

Wang Shu 2012 Laureate Essay

The Infinite Spontaneity of Tradition

By Grace Ong Yan

Through the thick, humid air in the seaside city of Ningbo, China an unexpectedly singular architecture stands out from a bland commercial district. Comprised of an accumulation of materials, the Ningbo Historic Museum rises up from the ground as a squared geometry, then angles outward towards the top. "Architecture as mountains"¹ is how its architect, Wang Shu describes his design for the Ningbo Historic Museum. The matter-of-fact, yet monumental manner in which his architecture sits on the barren plaza is no mistake. Envisioning a natural formation is, in fact, a re-instatement of the rural past into what has become a hyper-urbanized context, devoid of history. The museum's site is a flat, paved landscape, dotted by nondescript buildings. By creating an artificial mountain, Wang has shaped an architectural topography that is filled with an abundance of nature-inspired experiences. The building massing appears monumental but once inside, Wang's architecture is focused around experience. The museum as a mountain is composed of three "valleys," four "caves," four sunken courtyards, a body of water with reed covered banks, as well as a mountainous topography. Wang expresses the building's key moments of space and circulation as natural phenomena. Understanding Ningbo Historic Museum as a landscape is key to perceiving the project's meaning. Movement through the building is not expeditious, but slow and thoughtful, as if we have been transported to a past, pre-technological time. Wang has imagined his architecture as a kind of Chinese garden where a likely scenario involves a thoughtful scholar meandering through the landscape. The building's circulation was conceived as "a labyrinth of pathways,"² which means that multiple paths interconnect with public spaces. As a result, inhabiting the building is wonderfully cinematic.

The exterior of the Ningbo Historic Museum was conceived as a kind of mountainous topography. Through different devices, Wang Shu's allusion to nature occurs on both the interior and the exterior of his building. Its walls have been built with what Wang calls, "Chinese vernacular sustainable construction."³ In response to the large-scale demolitions and reconstructions in China, millions of pieces of bricks and roof tiles from different decades are salvaged from demolition sites all over the province to construct the new building.⁴ The collected building rubble is used in the construction of new walls with the rammed earth wall technique. While quarried earth is traditionally used to fill the walls, Wang has re-invented the technique by using rubble from demolished villages as fill. It is at once a rejection of China's demolition and renewal projects, and a way to ensure continuity of the region's history in its new construction. Additionally, the appeal of rammed earth walls as a sustainable building technology is recognized as intelligent and timely.

Another major project designed by Amateur Architecture Studio, Wang Shu's architectural practice with his partner and wife, architect Lu Wenyu, is the Xingshan Campus of the China Academy of Art, in Hangzhou China. Wang Shu has served as the head of China Academy of Art's architecture department at the since 2000. Xingshan Campus is not contained as a single mass as at Ningbo, but an accumulation of more than twenty discrete buildings that make up a campus for studying, working, and living. Wang's approach was to allow the pastoral site, composed of a large hill, rivers, and trees, to inform how the architecture would be situated. As a result, nature and architecture not only co-exist but also complement one other. While Xingshan Campus is vast in size, its scale does not feel this way and can be described as an architecture of accumulation and variation. While the complex demonstrates a consistency of design, it also possesses the bricolage of a rural village in its use of a variety of local and available materials and siting. Again, as with the Ningbo Historic Museum and other projects, Wang utilized Chinese vernacular sustainable construction. Bricks and tiles collected from the Zhejiang province which would have been otherwise treated as garbage, were reused.

Xingshan Campus' planning is not grid-based, but a tight layout of scattered architecture. This approach, like that of the Greek tradition, gives experiential views of buildings as three-dimensional rather than as frontal. As well, picturesque views are offered through idiosyncratically shaped openings. Through these openings, one sees compositions of building facades, and courtyards, as well

The Infinite Spontaneity of Tradition (continued)

as glimpses of the fertile landscape beyond. These framed views are rich and complex, highlighting the variety of light, materials, and shapes seen throughout the campus. Building profiles and roofs are reminiscent of Chinese temple roofs, yet firmly contemporary. At the Xingshan campus, architecture has achieved the variance found only in nature. Textures, shapes, and colors are defined by the natural landscape and the architecture.

The three defining aspects of Wang Shu's approach to architecture are his counteractions against mainstream architecture in China, the inspiration of nature, and a philosophy of architecture as a house. Wang's architecture, which has so far been built only in China, is critical of his country's rapid modernization. He considers China's recent development as sprinting forward, while leaving behind the country's long and rich history. He views the professional architect in China as complicit with the country's brash modernization. In opposition, Wang honors the past traditions of China as a culture and a place by incorporating them into his architecture. While his architecture speaks against a deleterious approach to modernization, and looks to the past, it is in all respects, utterly contemporary. To be an "amateur" architect, as the name of Wang's practice Amateur Architecture Studio states, is to practice with an alternate process away from the systematizing machine that professional architecture has become in China. Wang's "amateur" approach boldly maneuvers against the grain. Practicing architecture is more about handicraft than technology, nature rather than the man-made, vernacular rather than monumental, and surprisingly, humanity rather than architecture. Wang thoughtfully redefines the practice of architecture instead of having the architectural profession define him.

Secondly, Wang Shu writes and lectures about his projects in juxtaposition with nature depicted in the traditional Chinese landscape paintings of the Song dynasty. By doing so, Wang encourages a landscape city model for China. He does not view China in the monolithic nationalist view, but instead as a country of localities. The landscape paintings are largely void of man-made structures, containing only elements of nature. In fact, Wang points out that the Zhejiang province, where he lives, consists of 70% mountains, 20% water, and only 10% buildable land.⁵ This kind of landscape has cultivated a strong relationship with nature in what has historically been an agriculture-based society. This underscores the importance of the crucial relationship of nature in Wang's architecture in which man-made structures do not dominate nature, but instead the reverse. Wang's architecture relates to nature and embodies those rich experiences found in it. Cities in Wang's view should be primarily natural. As such, the city and its architecture should not be distinct from nature and the landscape, but instead, unified.

Thirdly, Wang asserts the importance of houses, rather than buildings. That his interest lies in the common, non-descript house is important. It conveys a stake in the vernacular, instead of the spectacular, and in the domestic or functional, rather than the grand. Wang's worldview is farsighted. As a young architect, Wang chose to break with a typical career path and worked for a number of years with craftsmen on building sites to learn traditional building methods. It was in part because of this experience that he considers architecture as only one small aspect of humanity. The simplicity and triviality of houses exposes architecture as humble. In houses, everyday living occurs as the direct interaction between people and a built form. Houses embody an "infinitely spontaneous order"⁶ that Wang aspires to achieve in his architecture. Its inhabitants, and perhaps even humanity as a whole embodies an impromptu aspect of architecture. Wang's architecture is not meant to control the behavior of its inhabitants, but instead cultivate the human spirit. His interest in houses as he approaches the design of even the largest-scale projects is one that breeds a down-to-earth, authenticity of space that is sorely missing in much of contemporary architecture.

In choosing Wang Shu, the Pritzker Prize jury, supported by Martha Thorne, the Prize's executive director since 2005, and Associate Dean for External Relations at IE University's School of Architecture in Madrid, Spain, gave weight to the kind of critical mind that is necessary to lead architecture culture, especially in our increasingly developed and globalized world, in discerning what matters and what does not. Wang's work grapples with an inherited zeitgeist, which, as his work reminds us, is still fraught with issues of modernization and the discrepancies between individualism and collectivity.

The Infinite Spontaneity of Tradition (continued)

Having won the Pritzker Prize at age 48, Wang Shu has a good deal of his career, and most likely, his best work ahead of him. The jury drew together such diverse individuals as 2002 laureate Glenn Murcutt; 2004 laureate Zaha Hadid; architect and educator, Juhani Pallasmaa; architect and educator, Yung Ho Chang; U.S. Supreme Court Justice, Stephen Breyer; Chairman of the Trustees of the Serpentine Gallery, Lord Peter Palumbo (Chairman); architect, Alejandro Aravena; and architectural editor, Karen Stein. The jury deliberated Wang's prize in a unanimous decision. The decision to choose an architect who is so young in comparison to other laureates, was not unintentional, as seen from Breyer's compelling comment: "In awarding the Pritzker Prize to Wang Shu, a young Chinese architect, the jury has sought to both reward past work that meets the Prize's high standards and to send a message of optimism, recognizing and encouraging the promise of similar work in the future."⁷ Since the prize is awarded to architects who have already built a substantial body of work, the median age of laureates tends to be at least a decade older than Wang. This makes his next steps and future all the more important as they are more likely to be scrutinized.

The immediate effects of winning a Pritzker Prize are intense. Six months after the March 2012 announcement, Wang was still inundated with requests from the media and potential clients from all over the world. This intense attention led to a frustrating inability for Wang to accept new projects. However, he was optimistic that in another six months, he would be able to work again, stating that he needed a "balance of the heart," for his life "to become slower, so I can think. Now [there are] too many things around me."⁸ As Wang's life becomes more settled and Amateur Architecture Studio can focus on new projects, it will be fascinating to see how "the promise of similar work in the future" materializes. While we cannot know what Wang's future holds, we can look to the post-Pritzker Prize work of previous laureates to glean insight. How does the laureate's career change after winning the Pritzker Prize? Does the kind of commissions a laureate accept typically change? Does it affect their architectural approach? These are all important questions to consider.

In 1992, Kenneth Frampton declared a "new phase of activity" in Alvaro Siza's post-Pritzker career. (Incidentally, Wang Shu credits Alvaro Siza as a past laureate who has influenced his work.) Frampton illustrated his optimism with a real-life situation in which Siza's new found prestige would potentially bolster his struggle with road engineers who had built a main road that deprived his design for the University of Porto architecture school of an important river frontage. Frampton describes Siza's post-Pritzker career as a "new phase of activity,"⁹ writing that "now commissions for one large building after another land on his desk from every quarter, with the result that a new frustration emerges: namely the difficulty of having too much work."¹⁰ Since then, Siza has navigated the predicament of too much work by leveraging the demand for his work with greater selectivity. Wang Shu is now faced with a similar situation of having too much work. He has stated that the "studio accepted one new project every year. But now after I won the prize, one thing changed, suddenly I have more and more clients."¹¹ Despite an express desire for his practice and life to remain the same,¹² something inevitably had to change: "so now I accept two new projects every year. 100% increased."¹³ How will Wang's practice grow with an increased load of projects, given that he prefers the less hectic pre-Pritzker pace of his practice? The careful balance of his practice will be challenged in this next phase of activity.

For some, the win of a Pritzker Prize brings a crucial element of confidence; confidence that is felt by both the architect and the public. Perhaps Swiss architect and 2009 Pritzker laureate Peter Zumthor said it best when he admitted that the prize gave him a sense of quiet. He believed that winning a Pritzker Prize made people question him less, and gave him more of a base to stand on.¹⁴ When Zumthor won the Prize in 2009, he had already built a number of stunning buildings, including the Kolumba Art Museum and the Brother Klaus Field Chapel in 2007, the Thermal Bath in Vals, in 1996, and the Bregenz Art Museum in 1997. Similarly, when Wang Shu won the Pritzker Prize, he had also already built a number of exquisite buildings, and was renown in China, as well as a rising star in American and European architecture and academic circles. Wang has already noticed an elevated sense of confidence on the part of the Chinese, if not the global public. "I think the difference is," said Wang, "before I won the prize, the clients who love my work look for me. Now after the prize, so many

The Infinite Spontaneity of Tradition (continued)

clients [are] looking for me. Now they understand me, suddenly they have the confidence."¹⁵ This confidence may be a critical ingredient that can catalyze the important client-architect dynamic and could potentially form the basis for career-defining architecture.

After winning, Pritzker Prize laureates' tend to experience a new phase of activity and a more complete sense of confidence. But in the case of Wang Shu, the critical question to consider is how his particular *regional* or *vernacular* approach to architecture will accommodate this new phase of activity, especially as he is poised to build outside of China for the first time. Wang Shu's work as a Chinese architect in the contemporary Chinese condition is significant. The specificity of his architecture in China is what makes his work truly powerful. The question remains of how Wang Shu's architecture, which is so rooted in Chinese history, memory, and craftsmanship, will evolve on foreign soil. Wang does not consider his use of rammed earth wall construction as exclusively linked to Chinese traditions.¹⁶ He believes this to be a misunderstanding of his work. In fact, he is quite interested in the universality of tradition. For example, he explained that rammed earth wall is common to other cultures, among them, French and Italian traditions.¹⁷ In this sense, Wang's architecture in China could be seen as a testing ground for future work in foreign countries.

Wang Shu's architecture is not the first to address the issue of place and displacement. Throughout history, architects have grappled with this issue. The geographic dislocation of architecture has been considered from various viewpoints. Nineteenth-century architect Eugène Viollet-le Duc, raised the idea that architecture was attached to place. The local vernacular is created out of a city's culture, its social ideas, and its economic and political systems. Therefore, not to build in the vernacular of a place would have an uprooting, and displacing effect. Yet placelessness in architecture has appeared in history, manifesting itself as a systematized approach to architecture, the kind that Wang Shu sees China as undertaking in the planning of new cities. It was also with just this kind of approach that Austrian architect Fisher von Erlach produced a vision for a new Vienna. His 1721 *Entwurf einer historischen Architektur* demonstrated a universal style for the Austrian capital through great panoramic views of fictional places created with appropriated monuments from other lands. By assembling images with real architectural artifacts from far away places, von Erlach's represented Vienna as a new world capital. However, this collection of foreign architecture did not support an anthropological acceptance of culture, leaving his vision and architecture marginalized. What was lacking from this view was praxis: the life of a culture, not as an icon, but an everyday culture. Fisher von Erlach offered grand proposals of how architecture could become global. This is not so different from contemporary building in China, where planning decisions are made at an executive level, and then implemented. The designs of foreign architects are plentiful in Chinese cities—unfortunately, they lack great familiarity and insight of the place.

Wang Shu's approach to China's new urban landscape shares a similar viewpoint with the work of nineteenth-century architect Gottfried Semper. In contrast to Fisher von Erlach, Semper viewed architecture with an ethnographic approach, which he employed in his observations of the world market of the 1851 Great Exhibition of the Works of Industry of all Nations, housed in the Crystal Palace. Here, Semper was less interested in what most visitors came to see, which were the most advanced products of manufacturing. Instead, he was more interested in the least technological products, those objects that were primitive and handmade. Semper was interested in re-evaluating architecture's lost origins and developed his theories based on this premise in *The Four Elements of Architecture*. At the Great Exhibition, Semper was most interested in the exhibit of a primitive Caribbean hut, as it was an ideal example of his theory. Inherent in Semper's work was a respect for the accomplishment of less developed cultures and the praxis of everyday life. His thesis that "architecture everywhere borrowed its types from pre-architectural conditions of human settlement,"¹⁸ is echoed in Wang Shu's approach. Within the transformative nineteenth-century context, Semper's interest in primitivism was both a critique of and a suggestion for the proponents of industrial production. The juxtaposition of high and low culture or of industrialized and non-industrialized culture, held much potential for new forms of production.

The Infinite Spontaneity of Tradition (continued)

Like Gottfried Semper, Wang Shu is interested in primitive culture and the praxis of everyday life. While the nineteenth and the twenty-first centuries are divided by time, the contrast between industrial progress and non-industrial life still exists today, especially in China. For example, Wang has adapted primitive processes into contemporary construction, such as the use of rammed earth walls with artifacts of demolished rural Chinese villages. Also like Semper, Wang's interest in the primitive is a critique of how industrialization has left a sense of humanity behind, and at the same time, a suggestion for serious re-evaluation. In the nineteenth century, the modular technology of the Crystal Palace represented a broad and accelerated push to adapt the new industrialization. Similarly, today, China's rapid industrialization has given rise to anonymous cities filled with foreign architecture. Wang Shu is outspoken about his rejection of this situation. His architecture provides an antidote to it and proposes an acceptance of a new kind of technology that fuses the primitive and contemporary. In this way, Wang Shu differs from Gottfried Semper, as his practice is as contemporary as it is introspective of past cultures. While Semper was not able to achieve his theories in practice, Wang Shu has been exceedingly successful in realizing his thinking through built work.

Historically, the Pritzker Prize has been awarded to a wide range of architects, whose works represent a broad spectrum of architectural thinking. An impressive aspect of the Pritzker Prize laureates is that their built works are richly varied.¹⁹ Perhaps there is a kind of fervent individualism that the Prize advocates. Along those lines, there is a distinctive quality that a few laureates share—that of regional specificity, which demonstrates an interest in vernacular tradition. These architects' built works are not only located almost exclusively in their home countries, but the works emerge, to an extent, from their native culture as well. These laureates include Eduardo Souta de Moura of Portugal, Paulo Mendes da Rocha of Brazil, Glenn Murcutt of Australia, Sverre Fehn of Norway, Gottfried Böhm of Germany, Luis Barragan of Mexico, Peter Zumthor of Switzerland and Tadao Ando of Japan. While these architects bring great cultural depth and knowledge to their built work, they do not tend to build in far away places. These architects' works possess a kind of regionalism or place specificity; architecture deeply embedded in a particular place. At the same time, these architects' renown, not least of all supported by winning a Pritzker Prize, has certainly led to opportunities to build on the international stage. This is a challenge that Wang Shu faces in the coming years. Other Pritzker Prize winners have taken on this challenge with degrees of success. The works of Tadao Ando and Peter Zumthor come to mind. Tadao Ando, who on the Prize in 1995, began building outside Japan after 2000 with projects such as the Pulitzer Foundation for the Arts in St. Louis, Missouri, the Modern Art Museum in Fort Worth, Texas, and the Langen Foundation in Neuss, Germany. While the continuity of his work is apparent, there are certainly differences to manage, especially in the craftsmanship of concrete. Peter Zumthor, another laureate whose work concerned with place, has begun to realize his architecture outside of Switzerland as well. His early projects like Saint Benedict Chapel, Thermal Bath, and Swiss Sound Box were inextricably situated in his native Switzerland. Since then, he has built projects in Germany and Austria. Most recently, in 2011, Zumthor completed the Serpentine Pavilion in London, and Steilneset Witch Trial Memorial in Norway, with Louise Bourgeois. Zumthor's architectural approach continues to evolve as to how his careful approach to site, tradition, and cultural context are incorporated into design outside of his homeland.

In addition to Alvaro Siza, Wang Shu has acknowledged Aldo Rossi and Tadao Ando, as past Pritzker Prize laureates who have influenced his work. Though Wang has not mentioned 1981 laureate, James Stirling, he is another architect whose ideas share great resonance with Wang's. In 1957, Stirling expressed interest in "a reassessment of indigenous and usually anonymous building."²⁰ At this time, the historicist ethos of Neo-Palladianism had become worn out in the view of some architects. There was a new excitement surrounding a reaction away from it, and both primitive and vernacular architectures were alternate precedents being seriously considered. "Stonehenge was more significant," declared Stirling, "than the architecture of Sir Christopher Wren."²¹ Instead of looking to a monument of nineteenth century architecture, Stirling's attention was directed to Neolithic, vernacular architecture. Perhaps what stimulated his interest in something like Stonehenge was "a reevaluation of the experience embodied in the use of traditional methods and materials."²² Stirling's interest

The Infinite Spontaneity of Tradition (continued)

is echoed in Wang Shu's work. Wang's approach to architectural experience as rooted in natural environments, and his use of the traditional rammed earth wall both illustrate Stirling's points. Both architects in the midst of various trends in architectural theories, sought out sources that pursued the ideas of truth and origin in architecture. Like Stirling, Wang studies the vernacular sources that most of his contemporaries do not.

Beyond sources, the architectures of Wang Shu and James Stirling share further sensibilities. Stirling's work turns away from orthogonal proportions and basic geometrical elements, and instead develops an interest in what he called, "variability found in nature."²³ He also used the term "dynamic cellularism," defined as the assemblage of units in terms of growth and elements, which are repetitive or varied, and more akin to patterns of crystal formation or biological divisions than to the static rigidity of a structural grid. Stirling's terms, *variability* and *cellularism*, are incredibly apt ways to describe Wang Shu's work. At Wang's Ningbo History Museum, the rubble of recycled bricks and tiles that constitute the rammed earth wall are patterned in a compartmental and cellular, yet varied manner. The walls are an assemblage of units that thrive on variability. Wang's Tiles Hill Reception Center on the Xiangshan campus is another project that demonstrates variability. The plan of Tiles Hill is an elongated, irregular shape containing areas that constantly shift geometries. The shift occurs in response to the river, trees and hills with which the building shares a landscape. Instead of following a structural grid, Tiles Hill Reception Center is defined by varied repetitive patterns, reminiscent of, as Stirling stated, irregular crystal formation patterns. At the Ningbo Tengtou Pavilion, Wang's design began from eleven section drawings that describe walking through irregular spaces or in his term, "natural shaped caves."²⁴ Here, architecture offers an experience typical to landscapes or gardens—which, as natural environments, are fluid and changing, rather than fixed and stable. Stirling pointed out how modern architecture in the 1930s had "encountered the infinite idiosyncrasies of locality,"²⁵ an idea that Wang Shu's architecture in the 21st century has also embraced. But while Stirling understood tradition and invention as divided, Wang does not. For example, Stirling wrote about "The Old World exploiting, and contorting, traditional ways and means," to emphasize his viewpoints on tradition in comparison to his views on invention where he notes "the New World inventing techniques and developing the appropriate expression of the modern attitude."²⁶ Stirling's ideas are similar to Wang Shu's work, but with an important difference. For Wang Shu, tradition and invention are no longer divided, but instead have negotiated a common ground. His architecture blends tradition and invention, through the unique synthesis of resistance towards the status quo, an emphasis on nature and landscape in cities, as well as an interest in the common house.

Just six months after winning the prize, Wang's influence has already begun to instigate cultural change within his home country. "For the common Chinese, they know building. [But] People had no concept about architecture. [For example] people know you are an architect, but outside of this, they don't know the meaning of *what is architecture*."²⁷ When he was deciding on architecture as a career path, others "thought I must be crazy, because so few ordinary Chinese people really know anything about the study of architecture."²⁸ But Wang Shu's winning of the Pritzker Prize in architecture has started to change this. Even in the first months after winning the prize, Wang has already seen an awakening of the Chinese public to what architecture truly is. Children recognize Wang as he walks down the street and tell their parents that they want to grow up and become architects, just like him. Wang Shu's Pritzker Prize may be just the catalyst necessary to open the minds of the mainstream architectural profession to how an alternate approach to China's development can be realized—a vision forward that takes tradition, humanity, and invention into account.

The Infinite Spontaneity of Tradition (continued)

¹ Wang Shu quoted in "Wang Shu & Lu Wenyu, Ningbo History Museum," *GA Document 112(2010): Featuring: China Today* (Tokyo: A.D.A. Edita, 2010), 95.

² Ibid.

³ Wang Shu quoted in "Wang Shu & Lu Wenyu, Xiangshan Campus, China Academy of Art," *GA Document 112(2010): Featuring: China Today* (Tokyo: A.D.A. Edita, 2010), 112

⁴ Ibid.

⁵ Wang Shu, "Geometry and Narrative of Natural Form," (2011 Kenzo Tange Lecture, Graduate School of Design, Harvard University, November 4, 2011).

⁶ Amateur Architecture Studio's profile overview, accessed March 2013, <http://www.chinese-architects.com/en/amateur/en/>

⁷ "Jury Quotes," *2012 Pritzker Architecture Prize Media Kit*, p.7, Pritzker Prize, accessed August 2012, http://www.pritzkerprize.com/media/2012_media

⁸ Wang Shu, Phone interview by author, August 20, 2012.

⁹ Kenneth Frampton, "In Praise of Siza," in *Design Quarterly 156* (Minneapolis: Walker Art Center, 1992), 5.

¹⁰ Ibid.

¹¹ Wang Shu, Phone interview by author, August 20, 2012.

¹² Ibid. When asked about the kinds of changes his practice was experiencing, Wang Shu stated, "I don't want to change."

¹³ Ibid.

¹⁴ Peter Zumthor, "Pritzker Winner Zumthor on Serpentine Pavilion," interview by Farah Nayeri, Bloomberg TV, July 4, 2011.

<http://www.bloomberg.com/video/71837590-pritzker-winner-zumthor-on-serpentine-pavilion.html>

¹⁵ Wang Shu, Phone interview by author, August 20, 2012.

¹⁶ Ibid.

¹⁷ Ibid.

¹⁸ Gottfried Semper, "Science, Industry, and Art," in *The Four Elements of Architecture and Other Writings*, trans. Harry Francis Mallgrave and Wolfgang Hermann (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1989) 133.

¹⁹ For the most complete account of the Pritzker Prize laureates from 1979-2010, see *Architect: The Pritzker Prize Laureates In Their Own Words*, ed. Ruth Peltason and Grace Ong Yan (New York: Blackdog and Levanthal, 2010)

²⁰ James Stirling, "Regionalism and Modern Architecture," in *Architecture Culture 1943-1968*, ed. Joan Ockman (Columbia Books of Architecture/Rizzoli, 1993) 243.

²¹ Ibid.

²² Ibid.

²³ Ibid., 245.

²⁴ Wang Shu quoted in "Wang Shu & Lu Wenyu, Expo 2010 Shanghai China—Ningbo Tengtou Pavilion," *GA document 112(2010): Featuring: China Today*, (Tokyo: A.D.A. Edita, 2010) 134.

²⁵ James Stirling, "Regionalism and Modern Architecture," in *Architecture Culture 1943-1968*, ed. Joan Ockman (New York: Columbia Books of Architecture/Rizzoli, 1993) 248.

²⁶ Ibid.

²⁷ Wang Shu, Phone interview by author, August 20, 2012.

²⁸ Ibid.

© The Hyatt Foundation / The Pritzker Architecture Prize

For more information, please contact:

Edward Lifson
Director of Communications
The Pritzker Architecture Prize
edwardlifson@pritzkerprize.com
+1 312 919 1312