusushitsu no shinrinorikaru safusu</td>
<td>A metallic cylindrical surface above a stand of trees</td>
<td>Kuramae Kogyo Kaishi, January 1988</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>今、モノネクスト</td>
<td>Ima, modan nekusuto</td>
<td>Now, Modern Next</td>
<td>Jutaku Tokushu, March 1988</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>建築と私の住い</td>
<td>Kenchiku to watakushi to no deai</td>
<td>The meeting between architecture and me</td>
<td>Kenchiku Bunka, April 1988</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Una nuova macchina per l'architettura</td>
<td>A new machine for architecture</td>
<td>Gran Bazaar, April/May 1988</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Από τον αέρα στον χάος</td>
<td>From the air to chaos</td>
<td>The Japan Architecte, May 1988</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A new machine for architecture</td>
<td>Chaos and machine</td>
<td>The Japan Architecte, May 1988</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Αναρχία σε ατμόσφαιρα</td>
<td>Anarchie en bruit aléatoire</td>
<td>Casabella 608-609, 1994</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ポストポストモダン</td>
<td>Post-Postmodernism</td>
<td>Kenchiku Bunka, January 1989</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>建築と私の住い</td>
<td>Kenchiku to watakushi to no deai</td>
<td>The meeting between architecture and me</td>
<td>Kenchiku Bunka, October 1988</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>リユクテルについてのアンケート</td>
<td>A questionnaire about Post-Postmodernism</td>
<td>Kenchiku Bunka, October 1988</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A new machine for architecture</td>
<td>Chaos and machine</td>
<td>The Japan Architecte, May 1988</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Αναρχία σε ατμόσφαιρα</td>
<td>Anarchie en bruit aléatoire</td>
<td>Casabella 608-609, 1994</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ポストポストモダン</td>
<td>Post-Postmodernism</td>
<td>Kenchiku Bunka, January 1989</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>建築と私の住い</td>
<td>Kenchiku to watakushi to no deai</td>
<td>The meeting between architecture and me</td>
<td>Kenchiku Bunka, October 1988</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>リュクテルについてのアンケート</td>
<td>A questionnaire about Post-Postmodernism</td>
<td>Kenchiku Bunka, October 1988</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Αναρχία σε ατμόσφαιρα</td>
<td>Anarchie en bruit aléatoire</td>
<td>Casabella 608-609, 1994</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ポストポストモダン</td>
<td>Post-Postmodernism</td>
<td>Kenchiku Bunka, January 1989</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Αναρχία σε ατμόσφαιρα</td>
<td>Anarchie en bruit aléatoire</td>
<td>Casabella 608-609, 1994</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ポストポストモダン</td>
<td>Post-Postmodernism</td>
<td>Kenchiku Bunka, January 1989</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Αναρχία σε ατμόσφαιρα</td>
<td>Anarchie en bruit aléatoire</td>
<td>Casabella 608-609, 1994</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ポストポストモダン</td>
<td>Post-Postmodernism</td>
<td>Kenchiku Bunka, January 1989</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Αναρχία σε ατμόσφαιρα</td>
<td>Anarchie en bruit aléatoire</td>
<td>Casabella 608-609, 1994</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ポストポストモダン</td>
<td>Post-Postmodernism</td>
<td>Kenchiku Bunka, January 1989</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Dialogues & Interviews

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Original Title</th>
<th>Rōmaji</th>
<th>English Translation / Other languages</th>
<th>Original Publisher or Magazine</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ドルフと語る</td>
<td>Rudorufu to kataru</td>
<td>Talking to Rudolph</td>
<td>Shinkenchiku, July 1960</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>什一新奇</td>
<td>Shichin shinchiku</td>
<td>Freedom in interiors</td>
<td>Kenchiku, February 1962</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>新代性の構築</td>
<td>Gendai jutaku no kūkō o sagatte</td>
<td>Seeking the trends of modern housing</td>
<td>Shinkenchiku, May 1962</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>それからの道</td>
<td>Korekara no zokki</td>
<td>The shaping of the future</td>
<td>Shinshin, January 1963</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>建築家と住宅</td>
<td>Kenchiku to jutaku</td>
<td>Architects and houses</td>
<td>New House, November 1963</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>住宅</td>
<td>Jutaku</td>
<td>The house</td>
<td>Glass, March 1964</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>仮想における自由</td>
<td>Shitsunai ni okeru jiyu</td>
<td>Freedom in interiors</td>
<td>Hiroshi Sasaki, Kazuo Shinohara, Masahiro Miwa</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Additional Notes

- 建築と私の住い | Kenchiku to watakushi to no deai | The meeting between architecture and me | Kenchiku Bunka, April 1988 |
- リュクテルについてのアンケート | A questionnaire about Post-Postmodernism | Kenchiku Bunka, October 1988 |
- Αναρχία σε ατμόσφαιρα | Anarchie en bruit aléatoire | Casabella 608-609, 1994 |
- ポストポストモダン | Post-Postmodernism | Kenchiku Bunka, January 1989 |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>原タイトル</th>
<th>ローマ字</th>
<th>英語翻訳/その他の言語</th>
<th>初版出版社や誌名</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>住宅の芸術性に打ち込んで</td>
<td>Jutaku no gerjutsusei ni uchikonde</td>
<td>Infatuated with the artistic qualities of houses</td>
<td>Kinkkan Kensetsu Sangyo Shinbun, 17 April 1964</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>人とふれあう建築</td>
<td>Hitotó fureau kenchiku</td>
<td>Architecture which contacts people</td>
<td>Shinkenchiku, May 1966</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>住宅建築の新しい徳感</td>
<td>Jukukan no atarashii gainen</td>
<td>New concepts of living space</td>
<td>Shinkenchiku, July 1966</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>村戸長喜氏のインタビュー</td>
<td>Murano Togo-shi no intabyu</td>
<td>The Togo Murano Interview</td>
<td>NHK Education Television, November 1967</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>住宅設計における物語性の発生</td>
<td>Jutakusekkei ni okeru monogatarisetsu ni hasseiru</td>
<td>The development of the narrative qualities of house design</td>
<td>Shinkenchiku, February 1971</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>住宅の新しい動きを語る</td>
<td>Jutaku no atarashii uogoki o kataru</td>
<td>Discussing the new trends in housing</td>
<td>Toshijutaku, May 1968</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>新の有名建築家</td>
<td>Jukukan no atarashii ugoki o kataru</td>
<td>Discussing the new trends in housing</td>
<td>Shinkenchiku, July 1968</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>独立住宅の設計はお意味をもちうか</td>
<td>Dokuritsu jutakukan no sekkei wa nai imi o mouchirukara</td>
<td>Can independent houses have a greater meaning?</td>
<td>Shinkenchiku, February 1973</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>抽象と具象</td>
<td>Chusho to gusho</td>
<td>Abstraction and concreteness</td>
<td>Shinkenchiku, March 1975</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>住宅建築をもじめさせ</td>
<td>Dentokechiku ni miritare</td>
<td>Familiarized the architectural design</td>
<td>Shinkenchiku, March 1975</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>住宅建造の中心</td>
<td>Jutaku wa subete no kenchiku no chushin desu</td>
<td>The heart of all architecture</td>
<td>Shokun Asahi, 2 June 1972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>家族設計に対する研究会</td>
<td>Shinsho to nyusensha ni yoru zaidankai</td>
<td>Symposium of competition judges and entrants</td>
<td>Shinkenchiku, July 1972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>住宅における自然と伝統への対応</td>
<td>Jutaku ni okeru shinzen to dento e no taio</td>
<td>An accommodation to nature and tradition in houses</td>
<td>Shinkenchiku, February 1973</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>住宅と都市</td>
<td>Jutaku to toshi</td>
<td>The house and the city</td>
<td>Taki Koji yonin no dezaina to no taiwa (Koji Taki talks with four designers), March 1975</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>建築について</td>
<td>Kenchiku ni tsuite</td>
<td>On architecture</td>
<td>Shinkenchiku, March 1975</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>今は何 Political change...</td>
<td>Ima wa neo, hissho no jidai...</td>
<td>Is now the age of neo- and non-creation...?</td>
<td>Shinkenchiku, January 1983</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>モダニズムについて</td>
<td>Modanizumu ni tsute</td>
<td>On modernism</td>
<td>Shinkenchiku, January 1981</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>近代建築をどう考えるか</td>
<td>Kindokenchiku o no dorerauka?</td>
<td>How can modern architecture be understood?</td>
<td>Shinkenchiku, September 1983</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>伝統的な建築空間をこえて</td>
<td>Dentotekina kenchikukukan o koete</td>
<td>Beyond traditional architectural space</td>
<td>Shinkenchiku, September 1983</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>表面/断面/アナーキー</td>
<td>Hyosou/danpen/anaki</td>
<td>Surface layers/fragments/anarchism (Kazuo Shinnohara, Ritsuki Miyake)</td>
<td>Shinkenchiku, September 1983</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Papers for the Architectural Institute of Japan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Original Title</th>
<th>Rōmaji</th>
<th>English Translation / Other languages</th>
<th>Original Publisher or Magazine</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>モデュロール批判</td>
<td>Modeuroru hihan</td>
<td>A critique of Moduler, 17th Conference of the Kanto Branch, 1955</td>
<td>Kenchiku Bunka, February 1955</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>開放的な空間という意味、日本建築の性格</td>
<td>Kaishōteki kukan to iu imi, Nihonkenchiku no seikaku 1</td>
<td>The meaning of open space, The nature of Japanese architecture 1</td>
<td>Papers, No. 57, 1957</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>空間の相違性とその背景、日本建築の性格2</td>
<td>Kukan no sojisei to sono haikai, Nihonkenchiku no seikaku 2</td>
<td>The resemblance of space and its background, The nature of Japanese architecture 2, 22nd Conference of the Kanto Branch, 1957</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>論文批評の流れ</td>
<td>Ronbunhiihan no ruru</td>
<td>Rules for the critiques of papers</td>
<td>Kenchiku Bunka, February 1958</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>虚空と建築論</td>
<td>Koku to kenchikuron</td>
<td>On empty space and architecture</td>
<td>Kenchiku Bunka, June 1958</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>日常的な空間について 日本建築の方法3</td>
<td>Hijakutekina kukan ni tsuite, Nihonkenchiku no ho 3</td>
<td>On non-open space, The methods of Japanese architecture 3</td>
<td>Papers, No. 60, 1958</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>古代的建築と地表 日本建築の方法4</td>
<td>Kodaiteki kenchiku to chihyo, Nihonkenchiku no ho 4</td>
<td>Ancient architecture and ground surface, The methods of Japanese architecture 4, 26th Conference of the Kanto Branch, 1959</td>
<td>Papers, No. 63, 1959</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>古代的建築の高さのプロポーション 建築の方法5</td>
<td>Kodaiteki kenchiku no takasa no proposhon, Nihonkenchiku no ho ho 5</td>
<td>The height proportions of ancient architecture, The methods of Japanese architecture 5, 26th Conference of the Kanto Branch, 1959</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>建築と地表との古代的造形 日本建築の方法6</td>
<td>Kenchiku to chihyo to no kodaitekikaseki, Nihonkenchiku no ho ho 6</td>
<td>Ancient modeling of buildings and terrain, The methods of Japanese architecture 6</td>
<td>Papers, No. 63, 1959</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>空間の分割と連続 日本建築の方法7</td>
<td>Kukan no bunkatsu to renketusu, Nihonkenchiku no ho ho 7</td>
<td>Division and linkage of space, The methods of Japanese architecture 7, 28th Conference of the Kanto Branch, 1960</td>
<td>Papers, No. 66, 1960</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>空間分割から見た平面構成 日本建築の方法8</td>
<td>Kukanbunkatsu kara mita heimenkonseki, Nihonkenchiku no ho ho 8</td>
<td>Plane composition viewed from space division, The methods of Japanese architecture 8</td>
<td>Papers, No. 69, 1961</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>西方の平面構成の対比 日本建築の方法9</td>
<td>Sado no heimenkonseki to no taishi, Nihonkenchiku no ho ho 9</td>
<td>Comparison with Western plane composition, The methods of Japanese architecture 9</td>
<td>Papers, No. 89, 1963</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>合理精神の記念碑 - 日本建築の作品をたどって</td>
<td>Gouriteisshin no kinenhi - Taniguchi Yoshiro no sakuhin o tadotte</td>
<td>A memorial tablet for rationality: Retracing the works of Yoshiro Taniguchi</td>
<td>Kenchiku Bunka, April 1962</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>空間論 - 日本建築の空間について、非欧説的空間の評価</td>
<td>Kukanron - Nihonkenchiku no kukan ni tsuite, hirouteikineni kukan no hyoka</td>
<td>A theory of space - On the space of Japanese architecture, an assessment of irrational space</td>
<td>Kenchiku Bunka, October 1963</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
民家集落の形成研究Ⅰ その１ 奈良民家集落から見た実調研究
Minkashuraku no keitaitekikenkyu I sono 1, Naraminkashuraku no jissokokusha
A formal study of the village I [1], A survey examination of Nara villages
Papers, separate publication, 1966

民家の形態研究 その2 部屋配置
Minkashuraku no keitaitekikenkyu II sono 2, Mensekisantai kara mita shuraku keita
A formal study of the village II [2], Mensekisantai kara mita shuraku keita
Papers, separate publication, 1966

民家集落の形成研究Ⅲ その３ 並びと民家集落の統一
Minkashuraku no keitaitekikenkyu III sono 3, Michi to minkashuraku no musubitsuki
A formal study of the village III [3], The links between roads and the plans of houses
Papers, separate publication, 1966

民家集落の形成研究Ⅲ その1 金沢、高山の町屋の実調研究 I
Minkashuraku no keitaitekikenkyu III sono 1, Kanazawa, Takayama no machiya no jisso kokushosa I
A formal study of the village II [1], A survey examination of Kanazawa and Takayama tradesmen's houses I
Papers, separate publication, 1967

民家集落の形成研究Ⅲ その2 金沢、高山の町屋の実調研究II
Minkashuraku no keitaitekikenkyu III sono 2, Kanazawa, Takayama no machiya no jisso kokushosa II
A formal study of the village II [2], A survey examination of Kanazawa and Takayama tradesmen's houses II
Papers, separate publication, 1967

民家集落の形成研究Ⅲ その3 平面構成について
Minkashuraku no keitaitekikenkyu III sono 3, Heimenkosei ni tsuite
A formal study of the village III [1], A survey examination of Kanazawa and Takayama tradesmen's houses
Summaries of the Academic Lectures of the General Meeting, 1968

民家集落の形成研究Ⅲ その4 部数配置
Minkashuraku no keitaitekikenkyu III sono 4, Mensekisantai kara mita heimen
A formal study of the village III [2], The links between roads and the plans of houses
Summaries of the Academic Lectures of the General Meeting, 1968

民家集落の形成研究Ⅲ その5 立体構成について
Minkashuraku no keitaitekikenkyu III sono 5, Ritsumenkosei ni tsuite
A formal study of the village III [5], Elevation composition
Papers, separate publication, 1967

民家集落の形成研究Ⅲ その6 並びと民家集落の統一
Minkashuraku no keitaitekikenkyu III sono 6, Michi to minkaheimen no musubitsuki
A formal study of the village II [6], The links between roads and the plans of houses
Papers, separate publication, 1967

民家集落の形成研究Ⅲ その1 中国遺跡調査
Minkashuraku no keitaitekikenkyu III sono 1, Nakasendo kyoushukubamachi no jisso kokushosa
A formal study of the village III [1], A survey examination of the Nakasendo highway
Summaries of the Academic Lectures of the General Meeting, 1968

民家集落の形成研究Ⅲ その2 平面とその部数配置から見た集落
Minkashuraku no keitaitekikenkyu III sono 2, Heimen to sono mensekisantai kara mita shuraku
A formal study of the village III [2], The Eagle seen in terms of planes and their surface calculations
Summaries of the Academic Lectures of the General Meeting, 1968

民家集落の形成研究Ⅲ その3 並びと民家集落の統一
Minkashuraku no keitaitekikenkyu III sono 3, Michi to minkaheimen no musubitsuki
A formal study of the village III [3], The links between roads and the villages
Summaries of the Academic Lectures of the General Meeting, 1968

城下町の形態研究Ⅰ その1 東北地方城下町の地図と街形について
Jokamachi no keitaikenkyu I sono 1, Tohokuchihojokamachi no chikei to ikaku ni tsuite
A formal study of the castle town I [1], The toponography and boundaries of Tohoku castle towns
Summaries of the Academic Lectures of the General Meeting, 1973

城下町の形態研究Ⅰ その2 屋敷間隔の関係について
Jokamachi no keitaikenkyu I sono 2, Yashikihirokkan no kanka ni tsuite
A formal study of the castle town I [2], The relationship between residential areas
Summaries of the Academic Lectures of the General Meeting, 1973

城下町の形態研究Ⅰ その3 並びと民家集落の統一
Jokamachi no keitaikenkyu I sono 3, Michi to minkaheimen no musubitsuki
A formal study of the castle town I [3], The characteristics of the roads
Summaries of the Academic Lectures of the General Meeting, 1973

城下町の形態研究Ⅰ その4 並びと民家集落の統一
Jokamachi no keitaikenkyu I sono 4, Michi to minkaheimen no musubitsuki
A formal study of the castle town I [4], Linkage between roads and mansions
Summaries of the Academic Lectures of the General Meeting, 1973

城下町の形態研究Ⅱ その1 中国地方城下町の視察
Jokamachi no keitaikenkyu II sono 1, Chugokuuchijojokamachi ni gikan
A formal study of the castle town II [1], A survey of castle towns of the Chugoku region
Summaries of the Academic Lectures of the General Meeting, 1975

城下町の形態研究Ⅱ その2 庭園について
Jokamachi no keitaikenkyu II sono 2, Ikaku ni tsuite
A formal study of the castle town II [2], Boundaries
Summaries of the Academic Lectures of the General Meeting, 1975

城下町の形態研究Ⅱ その3 侍屋敷について
Jokamachi no keitaikenkyu II sono 3, Samurai yashiki ni tsuite
A formal study of the castle town II [3], Samurai mansions
Summaries of the Academic Lectures of the General Meeting, 1975

城下町の形態研究Ⅱ その4 町屋について
Jokamachi no keitaikenkyu II sono 4, Machiya ni tsuite
A formal study of the castle town II [4], Tradesmen's houses
Summaries of the Academic Lectures of the General Meeting, 1975

城下町の形態研究Ⅱ その5 並びと民家集落の統一
Jokamachi no keitaikenkyu II sono 5, Michi to minkaheimen no musubitsuki
A formal study of the castle town II [5], The characteristics of the roads
Summaries of the Academic Lectures of the General Meeting, 1975

城下町の形態研究Ⅲ その1 九州地方城下町と自然地形
Jokamachi no keitaikenkyu III sono 1, Kyushuhuchijojokamachi to shizenreiki
A formal study of the castle town III [1], Castle towns of the Kyushu region and the natural topography
Summaries of the Academic Lectures of the General Meeting, 1975

城下町の形態研究Ⅲ その2 町屋について
Jokamachi no keitaikenkyu III sono 2, Machiya ni tsuite
A formal study of the castle town III [2], Tradesmen's houses
Summaries of the Academic Lectures of the General Meeting, 1975

城下町の形態研究Ⅳ 江戸・その1 侍屋敷について
Jokamachi no keitaikenkyu IV sono 1, Edo - sono samurai yashiki ni tsuite
A formal study of the castle town IV [1], Edo - 1, Samuraiyashiki ni tsuite
Summaries of the Academic Lectures of the General Meeting, 1977

城下町の形態研究Ⅳ 江戸・その2 町屋について
Jokamachi no keitaikenkyu IV sono 2, Edo - sono machiya ni tsuite
A formal study of the castle town IV [2], Edo - 2, Tradesmen's houses
Summaries of the Academic Lectures of the General Meeting, 1977

城下町の形態研究Ⅴ 京都・その1 屋敷の分布について
Jokamachi no keitaikenkyu V sono 1, Kyoto - sono yashiki no bunpu ni tsuite
A formal study of the castle town V [1], Kyoto - 1, Distribution of mansions
Summaries of the Academic Lectures of the General Meeting, 1977

城下町の形態研究Ⅴ 京都・その2 町区について
Jokamachi no keitaikenkyu V sono 2, Kyoto - sono 2, Blocks
A formal study of the castle town V [2], Kyoto - 2, Blocks
Summaries of the Academic Lectures of the General Meeting, 1977
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Architectural Criticism</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Original Title</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>印象と批評: 神奈川県立図書館および音楽堂</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>講堂の印象のなかから</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>東京文化会館の人間像</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>く情報のフォルムと新持デザイン研究所について</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>山根隆一のコレージュ</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## ANNEX 4: PUBLICATIONS ABOUT KAZUO SHINOHARA

### Special Magazine Editions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Original Title</th>
<th>Rōmaji</th>
<th>English Translation / Other Languages</th>
<th>Original Publisher or Magazine</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mukai, Masanari</td>
<td>Shinohara Kazuo</td>
<td>Shinohara Kazuo</td>
<td>In response to Shinohara</td>
<td>Kenchiku, February 1958</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mukai, Masanari</td>
<td>言葉の魔術と建築論 (Kotoba no majutsu to kenchikuron) (Shinohara-shi no hanronni kotaete)</td>
<td>Kotobato majutsuto to kenchikuron (Shinohara-shi no hanronni kotaete)</td>
<td>The magic of words and the theory of architecture [a response to Shinohara's counter-argument]</td>
<td>Kenchiku, June 1958</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kawase, Noboru</td>
<td>無駄な空間 (Mudana kokan)</td>
<td>Wasted space</td>
<td>Shitsunai, May 1962</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tanikawa, Shuntaro; Iizawa, Tadashi</td>
<td>住まいは人なり (Sumai wa hito nari)</td>
<td>The house is the man</td>
<td>Modern Living, Vol. 44, 1963</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>住宅建築の原点</td>
<td>ただひとつの曲面の表明 (Tada hitotsu no Jiyu no hyomei)</td>
<td>Tada hitotsu no Jiyu no hyomei</td>
<td>Only One Expression of Freedom</td>
<td>Hokkai Shinbun, 13 May 1964</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taki, Koji</td>
<td>新しい宣言 (Atarashii sengen)</td>
<td>New statement</td>
<td>Glass, April 1964</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kondo, Shoshei</td>
<td>植物について (Koten ni tsuite)</td>
<td>On the oneman show</td>
<td>Kenchiku, May 1964</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Articles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Original Title</th>
<th>Rōmaji</th>
<th>English Translation / Other Languages</th>
<th>Original Publisher or Magazine</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Shitsunai, May 1961</td>
<td>Shinohara Kazuo</td>
<td>Shinohara Kazuo</td>
<td>Kenchiku, May 1961</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kō ichi, April 1964</td>
<td>Design, April 1969</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summaries, October 1977</td>
<td>Kazuo Shinohara, a philosophy of the house</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Šindai Kenchiku, June 1964</td>
<td>The architect Kazuo Shinohara: Geometric imagination</td>
<td>Seido sha, July 2007</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prolegomena, No. 53, Vienna 1986</td>
<td>Kazuo Shinohara in preparation for the fourth space</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shokokusha, Tokyo, 2007</td>
<td>Kajito, Taki Kojirō Kinen: Shinohara Kazuo shi Sōzō yoku Taki Koji</td>
<td>The architect Kazuo Shinohara: Geometric imagination</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seido sha, July 2007</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seido sha, July 2007</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author</td>
<td>Original Title</td>
<td>Rilâmaj</td>
<td>English Translation / Other Languages</td>
<td>Original Publisher or Magazine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minazuka, Akiko</td>
<td>Rōmaji English Translation / Other Languages</td>
<td>ࣰࣰ້</td>
<td>Kazuo Shinkohara, attempting the volume production of living space</td>
<td>Genjutsu Sekkyô, June 1964</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenoouchi, Isamu</td>
<td>雑説—男のデザイン</td>
<td>Shinohara Kazuo no dezin</td>
<td>The design of Kazuo Shinkohara</td>
<td>Design, June 1964</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kurokawa, Takashi</td>
<td>雑説—男, 1964春</td>
<td>Shinohara Kazuo, 1964 Haru</td>
<td>Kazuo Shinkohara, Spring 1964</td>
<td>Kenchiku, July 1964</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tanikawa, Shuntaro</td>
<td>ウォーム形式のわが家</td>
<td>Ուանձուկեստիկհի ուագայա</td>
<td>My one-room house</td>
<td>Sankët Katoëban, February 1965</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kojirô, Yuichiro</td>
<td>雑説は数値できるか—自の家と地の家を見て</td>
<td>Jukukan wa kakuho dekinaika - shiro no ie to chi no ie o mitte</td>
<td>Can living space be ensured? - Looking at the House in White and the House of Earth</td>
<td>Kenchiku Bunika, July 1967</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Onobayashi, Hiroki</td>
<td>Kazuo Shinkohara’s architectural theory</td>
<td>ࣰੱGrün</td>
<td>The Japan Architect, October 1967</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nishihara, Kyôshi</td>
<td>House with an Earthen Floor, House in White, House of Earth</td>
<td>Ուանձուկեստիկհի ուագայա</td>
<td>Japanese House (part), 1968</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taki, Koji</td>
<td>異荘の空間—雑説—男論</td>
<td>Itan no kukan = Shinohara Kazuo-roon</td>
<td>Space of heresy. On Kazuo Shinkohara</td>
<td>Shinkenchiku, July 1968</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kajima, Akiko</td>
<td>雑説—男の前の住宅(山城さんの家, 西生さんの家, 花山さんの家)</td>
<td>Shinohara Kazuo no mitsu no jutaku (Yamashiro-san no ie, Suzzusho-san no ie, Hanayama minami no ie)</td>
<td>Three houses by Kazuo Shinkohara (Yamashiro house, Suzzuhou House and Hanayama South House)</td>
<td>Genjutsu Shincho, September 1968</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taki, Koji</td>
<td>&lt;意味の空間&gt; 華織孫—男論</td>
<td>Imi no kukan, Zoku-Shinohara Kazuo-on</td>
<td>The space of meaning - On Kazuo Shinkohara, part 2</td>
<td>Shinkenchiku, January 1971</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Takamatsu, Jiro</td>
<td>無邪への指倉</td>
<td>Muku e no shiko</td>
<td>Pointing to purity</td>
<td>Interia, No. 142, January 1971</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tamaishi, Kazumasa</td>
<td>二つの住宅をみて</td>
<td>Futatsu no jutaku o mite</td>
<td>Looking at two houses</td>
<td>Kenchiku, January 1971</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Onobayashi, Hiroki</td>
<td>review of the book Domestic Architecture</td>
<td>Ուանձուկեստիկհի ուագայա</td>
<td>Shinkenchiku, February 1971</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taki, Koji</td>
<td>Significant spaces</td>
<td>Ուանձուկեստիկհի ուագայա</td>
<td>The Japan Architect, April 1971</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seo, Fumitsuki</td>
<td>Review of the collected works, Kazuo Shinkohara</td>
<td>Ուանձուկեստիկհի ուագայա</td>
<td>Shinkenchiku, June 1971</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohashi, Teruo</td>
<td>ものあるか家空間</td>
<td>Mono anaka kaku to kukan</td>
<td>Objects or furniture and space</td>
<td>Interia no jida e, September 1971</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hamaguchi, Ryuchi</td>
<td>直方体の森(現代の建築)</td>
<td>Chokuhuatari no mori (gendai no kenchiku)</td>
<td>The Cubic Forest (modern architecture)</td>
<td>Kindai no Bijutsu, 1 November 1973</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Koi, Taro</td>
<td>仮想性の主張—実住の住宅</td>
<td>Mikon no ie, umi no kaidan, Shino-san no ie no shokai</td>
<td>An introduction to the Uncompleted House, the Sea Stairway and the Shino House</td>
<td>Home Los Angeles Times, 5 November 1972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hamaguchi, Ryuchi</td>
<td>直方体の森(現代の建築)</td>
<td>Ուանձուկեստիկհի ուագայա</td>
<td>The Cubic Forest (modern architecture)</td>
<td>Kindai no Bijutsu, 1 November 1973</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Koi, Taro</td>
<td>仮想性の主張—実住の住宅</td>
<td>Mikon no ie, umi no kaidan, Shino-san no ie no shokai</td>
<td>An introduction to the Uncompleted House, the Sea Stairway and the Shino House</td>
<td>Home Los Angeles Times, 5 November 1972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ito, Toyo</td>
<td>作家論—雑説—男</td>
<td>Sakkaron = Shinohara Kazuo</td>
<td>Kazuo Shinkohara, a study. A History of Housing in the Showa Period</td>
<td>a special expanded edition of Shinkenchiku, November 1976</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stewart, David B.</td>
<td>雑説—男の作品, 軽井沢の住宅</td>
<td>Shinohara Kazuo no sakuhin: Karuizawa no jutaku nida!</td>
<td>The works of Kazuo Shinkohara: Two houses in Karuizawa</td>
<td>a+u, October 1975</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taro Minemura</td>
<td>仮想性の主張—実住の住宅</td>
<td>Fankushon o mugeatte - imada mizutaru Shinohara Kazuo no jutaku nado</td>
<td>Concerning function - the yet unseen houses of Kazuo Shinkohara</td>
<td>Kindai Kenchiku, April 1975</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Furi, Hiromi</td>
<td>仮想性の主張—実住の住宅</td>
<td>Ragyo no kukan</td>
<td>Naked space</td>
<td>Yomiuri Shinshin, 5 December 1975</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ito, Toyo</td>
<td>作家論—雑説—男</td>
<td>Sakkaron = Shinohara Kazuo</td>
<td>Kazuo Shinkohara, a study. A History of Housing in the Showa Period</td>
<td>a special expanded edition of Shinkenchiku, November 1976</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stewart, David B.</td>
<td>上原通りの住宅</td>
<td>Ueharedorî no jutaku</td>
<td>The House in Uehara</td>
<td>Kenchiku Bunka, January 1977</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fuji, Hiromi</td>
<td>review of the collected works, Kazuo Shinkohara</td>
<td>Ուանձուկեստիկհի ուագայա</td>
<td>Shinkenchiku, February 1977</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marina Waisman (ed)</td>
<td>Una filosofía de la vivienda</td>
<td>A philosophy of the House</td>
<td>Summarios, October 1977</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taki, Koji</td>
<td>Kazuo Shinkohara</td>
<td>Ուանձուկեստիկհի ուագայա</td>
<td>Summarios, October 1977</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author</td>
<td>Original Title</td>
<td>English Translation / Other Languages</td>
<td>Original Publisher or Magazine</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Watanabe, Takenobu</td>
<td>Review of the collected works, Shinohara Kazuo 2.</td>
<td>SD, March 1978</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matsunaga, Yasumitsu</td>
<td>Aproximación a un genial creador. El arquitecto Kazuo Shinohara</td>
<td>La Nación, 8 May 1978</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kuwakake, Fumio</td>
<td>The absence of architecture</td>
<td>Kenchiku Bunka, October 1978</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suzuki, Hiroyuki</td>
<td>The Aesthetics of Theoretical Structure</td>
<td>The Japan Architect, March 1979</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luigi, Gilbert</td>
<td>La géometrie émotionnelle de Shinohara</td>
<td>Neuf, No. 4, 1980</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matsunaga, Yasumitsu</td>
<td>A Long, Winding Road to the Modern Age</td>
<td>The Japan Architect, September 1981</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frampton, Kenneth</td>
<td>Kazuo Shinohara: Architecture as Savage Machine</td>
<td>Review, Summer 1982</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Watanabe, Hiroshi</td>
<td>Kazuo Shinohara: An Exodus for Reinterpretation</td>
<td>Progressive Architecture, May 1983</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taki, Koji</td>
<td>Kazuo Shinohara Exhibition has Parisians flocking in, extolled by Le Monde etc</td>
<td>Kenchiku Bunka, April 1980</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miyake, R’ichi</td>
<td>Architectural Mutants: The Invisible Machine</td>
<td>Yurika, December 1983</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arents, Wiel</td>
<td>Shinohara’s Machine</td>
<td>De Architect, February 1984</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frampton, Kenneth</td>
<td>Shinohara and Japan’s Negative Avant-Garde</td>
<td>Harvard Graduate School of Design News, May/June 1984</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miyake, R’ichi</td>
<td>建築家のデビュー作品/凧山道の家</td>
<td>Toshi jutaku, July 1984</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Köenig, G.K.</td>
<td>Una Domenica A Tokyo</td>
<td>A Sunday in Tokyo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kemp, Piet</td>
<td>Kazuo Shinohara: relaties tussen coexistenties</td>
<td>Forum, 29, 1984/85</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tominga, Yuzuru</td>
<td>宰の変容（谷川さんの住宅）</td>
<td>Toshi jutaku, February 1985</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kural, René</td>
<td>Skriver om Kazuo Shinohara</td>
<td>Skala, June 1985</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mollenier, Henrik Setn</td>
<td>Enfamiliehus sam Kunst</td>
<td>Politiken, 23 October 1985</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borysławski, Tadeusz</td>
<td>The Invisible machine</td>
<td>NWDH, 1986</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taki, Koji</td>
<td>形の意味</td>
<td>Tokyo Shinbun, 17 November 1987</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chirat, Sylvie; Bange, François</td>
<td>Le Bruit Aleatoire</td>
<td>CREE, April/May 1988</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iijima, Yoichi</td>
<td>Architecture Campus Note</td>
<td>Architecture Campus Note</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stewart, David B.</td>
<td>The Spaceship looming over the campus</td>
<td>Nikhon Kenzai Shinbun, 20 July 1988</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taki, Koji</td>
<td>主題の変化と基本的構造；機能建築学における変化</td>
<td>Kenchiku Bunka, October 1988</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author</td>
<td>Original Title</td>
<td>Rōmaji</td>
<td>English Translation / Other Languages</td>
<td>Original Publisher or Magazine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hikosaka, Yutaka</td>
<td>生産機関としての篠原一男的装置、その言語空間</td>
<td>Sesanlikiko toshite no Shinohara Kazuo teki sochi, sono genseitsukukan</td>
<td>The Kazuo Shinohara - type device as production mechanism, the statement space</td>
<td>Kenchiku Bunka, October 1988</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hagiwara, Takeshi</td>
<td>輔原一男のエクリチュール</td>
<td>Shinohara Kazuo no ekurichuru</td>
<td>The écriture of Kazuo Shinohara</td>
<td>Kenchiku Bunka, October 1988</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miyake, Ritschi</td>
<td>完成の場へ</td>
<td>Kansei no ba e</td>
<td>Towards the place of sensitivity</td>
<td>Kenchiku Bunka, October 1988</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tominaga, Yuzuru</td>
<td>建築という不可視性</td>
<td>Kakou to iu buttaisei</td>
<td>Objectivity of skeleton</td>
<td>Kenchiku Bunka, October 1988</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chirat, Sylvie</td>
<td>Construire dans le Chaos</td>
<td>Building in the chaos</td>
<td>L'Architecture d'Aujourd'hui, October 1988</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chirat, Sylvie</td>
<td>Construire du Japan (part)</td>
<td>The building of Japan (part)</td>
<td>La Revue d'Architecture du Moniteur, April 1988</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taki, Koji</td>
<td>フレグメントとノイズ</td>
<td>Fragments and Noise</td>
<td>Architectural Design, May/June 1988</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stewart, David B.</td>
<td>Talking of Michelangelo</td>
<td></td>
<td>GA Houses, No. 25, 1989</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Watanabe, Hitako</td>
<td>肯定のための留留に思う</td>
<td>Kotei no tame no renji ni omou</td>
<td>Stimulation as affirmation</td>
<td>Shinkenchiku, March 1990</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Zurich - ETH
1982 New Haven (CT) - Yale University
1982 Montreal - Centre de Création et de Diffusion en Design (Univ. Québec)
1983 Cambridge (MA) - Harvard University
1984 Tokyo - Architectural Institute of Japan
1988 Paris - La Villette
1997 Krems (Austria) - ORTE Kunst Halle Krems
2004 Kitakyushu - Center For Contemporary Art
2010 Arles (F) - Les Rencontres de la Photographie
2014 Saint Louis (MO) - Washington University
Nanjing - Southeast University School of Architecture
Shanghai - Power House of Art

ANNEX 6: KAZUO SHINOHARA TIMELINE

02.04.1925 Born in Shizuoka Prefecture
1947 Graduated in mathematics from Tokyo University of Science (Tokyo College of Physics at the time)
1949 Enrolled at TokyoTECH at Seike’s Laboratory
1953 Graduated from TokyoTECH
1953-1961 Instructor, Architecture Department TokyoTECH
1962-1969 Associate Professor, TokyoTECH
1970-1986 Professor, TokyoTECH
1972 Awarded the Architectural Institute of Japan Prize
1984-1986 Visiting Professor, Yale University & Technische Hochschule, Wien
1986 Retirement as Emeritus Professor Founding of Shinohara Atelier Lectures in Barcelona and Palma de Mallorca
2005 Awarded the Architectural Institute of Japan Grand Prize
15.07.2006 Died in Kawasaki
2010 Awarded In Memoriam Venice Biennale Commemorative Gold Lion