On Adam’s House in the Pacific
Symposium in Honour of Joseph Rykwert

Friday 14 and Saturday 15 November 2008
If, in this part of the world, the context is defined as paradisiacal, what is the need for architecture? Is it enough that building in such circumstances be as little mediated, as natural, as possible? How does architecture become dependent on this natural context? What is this Pacific which is invoked in the guise of a scene or site to safeguard a paradise and to define a natural architecture? Idyllic, remote and untouched parts, where architecture is barely needed, seem to summon up notions of original dwelling from the very surroundings in forests, glades, clearings, mountains, beaches, lakes and deserts. They summon up the primitive in the form of sheds, cabins and even villas and tourist resorts which assemble sources for the uncorrupted hut.

Why does the private or single family house gain importance within such a primal setting? Does the proliferation of books on the house signify that this is the sole local discourse? How does this demand for native traits measure against the original dwellings, such as whare and fale? Where do they fit? How do they fit? What has been the role of the discourse of appropriation?

The primitive hut seems to provide the basis of a natural perception, uncluttered by cultural baggage where only innate ideas and external necessities prevail in the pursuit of ever purer tectonics and returns to origins. As Joseph Rykwert argued over thirty years ago in On Adam’s House in Paradise: The Idea of the Primitive Hut in Architectural History (1972), the primitive hut provides an image of perpetual reconstruction, a paradigm of building and renewal by return to origins. But perhaps this primitive hut could also be encountered as an exorbitant cultural accumulation of concerns with natural origins, derivative of a Rousseau-inspired Eurocentrism, an overly-cluttered baggage of cultural assumptions and idealisms. Since the publication of Adam’s House, discourses of architecture have engaged in a panoply of critical concerns that question the search for origins and the existence of simple natures. Would Adam’s house, for example, survive the tremors of Grammatology? Could a radical understanding of communitarian ethics be derived from the Hut’s primitive and essential nature?

In what ways are these themes still alive and relevant today? What modes of renewal, return, persistence, continuity exist in today’s architecture here? What further contribution could be made to the theme of Adam’s House?
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David Mitchell (b. 1941) is an architect whose work has figured prominently in New Zealand over the last twenty years. As well as winning numerous other awards, he received the NZ Institute of Architects highest honour— the Gold Medal in 2005, for his contribution to the theory and practice of architecture in NZ. He has designed master plans for large-scale urban areas, university and teachers’ college buildings, schools and community projects, art galleries, office buildings, public housing, apartments, and numerous private houses. Though he travelled and worked overseas for most of the 1990’s he continued with private commissions in New Zealand. He returned to Auckland with Julie Stout to set up practice again in 2000. He has taught design at The University of Auckland School of Architecture, written two books and many articles and presented a 6-part television series on New Zealand architecture.

Julie Stout has 25 years experience in architecture and urban design, both in New Zealand and overseas. She has been involved in a number of large scale masterplanning projects from early Albany Town Centre to Estuary Estates, Maungawhai and Eastern Boat Harbour, Whangaparaoa Peninsula. She also worked on urban projects in China, while working in Hong Kong. She collaborated with others on the Aatea Precinct ‘Outside the Square’ project. Other major projects include the New Gallery for Auckland City Council, Tauranga Art Gallery and 146 apartments in Orakei. She is currently working on the redevelopment of Lopdell House in Titirangi. She is a member of the Auckland Mayor’s Task Force on Urban Design plus a member and past chair of the NZIA Auckland branch’s Urban Issues Group. She was awarded the NZIA President’s Award for Services to Architecture in 2005.

Andrew Patterson is arguably New Zealand’s most internationally recognised architect, for example his firm Patterson Associates Limited is the only New Zealand architectural practice to be published in Phaidon’s 10x10 book of the Worlds Best Architects. He has been described as the ‘Virtuosi of New Zealand architecture’ by Herbert Ypma, Metro Magazine calls him ‘The architect responsible for the sculptural buildings’. Andrew graduated from Auckland School of Architecture in 1987 with its senior prize. At age 28 he received his first National Award for Architecture, and represented New Zealand in The New Breed Architectural Exhibition in Sydney that year. Patterson won the inaugural ‘New Zealand Young Architect of the Year Award’ in 1990 and since then, his Auckland-based firm has gone on to become one of the most respected architectural practices in New Zealand, with an acclaimed 20 year portfolio of buildings ranging from intimate residential projects to large scale infrastructure urban housing and public, commercial and tourism developments.

This year Patterson and Associates was
the most awarded Practice of any Architects in New Zealand gaining four New Zealand Institute of Architects honours including The NZ Supreme Award for Architecture 2008, for the Michael Hill Clubhouse in Arrowtown and being shortlisted into two categories at the recent World Architecture Festival awards, an achievement that is both exciting and humbling.

**Patrick Clifford**, in partnership with Michael Thomson and Malcolm Bowes, established Architectus in the late 1980’s. All three graduated from The University of Auckland in the same year and worked in various practices both in New Zealand and Europe before opening their own office. The work has moved over the years from an initial diet of small houses and house alterations to larger projects – competitions providing the opportunity in the first instance to make that transition.

The work of Architectus has been recognised for its clarity of intent and resolution, its careful reading of context and content and ability to advance a broad cultural agenda. There is a real commitment to research both programmatically and technically. The ongoing success of projects like the Mathematics Statistics and Computer Sciences Building from both a human and material resource perspective attests to this.

The practice has recently developed an international interest with offices in Sydney, Melbourne and Brisbane - Architectus Australasia recently joined a number of other invited firms to submit a proposal for the permanent premises of the International Criminal Court in the Hague.
Although the fale ‘Amelika departs from the structural origins of its most recorded predecessor the nineteenth-century fale Tonga, the contemporary fale archetype remains a legitimate progeny of the fale Tonga. The fale ‘Amelika—an appropriated western suburban house constructed in many modern Tongan villages—embodies many indigenous ideas of the fale Tonga. One particular idea stems from what Joseph Rykwert calls ‘primitive notions’ or a Tongan paradigm that motivates what is built and how it is constructed. Simply, the notion recognises that in elevating status one can survive culturally in Tonga’s hierarchical society. Architecturally, the importance of social status was articulated when the nineteenth century fale rose from the ground for the first time and rested its oval roof structure on pou, or posts. This structural elevation is interpreted by Tongan architect Tomui Kaloni as the alleviation of societal burdens and the rise of social autonomy in Tongan community (Kaloni 1990). Furthermore, the highly crafted lashings and neatly woven walls of the nineteenth century fale Tonga—exceeding the simplicity of earlier structures—showed a concern for good architectural and status appearance. Likewise, the contemporary fale ‘Amelika perpetuates this primitive need to survive culturally, through modes of architectural appropriation, exaggeration and over-embellishment. Essentially, the fale ‘Amelika embodies the appropriated western idea of a dream house. The result, however, is distinctly Tongan: scale is exaggerated beyond the original plan; a four-bedroom suburban home is amplified into a large mansion; and the excessive use of an architectural element—particularly windows or roof alcoves. Indeed such architectural modes help elevate the status of the fale ‘Amelika and its residents. Cultural survival pertains to both fale archetypes; the persistence of such inherent notions—regardless of the departure from primitive forms—validates fale ‘Amelika as a conceptual return to its origins.

Charmaine ‘Ilaiu is a trained architect, avid researcher, creative entrepreneur and developing artist. Her work contributes to the discourse of Pacific Architecture and art in New Zealand and the Pacific islands. She has presented her research at various international and national art and architectural symposiums including Pacific Arts Association hosted in Musée du quai Branly in Paris, 2007. As an architectural designer, she has worked on residential projects in Tonga and recently designed the concept for Manukau Institute of Technology’s Pasifika Centre. Recently selected by Manukau City Council’s ART source creative entrepreneurial programme, Charmaine is establishing a consultancy for Pacific architecture, which she hopes to advance more research-informed architecture that is responsive to our Oceanic region. Whilst practicing architecture with the Auckland firm design TRIBE, Charmaine continues to teach part-time in architectural design at Unitec Institute of Technology and The University of Auckland’s School of Architecture and Planning.
Building the Pacific Hut

Jeremy Treadwell & Mike Austin

The search for a history and theory of architectural origins is characterised by propositions of foundational acts and technological moments. Common to these moments are the ideas of the unsheltered human, the necessity for enclosure and the notion of a technical and creative genesis. Nineteenth century theorists propose that the act of creating shelter is a germination of technological and aesthetic thinking, an architectural ground zero, and that shelter is essential for providing the stasis of settlement. In the Pacific, as Rwkwert’s discussion of the Japanese Ise temple seems to suggest, other circumstances might apply. Here, where the need for shelter as the Western world understands it is not inevitable, an architecture might have other contexts than the enclosing wall, the cliff and the cave or the reproduction of nature itself.

This paper argues that instead of the stasis and enclosure that is embedded in ideas about western architectural origins, in the Pacific an architecture that emerged from mobility and sought openness might be found. It is proposed that rather than being an origin of technical practice, in the Pacific, architecture might itself be the result of transformation from other technologies.

Specifically this paper seeks to connect the tectonics of the Pacific building to the technology of the canoe and the openness of the ocean. With detailed reference to the construction of the Fale Samoa and the Haus Tambaran of the Sepik district of Papua New Guinea, this paper proposes a architecture from the Pacific that is technically and conceptually distinct from the grounded architecture of the west.

Jeremy Treadwell is a lecturer at the School of Architecture at Unitec. He has researched and taught New Zealand Pacific history for six years. His postgraduate thesis examined island settlement architecture in the Hauraki Gulf and in the Cook Islands. Subsequent research topics have focused on the architectural intersection of the colonial and the indigenous in the south western Pacific. He has published papers on the architecture of the New Zealand administration in the Cook Islands and more recently on the waterfront architecture of nineteenth-century Tonga. In 2004 he initiated and managed the project of building a Fale Samoa at the School of Architecture.

Mike Austin was Professor of Architecture at the School of Architecture and Landscape Architecture at Unitec teaching theory and design. He is now involved with the masters by project postgraduate course at Scala. His research area is the architecture of the Pacific Islands about which he has written several papers.
Whiteness, Smoothing and the Origin of Samoan Architecture

Albert Refiti

Samoans believed that the first craftsmen or tufuga were sent from heaven by the god Tagaloa to build a canoe for his daughter Mataiteite. These men had no axes or tools to smooth and remove the roughness in the wood therefore they gnawed the timber with their teeth (Kramer, p.239). In Upolu and Savaii, it is generally believed that the first house to be built was called Faleolo meaning, ‘house made of smooth timber’. This house was built with driftwood found by the maiden Lemalama by the seashore who suggested that they be used by the craftsmen to construct her fathers house and thereby the builders guild or tufuga-fai-fale became known as the ‘family of Lemalama’ or Salemalama.

This paper will explore the origin of Samoan architecture by looking at the attempt in Samoan craft at dressing and the smoothing of materials in the construction and raising of architecture. The paper suggests that in Samoa, what is considered architecture (which has recourse to the first house), must be dressed and be smoothed out. This is not because of a fascination with the ‘return to origins’ and the ‘renewal of human activity’ that Joseph Rykwert suggested as the impulse of human development and architecture in On Adam’s House in Paradise (Rykwert, 1992), but has to do with what Samoans considered ‘proper’ or teu which allows things to be put in order so that they turn towards the ancestors. Space-making in Samoan is inclined towards the production of things that are of whiteness, smoothness and openness because these are to be placed before the ancestor and the community therefore things-towards-the-ancestors must have a directionality, a smoothing out, that binds together the past and present.


Albert Refiti is a PhD candidate at AUT University and has worked in architecture and design in Auckland and London. He has lectured at The University of Auckland’s School of Architecture and Planning, Unitec School of Architecture and Manukau School of Art and Design. He is currently the Head of Department in Spatial Design at AUT University. Albert has published articles and papers on design, architecture and art in a number of publications.
The Contracted Joint

Carl Douglas

Rykwert argues a correlation between Jean-Jacques Rousseau’s account of the origin of civil society and Marc-Antoine Laugier’s account of originary architecture. This paper will speculate on the architectural construction of collective identities with reference to the material practice of jointing; and apply this speculation in a New Zealand context. In his drawing for the 1755 edition of the Essay on Architecture, Laugier’s hut is conspicuous for its structural self-sufficiency. The individual elements: the still-living columns, the cross-beams and the rafters, all rest together naturally, without pins or bonds. Simplicity of structure is a lack of ties.

These joints express the same tension between natural unconstrained freedom and the desire to institute co-dependence which we see at the beginning of Rousseau’s Social Contract (1762): a text that begins with chains, and remains entangled in questions of binding. In place of bondage, Rousseau seeks a relationship of free dependence which inaugurates collective identity and motives. This elemental social relation begins in the family hut, when familial bonds are replaced by the maintenance of a joint contract. The joint Rousseau seeks is held, but not constrained — a freely chosen dependence which could be withdrawn at any time. We might describe this kind of connection as a structural logic of the ‘contracted joint’.

In Looking for the Local (2000) Clarke and Walker discuss the idea that ‘straightforwardness’ is a specific characteristic of architecture in New Zealand. Conspicuously, this argument turns on the condition of the joint, which is seen once again in primitivist terms, and recalls the mythical status accorded to isolation in New Zealand. This paper explores the correlation between the proper jointing of architecture and proper social relations, and concludes by raising the question of the crowd (understood in some accounts as an improperly-jointed social construction) and collective space in New Zealand.

Carl Douglas is a Lecturer in Spatial Design at the School of Art + Design, AUT University, where he teaches Spatial Theory and leads Unit 2, a speculative studio concerned with the intersections of architecture, interior, landscape, infrastructure, and urbanism. Recent research has addressed the Parisian barricades of the nineteenth century; theorised lateness; and explored the spatiality of archaeological sites. He is also a member of the Emergent Geometries experimental practice group, and co-edited Interstices 09.
In his *On Adam’s House in Paradise*, Joseph Rykwert traces successive engagements in the question of the origin of architecture as this question opens to the more primordial one of the origin of being human. Being human and the primitive hut, whether articulated by Vitruvius or Le Corbusier, have a complex and essential relation and one that opens a space for articulating an understanding of the meaning of ‘nature’ in whatever epoch or era.

With this paper I aim to address Rykwert’s reference to Laugier’s *Essay on Architecture* and his understanding of the primitive hut. While Rykwert mentions that Laugier described himself as a *philosophe*, that is to say, associated with what we term the Physiocrats, the paper aims to amplify the significance of the writings of François Quesnay, on the first systematic understanding of what we now call economics. It is not simply that this invention of economics held that all wealth derived from nature, from cultivation and the land, to the extreme exclusion of manufacture as a source of wealth. Nor is it simply that this economics held the fundamental productive unit to be the family. In both of these we would simply see Laugier’s quaint image of the primitive hut as an all too literal manifestation of physiocratic economy.

Rather, with Quesnay, a new horizon of an understanding of the human emerges, one that displaces the rule of Mercantilism that had dominated the seventeenth century, and that relocates the essential nature of the human. There develops, in the 18th century, a new term for understanding precisely what seems to escape the sovereign exercise of power. That term is ‘population.’ This paper will critically assay the extent to which a bifurcation in an understanding of territory, power and sovereignty, that revolves around the human as subject and as population, opens a radical engagement with Laugier’s understanding of ‘origins,’ impacting on the discourse of origins in architecture that unfolds in modernity. Particular reference will be made to Michel Foucault’s 1977-78 lectures at the College de France, *Security, Territory, Population*.

**Mark Jackson** is currently Associate Professor of Design in the School of Art and Design and Associate Dean (Research & Postgraduate) for the Faculty of Design and Creative Technologies at AUT University. Prior to this he has held lecturing positions at the Faculty of Architecture, University of Adelaide and at the Sydney College of the Arts, the University of Sydney. He gained his PhD in Architecture at the University of Sydney in 1994 and was a Visiting Scholar in the Faculty of Architecture at MIT in Boston in 1996, and a Visiting Professor in the Faculty of Architecture, University of Karlsruhe, Germany in 2003-04. He has published in the fields of design history and theory, the visual arts, film and media as well as architecture and landscape architecture. He has had a number of film and video works exhibited internationally. His current research focus is on ethics and design cultures.
Material Origins of New Zealand Modern Architecture

Emina Petrović

One of the most essential aspects of all architecture is the materiality used in its creation. Joseph Rykwert considered this relevance in *On Adam’s House in Paradise* (1972) in relation to Semper’s and Loos’s work. Semper considered the origin of all forms in artefacts as a product of 1) their use or 2) the material used in their making, while Loos asserts that in the primitive the materials’ properties often directly influence the forms which consequently blend naturally with the landscape in the way architecture designed by architects rarely does. Developing these propositions, the basis of all architectural creation and its most constant feature is its materiality. Already the construction system and tectonics of a building are profoundly influenced by this choice and consequently make a significant impact on form and narrative focused around the architecture.

Although in the last 10-15 years one can observe an increase in active engagement with considerations of construction and tectonics as important for architecture, there is still a limited discourse on importance of materiality. Kenneth Frampton’s important works on tectonics, from 1990 and 1995, made passing references to Martin Heidegger’s assertions of relevance of substance without discussing materiality in much detail. From Heidegger’s phenomenological perspective, materiality is relevant as part of our experience of things and events: ‘What is constant in a thing, its consistency, lies in the fact that matter stands together with a form. The thing is formed matter.’ Despite noting of this philosophical framework, materiality has generally not been discussed much by the existing literature on architecture.

This paper will propose a theoretical framework for discussion of materiality as a fundamental principle of all architecture, the one that defines the very essence of its origin, and use the example of modern New Zealand architecture to argue a consequent significant difference in interpretation of any architectural theories due to a different local appreciation of materiality. During 1940s and 1950s New Zealand reflected on international modern architectural developments and despite often declared internationalism of those events, engagement with materiality is one of the important points of difference of New Zealand architecture of this period.

Emina Petrović is an architectural historian with a particular interest in cross-cultural study of architecture. She is a contract lecturer at Victoria University in Wellington where she is currently starting a doctoral study which will examine cross-cultural perceptions of materiality of domestic architecture in relation to well-being.
In his posthumous text, *An Historical Essay on Architecture* (1835), where he discussed and appraised architectural development from antiquity to the Greek Revival, Thomas Hope began:

‘The savage, on the shores of New Zealand, possessed of no goods; indifferent to wife and children; with no care beyond that for his own hideous person, and for that person merely requiring, during the hours of repose, shelter against the fury of the blast or of the bird of prey, digs in the sand, for his living body, a hole little larger than that which he might require for his grave.’ Rousseauesque terms, which were often used to describe the ideal of a natural architecture within the Pacific, are used here to condemn both Pacific people and their architectural traditions. Despite references to a paradisal origin, an examination of late-eighteenth and early-nineteenth century aesthetic theory relating to the architecture of the Pacific reveals ambivalence towards the notion of a natural architecture. Citing pre-1840s architectural texts and accounts of discovery (including the often published images of the pa on the natural arch at Mercury Bay), this paper considers how and why this shift from a positive to an ambivalent relationship occurred.

Robin Skinner teaches history, research methods and Pacific architecture at Victoria University of Wellington. He recently completed a PhD on perception of architecture and New Zealand in mid-nineteenth century Britain.

Paul James teaches design and communication at Victoria University in Wellington.

Conflictual Signs:
Finding Ambivalence to a Natural Architecture

Robin Skinner & Paul James
Images of the South Pacific Islands first appeared in the Australian architectural press during the 1900s. In 1905 *Art and Architecture* published an article on Maori carved houses. This was followed by an image of Islander huts ‘on the fringe of a primeval forest’ taken from *The Savage South Seas* by E. Way Elkington (1907). Months later the same journal published a photograph of Robert Louis Stevenson in Samoa. The paper will examine the appearance of these images and others in relation to a conjunction of media and professional interests in Australia during the early twentieth century. This was a time when an institutionally and theoretically active group were attempting to assert a critical approach to architecture derived from the artistic appreciation of Nature. In a quasi-Ruskinism, Nature was considered the primary source of artistic inspiration, which provided architects and artists with a model of beauty that could be transcribed, through interpretation and invention, into painting and architectural design. For several commentators, the decorative and constructional qualities of Islander building held lessons for those wanting to find the natural principles upon which to envisage a suitable architecture for Australian conditions.

The paper argues that the discourse about architecture and its relation to Nature, and what it drew into its sphere, including images of Pacific Island huts and houses, had an ideological and promotional dimension that makes sense of the elevation of this theme in Australia at this time. The architects involved were attempting to claim creative and intellectual superiority for themselves and their colleagues, especially as authorities on domestic architecture – a current area of lucrative work in Australia. Fellowship with Nature would provide this superiority and the critical authority to judge others. The same architects were also heavily involved with the architectural press as editors and writers, and having control over published discourse allowed for the discursive reproduction of this authority. The paper will show how this set of interests continued and underwent transformation in the 1920s and 1930s.

**Paul Hogben** is a lecturer in architecture at the University of New South Wales. His research focuses on promotional politics and the discourse of architecture over the twentieth century. This research has been published in *Architectural Theory Review and Fabrications*, the journal of the Society of Architectural Historians, Australia and New Zealand. With Xing Ruan he co-edited *Topophilia and Topophobia: Reflections on Twentieth-Century Human Habitat* (Routledge, 2007).
Rykwert’s discussion of Adam’s house begins by recalling speculations on the beginning of architecture. These speculations, such as the one offered by Laugier, rely on stripping away enough cultural baggage to see the moment of cultural conception. The exercise is, apparently, to identify the single architectural operation required to produce culture. Laugier’s minimal construction enables a particular view of culture as both the extension of nature, and a transformation of it. The height of minimalist art practice also relied on stripping away enough cultural baggage to see the moment of cultural conception. Work by artists such as Donald Judd sets out to identify the single cultural operation required to produce art. Many constructions and installations by Judd and his contemporaries also enable a particular view of culture as both an extension and transformation of nature.

This paper will compare cultural operations that both extend and transform nature. It will draw connections, and identify important differences. Laugier and Judd share an interest in minimal interventions, at least intellectually, but they have profoundly different views of the way in which those interventions transform their environment. The former’s reliance on essential qualities is incompatible with the latter’s persistent undoing of cultural assumptions and disciplinary classifications. In environmental conditions that surely suggest minimal interventions are taken seriously, it is an important discussion to have about making architecture in paradise today: the attitude with which we address our natural environment through contemporary architecture is at stake.

Sam Kebbell graduated from Harvard in 1999 and worked for architectural practices in Boston, New York and Amsterdam before the formation of KebbellDaish in 2002 where he is currently a founding principal. At KebbellDaish he has led the design and project delivery on several private houses including the Harte House on Great Barrier Island, high profile commercial interiors including Saatchi & Saatchi Ltd and Davidson Armstrong and Campbell (DAC Legal), and the submission for an invited competition for the Kumutoto precinct of the Wellington Waterfront. The Saatchi and Saatchi project has been widely published and received an NZIA award, a BeST award, and was named the most significant interior at the Wellington Architecture Centre’s 50th Anniversary awards. The project was also exhibited in a group exhibition of interior and landscape related work in Melbourne in 2005. The DAC Legal project has been sole winner in the Commercial and Public Category of the Origin Timber Design Awards, and the Harte House was sole winner in the Open Category of the Cavalier Bremworth Awards. Sam is engaged in ongoing research into contemporary architecture which also forms an integral part of his work in practice at KebbellDaish. This research has centered on the implications of specific architectural tactics for the wider cultural environment. Past research projects have included work on contemporary urbanism, coastal development, and the future of provincial towns. He is also a part-time lecturer at the Victoria University School of Architecture.
Benoît Goetz: A French Reader of Rykwert’s Adam’s House in Paradise

Tim Adams

Joseph Rykwert brought to our attention the primitive hut as a perennial theme in the theory and practice of architecture in *On Adam’s House in Paradise*. Benoît Goetz, senior lecturer in philosophy at the Paul Verlaine University in Metz, picks up and expands this theme in his recent book *La Dislocation: Architecture et Philosophie*. Goetz observes that there could not have been a house in the Garden of Eden (Rykwert himself admits that the Bible never mentions it) because prior to the expulsion from paradise there could not have been any division of places nor any inside or outside. Paradise lacks nothing so every space in it, Goetz concludes, is equivalent to all other spaces. Paradise is in other words an indivisible field of immanence without otherness and without limit.

This explains precisely why the primitive hut or first dwelling is so endlessly fascinating, it conveys the fundamental truth that human beings have acquired the sin of knowledge and have thus become increasingly alienated from the continuum of unknowing nature. The primitive hut seems to hold out the promise of some kind of direct access to nature but it is in fact the very product of our own sophistication. Little wonder then the attraction of the Japanese teahouse in the mountains or the New Zealand bach by the sea, they combine in a singular architectural type both the promise of a therapeutic return to an unknowing and unquestioning nature and are the very product of our sophisticated knowledge about the architectural nature intrinsic to all space. Goetz’s updating and expanding of Rykwert’s original thesis can shed new light on the New Zealand bach and give it the philosophical underpinning that it currently lacks. A twenty-minute talk illustrated by Stephan Sinclair’s play *The Bach* and various baches around New Zealand.

**Tim Adams** teaches history and theory in the School of Architecture and Planning at The University of Auckland where he is also a PhD candidate. His specialist areas include theories of architecture from Vitruvius up until Mark Goulthorpe, the writings of Western philosophers concerning architecture, 20th and early 21st century architecture and urbanism, Japanese architecture, California architecture, and French philosophy after 1968. His essays and translations have appeared in *Interstices* and the German magazine *Der Architekt*. His PhD is on the writings of Daniel Payot, a French philosopher who specialises in the history of philosophical discussions about architecture.
A Big House in the Pacific:
The New Zealand Pavilion at Expo 70, Osaka

Julia Gatley

Expo 70, held in Osaka in 1970, is remembered for the mainstreaming of Metabolist-influenced architecture and the concurrent combustion and demise of the Metabolist Group. In contrast to many of the Expo 70 pavilions, the New Zealand Pavilion was understated. Comparatively small, comparatively simple and comparatively low cost, it was designed by the comparatively little known Ministry of Works architect, John Newnham. While national pavilions at international expositions tend to celebrate and promote the culture, identity and design traditions and innovations of the subject nation, the New Zealand Pavilion was interpreted as having an Asian character, a Japanese character even, its points of reference being seen to lie not with the subject nation, but with the host nation.

Twenty years earlier, Japan-ness had informed a self-consciously locally-inflected New Zealand modernism, of which the Group were the best known protagonists. Their New Zealand modernism combined references to whare, huts and baches with homage to overseas architectures with mature timber building traditions – not only that of Japan, but also Scandinavia and California. Newnham was not associated with the Group. His Japan-ness was not a continuation of theirs.

This paper proposes a New Zealandness in the New Zealand Pavilion – but again, a New Zealandness that was not a continuation of that for which the Group were known. Rather, the paper proposes that the New Zealand Pavilion can be read as a house – a big house – or at closer inspection, five houses, for it in fact comprises five smaller buildings or huts. This is consistent with an ongoing fascination with the house in New Zealand architecture, yet ironically the building met with a lukewarm response from New Zealand’s architectural and design community, who celebrated the New Zealand exhibits but cringed about their island nation being represented on this international stage by a small, simple, low-cost and seemingly Japanese-inflected building. This paper teases out these ironies, analysing the design of the New Zealand Pavilion with reference to period reviews of the building, comments by members of the design team, and recent scholarship on national identity, Japan-ness and New Zealand-ness in architecture. The paper reveals that the apparent simplicity of the New Zealand Pavilion belies a range of complexities and contradictions.

Dr Julia Gatley lectures in the School of Architecture and Planning at The University of Auckland. She has degrees from Victoria University of Wellington and the University of Melbourne, and previously worked at the University of Tasmania and as a New Zealand Historic Places Trust conservation advisor. Julia is DOCOMOMO New Zealand’s secretary and registers coordinator. Her edited book, Long Live the Modern: New Zealand’s New Architecture, 1904-1984, was published by Auckland University Press in 2008.
Thinking and Doing: Situating the Houses of Feron Hay Architects in the Writing of Joseph Rykwert and the Paradise of New Zealand.

Peter Wood

Joseph Rykwert begins *On Adam’s House in Paradise* with the hypothesis that the original house resided inside the garden paradise of Eden. Identified by Rykwert in the biblical references to ‘dressing’ and ‘keeping,’ this theory is at best (by his own admission) substantive only as a ‘shadow’ or ‘outline.’ Rykwert presents an unarguably erudite and highly compelling case for the epistemological role of the primitive hut that recurs throughout architectural discourse, but his is an argument that hinges on the first house, and therefore architecture, originating from within paradise. But what if it were the case that the ‘shadow’ of a house in Eden is nothing more than that; just a trick of light and dark? Moreover that Adam neither required, nor desired, a house in paradise at all?

I offer two positions on this matter, neither of which is particularly flattering to architecture.

Firstly, that paradise (Eden) is the First House; that the garden is the proper place of original dwelling, and that architecture did not emerged against a natural state but that it is a natural state, for which buildings stands as proxies. Secondly, we must also be prepared to entertain the possibility that paradise does not require architecture; that there was no house in Eden, and indeed that the First House was a function of exclusion from paradise. That is, the house originated because the sanctity of Eden was violated, and it continues to be defined by its desire for a return to paradisiacal state.

I would note that neither of these positions undermines the significance of Rykwert’s thinking in *On Adam’s House*, but they do suggest alternate ways to interpret the significance of the motif of the Primitive Hut in architectural discourse. It is beyond the scope of this forum to develop such an argument here, but I would like to enter into this debate by way of an argument in two parts. In part one I make a close reading of chapter one of *On Adam’s House in Paradise* in order to show how Rykwert’s hypothesis of the Hut in Eden creates a set of values that create a stable – if contested – alliance between building and nature. In part two I compare some well publicized New Zealand houses by Feron Hay Architects to this position. Despite their celebrated International Style mannerisms and woodland settings I argue that these projects frequently display a particularly parochial insecurity toward building and nature. I find in the houses of Feron Hay examples of a counter origin for architecture in the New Zealand where Nature dominates architecture’s validation, and the houses cited genuflect to a view that architecture has been denied a place in paradise.