

論文の内容の要旨

論文題目 Representation and Contextualization of Japanese
Architecture in Western Architectural Periodicals
(西欧メディアにおける日本建築の表現と文脈化)

氏名 ニコロヴスキ ニコラ

This thesis studies the representational and contextualizing narrative of Japanese architecture in Western periodical. The study seeks to evaluate the role of the architectural periodical in presenting the unique values of Japanese architecture and establishing the relevance of this discourse. It seeks the patterns of representation in printed media, and by looking at these patterns, tries to understand how Japanese architecture is contextualized in the larger narrative of Western architectural history. The study's interest is to discover what is emphasized when presenting Japanese design and how this presentation correlates with Western architectural thought. Ultimately this research determines what Japan-ness in architecture is in the worldview of the West, and how it is sustained.

The thesis follows a linear structure of problem statement, literature review, methods and results. The problem statement is the introductory chapter, presenting the backgrounds of the research and elaborating upon the research questions, aims, objectives and methodology of this research. The literature review chapter covers some of the seminal readings that influenced this study. It is included in order to facilitate understanding of the field of study, as well as the position of this research amidst a wider range of studies conducted on similar topics. The methods portion covers the research conducted on the case study of representation and contextualization of Japanese architecture in the West. It comprises Chapters 3, 4 and 5, which analyze articles collected from three European magazines, and Chapter 6, which is based on interviews conducted with architects and writers. The last chapter of the thesis, Chapter 7, presents the conclusions of the study. The literature review of the research covers the following topics: media representation of architecture, Japanese architectural history, and Eurocentrism in architectural history. The architecture and media part covers writings that focus on the curatorial and contextualizing role of media in the field of architecture, with a particular focus on architectural periodicals. The role of the media in establishing architectural discourses has been wildly discussed in the periodicals themselves, but there is little scientific research available on this topic. Beatriz Colomina's books are definitely the most referred to work in

the field, but *“This is Not Architecture: Media Constructions”* by Kester Rattenbury and *“Mediating Modernism: Architectural Cultures in Britain”* by Andrew Higgott are invaluable sources for this study as well. The field that examines media and architecture, particularly architectural press, is still relatively small compared to the influence that media has had in architecture. This is yet one more reason for conducting this study and contributing to the field.

The term Eurocentrism implies a worldview based upon a European perspective, and it is mostly associated with decolonization and post-colonial thought. Although the foundations for this chapter are post-colonial studies, in this case it was more adequate to focus on Eurocentrism than post-colonial studies in general. Japan has been subjected to colonialism and Orientalized by the West, but has also been a colonizer. For the purpose of this study, it was important to understand the dominant role of Europe as a reference point for creating and contextualizing historical narratives in architecture. Representation of Japanese architecture, as the research showed, has been subjected to the domination of Eurocentricity; as a result, there are cases of misinterpretation or misrepresentation of the work of certain Japanese architects. Eventually, Japan-ness in architecture is constructed on Eurocentric principles – “Europe this, Japan that”.

The study is introduced with a brief history of twentieth century Japanese architecture; it covers the essential moments and key architecture figures in Japan prominent in the international scene. Following that is a discussion about the representation of Japanese architecture and a theoretical framework for Japan-ness in architecture. The part closes with a presentation of the broad findings in Western architectural periodicals. It discusses the primary data collected from *Architectural Design*, *Casabella* and *L'Architecture d'Aujourd'hui* in the period between 1955 and 2005. The trends in publishing indicate that a chronological gap appears in the 1970s in all of the magazines. This gap divides the data into two periods that are analyzed separately.

The years between 1955 and 1970 cover Western Late Modernism. The analyses of the articles published in this period discover that during the 1960s the Western media perceives Japanese architecture as an integral part of the Modernist movement. Though differences and specificities are recognized – sometimes even differences in theory, such as the work of the Metabolists – the idea that Japanese contemporary architecture is something completely different than that of the West doesn't exist at that time. Modernism appropriates everything designed in Japan. Japan-ness exists in the realm of traditional Japanese architecture, and the magazines recognize the specificity of Japanese architectural history. There are many examples of articles that identify the influence of tradition in Japanese modern architecture, but these articles do not do not distinguish the work in Japan as a different discourse. Metabolism as the first original modern movement in Japan is recognized for its different

voice and new progressive avant-garde ideas; this work is often interpreted in relation to the Japanese cultural background but it is still seen within the boundaries of Modernity.

The second part of the data, the articles published between 1978 and 2005 revealed the following information: towards the end of the 1970s, Isozaki's international activities resulted in several exhibitions that launched Japanese architecture onto the world stage as a source of exciting new ideas. The "New Wave" architects had wide international coverage during the 1980s. Initially published with individual presentations, or contextualized as Post-Modern, near the end of the decade these different voices were sublimated into the idea of a Japanese discourse. Media continually acknowledged the difference of Japanese architects, but in the late 1980s and early 1990s in the peak of the bubble economy, the presentations of these architects were discussed within the framework of a larger narrative of Japanese architecture. The representation of the late 1980s and early 1990s defined the discourse by presenting common denominators for all Japanese architects, despite their diverse theoretical positions. This period can be considered the beginning of a fully formed Japanese discourse, and the moment when the idea of Japan-ness was conceived in contemporary architecture. The burst of the bubble in 1990 was reflected in media in the period after 1994. This period was characterized by low-key presentations that retraced the already established understanding of Japanese architecture. By the early 2000s, these presentations become more frequent, but do not offer a new understanding for contemporary designs. Instead, the presentations return to already known patterns and historical topics.

Finally in the search for representational patterns in printed media, and in discussions with architects and writers, this study found a variety of theoretical and contextualizing narratives for Japanese architecture. What media portrays as Japanese architecture is most often represented as product of nature, place, urbanity and tradition. Japanese architects are almost exclusively tied to nature; dialogues between the buildings and nature are established from direct connections with the natural world to abstract ideas with light, shadow, rain and wind. Ultimately, for Itsuko Hasegawa architecture *is* nature; "second nature" for humans. Japanese architecture is place making and not place changing. Buildings are products of the urban and cultural environment, and the designs are a reaction to these environments. The theoretical stands of Japanese architects are products of their positions towards urbanity and tradition, and there is no right and wrong way, therefore there is no style to be followed.

The emphasis when presenting Japanese design is on its relational and abstract aspects. Relationships with nature, the urban context, the cultural setting, tradition and traditional space, the past and the future of the city, interior-exterior, relationships with the West, materials, technology, and so on... Ultimately, Japanese architecture is a relationship between people and space. The concept behind many Japanese buildings is not shown as a

theoretical position that is the product of rational programmatic, stylistic or formal categories, but more of empirical relational aspects of space, program and materiality. The second aspect of the presentations is focused on the abstract qualities that are associated with Japanese architecture. These abstract spatial categories include asymmetry, minimalism, multiple layers, heterogeneity, and fragmentation, and produce qualitative relationships recognized as Japanese: harmony, chaos, ephemerality, simplicity, space-time, memory, and Zen. These abstract categories are just layers of cultural references that are molded into archetypes that essentialize Japanese architecture. This is particularly noticeable in the post-bubble period and stretches until today.

But how do these presentations correlate with Western architectural thought? Japanese architecture stands as opposition in this presentation, and the West is used as a reference to define the differences of Japanese architecture. Only by difference with the West does Japanese architecture get to be a discourse of its own. This is particularly noticeable for the texts written by Japanese writers and architects, who rely heavily on the dichotomy in order to convey their messages.

Finally, Japan-ness in contemporary architecture is a set of images, symbols and constructs that help the West to understand the multiplicity of voices that exist within the Japanese discourse. It is not a tangible category, and it is qualitative expressed mostly through phenomenological and aesthetic positions. Presented in Western media, these theoretical positions change and adjust to create an Opposition, an Other that West is not, and challenge the discursive nature of Western architecture. The West applies meanings and readings, and systematizes Japanese architects to better understand them, but the non-discursive nature of Japanese architecture is an obstacle for creating a clearly defined discourse. Western architectural discourses represent statements, and act by change and active involvement with the environment. Movements have theoretical statements that act towards change. Japanese architecture has never been presented as a movement, but rather as a network of different architectural approaches, all of them having relational interactions. In fact, there is no discourse, but rather a relation with predecessors and peers and a will to create new realities and relationships between people and space. As Hasegawa (2015) would say, there is no hierarchy and idea to follow, but each architect creates a world webbed and connected with the worlds of their peers. This extremely heterogeneous group of architects that has the World's attention produces architecture that doesn't have a formal and operational design philosophy. Japan-ness is in the experiential qualities of space. It is in movement through space, its content and provided meaning. It is in the material and tactile qualities. It is phenomenological, and the results of the cultural references produced with that phenomenology. It is a result of the unique settling in a place by an artist.