

ORAL HISTORY OF STANLEY TIGERMAN

Interviewed by Betty J. Blum

Compiled under the auspices of the
Chicago Architects Oral History Project
The Ernest R. Graham Study Center for Architectural Drawings
Department of Architecture
The Art Institute of Chicago
Copyright © 2003
The Art Institute of Chicago

This manuscript is hereby made available to the public for research purposes only. All literary rights in the manuscript, including the right to publication, are reserved to the Ryerson and Burnham Libraries of The Art Institute of Chicago. No part of this manuscript may be quoted for publication without the written permission of The Art Institute of Chicago.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Preface	iv
Outline of Topics	vi
Oral History	1
Appendix: Selected References	253
Appendix: Curriculum Vitæ	258
Index of Names and Buildings	260

PREFACE

Ask anyone to name a living Chicago architect and, chances are, they will name Stanley Tigerman. How and why did Tigerman become one of Chicago's best known and most often-quoted architects? Born during the depression with little familial encouragement and few resources to study architecture, Tigerman managed by his driving ambition and sheer wit to go to Yale, where he received his bachelor's and master's degrees in record time. Determination to achieve is a cornerstone of Tigerman's personality and it is reflected in his kaleidoscopic range of projects and his multi-faceted career. He is a popular practitioner, an effective though controversial educator, co-founder of an alternative school of design education, writer on many topics, master cartoonist, and creative exhibition designer. Among Tigerman's diverse undertakings has been his leadership in the thought-provoking activities of the Chicago Seven, a group of young architects who, in the 1970s and early 1980s, fought against the prevailing norm and changed the direction of architecture in Chicago. Noted architectural historian Carl Condit has said about Tigerman, "I think his value for architecture in Chicago has been precisely that he's been a major figure in freeing it from the ruling Mies-Skidmore mode, which has been done to death." It is the intention of this oral history to take a closer look at Tigerman's contribution to the oftentimes controversial activities of the Chicago Seven and his participation in Chicago's architectural community in order to discover how and why he came to be the important force in architecture that he is today.

To tape record Tigerman's story in his own words, we met in his office on August 10, 11, 13, and 14, 1998, where, in almost ten hours on 7 ninety-minute cassettes, we recorded his recollections. He spoke about his family background, how he came to study architecture at Yale with Paul Rudolph, his early jobs with George Fred Keck, Skidmore Owings and Merrill and others, architects who have influenced his work, his teaching jobs, and his opinions and ideas. The transcript has been minimally edited to maintain the spirit and flow of the original spoken narrative. Tigerman's review of the transcript brought forth a few corrections and deletions as well as some additional comments. Selected references that I found helpful in preparing this interview are appended in two sections: those of general interest about the Chicago Seven, and those written by Tigerman and others about his work.

Tigerman's transcribed oral history is available for study in the Ryerson and Burnham Libraries at The Art Institute of Chicago, as well as on the CAOHP webpage on The Art Institute of Chicago's website: www.artic.edu

Thanks go to several people who contributed to bringing this oral history to completion. First, to Stanley Tigerman, for his willingness to commit time to record his oral history while also engaged with the demands of his busy office and school. In that Tigerman has donated some of his papers to the Art Institute, I hope this oral history will extend one's knowledge and understanding of his work. Special thanks go to the Graham Foundation for Advanced Study in the Fine Arts, without whose funding support this group study on the Chicago Seven may not have been documented. To Katherine Reid I am grateful for her transcribing help, and to Annemarie van Roessel, I am deeply appreciative for all she did to shape this document with her usual good judgment, care and skill in transcribing and in formatting this text for print and electronic publication.

Betty J. Blum
April 2003

OUTLINE OF TOPICS

Family Background and Early Influences	1
How Tigerman was Admitted to Yale University	8
Study at Yale with Paul Rudolph	12
Working in the Office of Keck & Keck	17
Tigerman's Work Ethic	21
Tigerman's First Office: Tigerman, Rudolph & Young	24
Robert Bruce Tague and the Institute of Design	27
Military Service in the United States Navy	31
More About Yale	34
Working for A.J. Del Bianco and in the Office of Milton Schwartz	38
Work and Colleagues at Skidmore, Owings & Merrill	41
Working in the Office of Harry Weese	56
An Evening With Mies	59
About Serge Chermayeff	61
Co-founding the Office of Tigerman & Koglin	63
American Institute of Architects Planning and Urban Affairs Committee and the City	66
Woodlawn Gardens Project and Thoughts About Housing	71
About John Entenza	77
Anti-Semitism and Architecture	79
More About John Entenza	84
More About Woodlawn Gardens and Projects with a Social Concern	85
About Muzharul Islam and Work in Pakistan	89
Resignation and Reinstatement in Pakistan	94
Fazlur Khan	102
Projects and Possible Influences	104
Inland Steel Building and Skidmore, Owings & Merrill	107
Harlow By the Lake and a Design by Paul Schweikher	110
Phases in Tigerman's Design Work	113
Faith and Interpretation in Architecture	114
Relationship Between Writing and Building	118
Designs for Zonolite Advertisements	123

Publishing and Writing	128
Responding to Change	134
Birth and Activities of the Chicago Seven	136
Continuing Activities of the Chicago Seven	146
Seven Becomes Eleven	161
The Chicago Architectural Club	162
Reflections	165
Teaching at UIC: Thoughts About Architectural Education and Educators	169
Publications	190
Difficulties and Departure at UIC	199
Archeworks	205
"Late Entries" Exhibition	220
The Venice Biennale	226
More About Mies and the Miesians	229
Reflections	231
More Exhibitions	232
Symposia: The Charlottesville and Chicago Tapes	235
More About Projects with a Social Cause	239
The American Institute of Architects	242
Marketing	244
Impact of the Chicago Seven	247

Stanley Tigerman

Blum: Today is August 10th, 1998, and I am with Stanley Tigerman in his office in Chicago. Stanley was born in 1930 in Chicago. Some years after a brief stint at MIT, Stanley received his architectural credentials at Yale—his bachelor's in 1960 and master's in 1961. Stanley worked for large, midsize, and small firms before organizing his own firm with Norman Koglin in 1962. The partnership ended in 1964 when Stanley founded Stanley Tigerman and Associates.

Tigerman: No, Stanley Tigerman, Architect, originally.

Blum: And today known as Tigerman McCurry.

Tigerman: Right.

Blum: Stanley has pursued a multi-faceted career as a practitioner, as an educator, as the ringleader of the Chicago Seven, the gadfly of the profession, publicist without equal, a writer, cartoonist, artist, and sculptor. The list is long. As a practitioner, Stanley Tigerman's stylistic vocabulary is "schizophrenic" by his own admission. It seems always to be personal, an idiosyncratic expression and at times very witty. Stanley, you've done it all. As an educator, you have been widely recognized for your excellent and challenging methods in the classroom but as an administrator/director your methods have been controversial.

Tigerman: Fair. If you're not controversial, perhaps you're not doing much.

Blum: Today, you are the co-founder and the director of Archeworks, a new concept in alternate architectural design education. In the mid-seventies, you and a

few of your colleagues attracted a small group of architects who, like you, wanted to overturn the hold that Mies and his followers had on the mainstream of architecture and to move architecture in new, fresh directions.

Tigerman: But Mies was dead. It wasn't Mies, it was his followers.

Blum: Well, wasn't it the stranglehold that the Miesian vocabulary had on mainstream thinking that you wanted to challenge?

Tigerman: When Mies was alive there was no stranglehold. But the followers...

Blum: Your effort came in the midst of one of the most tumultuous times in American history. It was a time of disenchantment, the status quo was under attack. How and why the Chicago Seven came into being, what they did, and what they didn't do, is what I hope you will explore. Before we do, may we go back to a more formative period in your life and learn what led you to architecture? You said, in an interview with Barbaralee Diamondstein, that as a thirteen year-old you read *The Fountainhead* and that book really inspired you to become an architect. Is that what you would say today?

Tigerman: Yeah.

Blum: Did you have any closer influences? From your mother, your father, your grandfather?

Tigerman: No.

Blum: Friends of your family or teachers?

Tigerman: No, no. There was a portrait painter on my mother's side of the family. But, I knew him only slightly. He actually did a portrait of me when I was twelve—I don't remember, twelve, eleven, ten, something like that, maybe ten. But

there was no one who had any clue about architecture. I didn't have any access to those sorts of influences at all.

Blum: You were born and raised in Chicago?

Tigerman: Right.

Blum: Do you remember being attracted by any construction site or any building that had already been built?

Tigerman: No, because my family didn't know anything about architecture. And I didn't. My family was very poor and so I didn't have access to culture.

Blum: No natural interests?

Tigerman: No, there was *The Fountainhead*. Yes, if I looked back, I could say, sure. Like many kids, there was nothing unusual about it. I did a lot of drawing, you could call it cartooning. I had friends, I had three friends who I was very close to. One got his doctorate at Columbia and is retired as an English professor, and a pair of twins, one of whom got his doctorate at Harvard in art history, the other one is a theologian. And we were all extremely close. We used to draw, we used to have battles through drawings, and I guess it was in the thirties, because we went through grammar school together.

Blum: You were less than ten?

Tigerman: Yeah, well, I would say by the time the Second World War started—not from the United States point of view, but in Europe—when I was ten. We would draw battles and airplane, dogfights and stuff. We made a ton of drawings of that kind. But that's all. I mean, I didn't know anything about building. I didn't understand it. I wasn't interested in it.

Blum: What were you doing with drawing, just playing? Today kids do that on the computer.

Tigerman: Right, they do on the computer. I was doing it in drawing form. I didn't have any special aptitude for math for sure—as you will discover in this interview—and I flunked out of MIT. The only thing I can honestly ever say was an influence were those three guys and drawing. That's all.

Blum: And only you became an architect?

Tigerman: Yes, they were all different guys. We were just kids. And we were doing what boy-type kids do. I was in a gang. I mean, I didn't understand. I had no access. There was no way I could have known about it. So *The Fountainhead* was my first exposure.

Blum: How did you come across this book? That was pretty sophisticated stuff for a thirteen year-old.

Tigerman: That I don't remember. I was either twelve or thirteen. It came out in 1942 or 1943 and I was in either seventh or eighth grade. And I don't know how I came across it, honest-to-God. I really don't know. I have no clue as to why I read the book. But I read the book.

Blum: What was it about the book that appealed to you so strongly that it set the course for your life?

Tigerman: Well, it had all these dirty parts. I can even remember the pages if you want to go check them out. The reason that the book attracted me... You gotta remember, imagine in 1942 or '43, whenever it was. I graduated grammar school in 1944, okay, so maybe it was 1943. And as a cute postscript to that, about her, what a bitch!

Blum: Ayn Rand?

Tigerman: Ayn Rand. There is a very cute postscript about it. The book was wild. I mean, you read the book, I assume.

Blum: Many years ago.

Tigerman: You couldn't be in the Department of Architecture without actually having read that book. It was great because kids, mostly boys, rebel against their parents in some fashion or another. It is *de rigueur*. Now imagine a Jewish boy with parents living in my grandmother and grandfather's boarding house and my father picking up leaves at the end of a stick in Lincoln Park in the depression—real poor people. So, my father couldn't even maintain his own family. My mother working for the Feds as a clerk typist and she resented my father's inability to support her in the way in which she wanted to be supported. She wanted money. So, as a great postscript to that, too, very poignant... In any case, I rebelled against her wanting money. I rebelled against what was always held up to me by her as success, which is material success. This is the sort of normal Jewish bullshit—it is about material success, right? I mean, it's the standard thing.

Blum: It is the stereotype.

Tigerman: It's the stereotype. So, my mother was the stereotype... My father was a very sweet, very weak man, and she was... I mean it is Woody Allen, it's Philip Roth, it's all that shit. And my mother was a bitch on wheels. She was very tough. And she wanted money. So what do you rebel against? You rebel against money, which means success, which means status quo, which means respectability, which means organized Jewish religion that looks at success and money and all the things from a somewhat different vantage point, that you also grew up with, okay?

Blum: I understand.

Tigerman: So, I wanted to rebel against it. So, I read a book. And the book is about heroism and against all those things and I thought, That is what the fuck I am going to do.

Blum: You had found a role model?

Tigerman: He was my hero. So, people have said today, "Do you still see Howard Roark as a heroic figure, particularly in the context of say, Archeworks?" They were talking about popular social cause and I thought, fucking absolutely. Yes. Because it still is against the status quo, in this case against the marketing of the eighties and architects with all that horrible shit that went on, and still does, all right? It diminishes the profession. So, the book was, no question about it, a *massive* influence in my life, massive. I probably have read that book twenty times.

Blum: Did you reread it to find additional insights?

Tigerman: No, to continue to be inspired. To give me the strength to go against the status quo, which is basically what I've always done, as you know. You know me very well. So, the book was a big thing in my life. Huge.

Blum: You said there was a postscript about...

Tigerman: Oh, about her.

Blum: Ayn Rand?

Tigerman: And my mother, too. Well, to do it chronologically, Ayn Rand first. Many, many years later when I was in graduate school at Yale she gave a lecture at the law school in either the fall of the 1960 or the early winter or spring of

1961. There was a symposium—which actually quoted—that’s colloquial, whatever it was—in a book written by... Who was the guy? Nathaniel Branden? She founded this group, which was sort of a Gurdjieff-Ouspensky mystical bullshit thing. And there was this guy, I think his name was Nathaniel—Jewish guy—Branden or something. He was much younger than she (Rand). He became her lover. They were both married to others. And she basically ruined his life and his wife’s life. I mean, not the affair so much, but he fell under the influence of a kind of neo-Facist woman, which was what Ayn Rand ultimately was. If you read the rest of her books, *Atlas Shrugged*, and all these were about unrestrained capitalism. So, in any case, Branden’s wife, or ex-wife, wrote this book, a sort of condemnatory, marginally bitter book about Ayn Rand. It’s a very good book. And among the things she missed, just as facts—almost like a footnote—was that symposium, but she did give that colloquial at Yale. So, when I saw in the *Yale Daily News* that she was giving this lecture, I got my buddies in the master’s class and we went to see, to hear, Ayn Rand. And afterward, stupidly, forgetting her well-known antagonism towards selflessness, which is what she was all about, I went up—there was a reception afterwards—to introduce myself. I said “My name is Stanley Tigerman, I’m at the graduate school in architecture here and I just wanted to introduce myself because reading your book as a child, when I was twelve or thirteen, was the thing that really impacted my life. And I just wanted to thank you for getting me here.” And she looked at me in that New York snotty way, up and down, and said, “So what?” Which is—it was great. I mean, it was a crusher, but it was a great thing. It was a great thing to have happen because it reminded me of who she really was, okay? That is one story.

Blum: What is the other story?

Tigerman: It’s interesting that both stories happen in New Haven. Sorry, I did it chronologically wrong—just before then, after I got my first degree—mind you I had no degree, I flunked out of MIT, poor family, all this bullshit, a lot

of baggage—so, I was finally getting my first degree. I was twenty-nine years old. My parents had never been on an airplane, so I mustered up whatever bucks I could, flew them to New Haven. There are two graduations at those schools, one is the major one at the freshman campus at Yale and then all the schools go back to their individual locations to hand out the individual degrees. So, we went back to Weir Court, where the architecture school was in those days, and I actually had my diploma in hand. I walked up to my mother, tears in my eyes, and handed her the degree, and she looked at it and said, “This is wonderful. Now you can make money.” So, I knew she would never understand, and she wouldn’t understand today, at all, zero.

Blum: Stanley, was she in your mind when you decided after so long to back to school?

Tigerman: No.

Blum: Was it her wish, either spoken or unspoken, that motivated you?

Tigerman: Nope. Nope. The way I went back to school is like a big joke. It was stupid. Here I had flunked out of MIT, I had been in the navy, all of those normal kinds of things. I worked for various architects, good, bad, and indifferent, from George Fred Keck on the up-side to Milton Schwartz on the down-side. He’s the guy that did the Executive House that I worked on and A.J. Del Bianco, who did subdivisions. Del was actually great. He came in second in the Paris Prize competition to Eero Saarinen in whatever year it was, I want to say the forties. He was a beautiful draftsman, Jesus Christ! He just basically sold out. He married a builder’s daughter and he started doing, prematurely, plans for spec houses, tract houses. He was great. He was a great guy. In any case, there was no way my mother would have understood any of that. In fact, even going back to school, when I decided I wanted to go back, I was a registered architect through the apprentice system. I had had one incredible failed year at MIT, where except for English, I failed

everything, everything, big time. I always gave excuses—there was this girl at Wellesley, or I was on the freshman fencing team, or I was coxswain on the freshman lightweight crew. I did everything. I was in a fraternity. I did everything in my power to not study. But the real truth is that it was very hard and it was just too hard for me. I wasn't trained well enough.

Blum: Were you too young for the discipline of college?

Tigerman: Well, I was too young. Senn High School was not a great preparatory thing to end up at MIT. So, all those years later, after four years in the navy, this and that, I found myself. I was at Skidmore [SOM] and there was a wonderful guy, whose oral history should probably be done, a guy named Robertson Ward, Junior. You know the name. And Bob was a brilliant, eccentric, unbelievable guy who would go on to Harvard, and who was a really, really good friend of mine. And at a Christmas party at Skidmore, in 1957—like December twenty-third or twenty-fourth—I was sitting in his office, drinking, and there was a book in front of me on the curtain wall, that I was just flipping through. It was published by the graduate students at MIT. I was flipping through the book and I noticed the credits, so here are these graduate students, (e.g.) John Jones, B.Arch, University of Nebraska; Sam Smith, B.Arch, Harvard; whatever it was, they were all listed. I came across a couple of names with no degrees, and I thought, This could be very cool. I could maybe go back and get a master's without getting a bachelor's.

Blum: Did you have a license already? Did you think that life experience would give you some credentials?

Tigerman: Let's see, this is 1957, so I was twenty-seven years old.

Blum: But you had also worked in the field for years.

Tigerman: And I was registered. And I thought maybe I could pull it off. So, I went home, and I talked to my then-wife Judy, and we had a little family conference with my mother and father and her mother. And they all thought it was stupid. I was now a family man, I needed to support my wife and so on. But Judy was very supportive and so I applied to four schools: Harvard, MIT, IIT, and Yale.

Blum: Three in the East and one right here.

Tigerman: Well, MIT, because I had gone there. I knew of Harvard because of Gropius, he was there. By then, of course, I knew all this stuff. IIT because of Mies. This was in 1957, Christmas and Mies was fired. No, Mies was fired in 1959. He died in 1969. But he was still there. And I knew—I respected him massively—so I knew what had happened. And Yale, because of Paul Rudolph. I knew he was there. So, MIT wrote back and they said, “We looked at your records and we’d love to have you back. Plan on spending the next four years with us and we’ll give you a bachelor’s degree.” So, I tore that up. Harvard wrote back, whoever the registrar was, and said, “You sound interesting but, basically, we have our rules,” kind of thing, so I threw that out. I am still waiting to hear from IIT.

Blum: And Yale?

Tigerman: Yale took a long time, it took about two months. Two months later, Paul Rudolph, himself, wrote a very brief note—I have it somewhere—saying, “I know I will live to regret this, but please find enclosed an application.” So, I was thrilled, of course. You can imagine. So, I put together a care package of drawings because I could draw beautifully. I mean, it is what I always did. And, I took the train to New York and then to New Haven, and I interviewed him. He was a tough guy, I mean you must know, Paul Rudolph was a killer of a guy. He said, “So, what do you want to do?” I said, “I want to come here and get a master’s in one year. I am registered. I flunked out of MIT but that

was a long time ago, nine years ago, eight years ago, whatever it was. So, I want to come here and get a master's in one year." He said, "You can't do that." I said, "Why?" He said, "Because to get a master's here—the program has changed since then—you have to have a bachelor's in architecture." And I said, "No, I want to come here for one year and get a master's." It was negotiation, right? All this was incredible chutzpah on my part. I look back and I think, How the fuck did I ever think of doing that? But I did. It is a true story. And so he said, "And getting a bachelor's in architecture here, because this is a graduate school, even for a bachelor's in architecture, you have to have an undergraduate degree from a college, in some discipline, in architecture, because this is about enculturation. I said, "No, I want to be here for one year and get a master's." Stupid. And he was getting angry. He was saying this was going nowhere. So, then he introduced me to Carroll Louis Vanderslice Meeks, the guy that wrote the book *The Railroad Station*, who was a brilliant historian. And it was Meeks that saw something in me.

Blum: He had been the dean at Yale.

Tigerman: That's right. Paul Rudolph was not the dean, this was before they had a decanal system but it was still a part of art and architecture, so there was a chairman. Then the dean was a man named Gibson Danes, but he was no one. So, Meeks put in a huge good word for me, which I'll never forget. I went back to meet with Paul a second time, in the same visit. And he said, "Okay I'll tell you what we will do. We will compromise. You spend two years here. Get a bachelor's the first year. If you do well, but only if you do well, in the second year you'll be in the master's class." So, I said, "Done!" So, that was a good deal.

Blum: So, you went back and fulfilled the terms of your agreement?

Tigerman: It was not quite that easy, because when I went back... It is interesting, a weekend a week ago, we were in Block Island for one of my bachelor's class

classmate's daughter's wedding. And about five of us were there and they were going to do a reunion in the year 2000 because it had been forty years since we got our bachelor's at Yale. I was just reminded about all this stuff. So, I went back and I entered the thesis year—the last year of the bachelor's program at Yale—and of course, the whole class resented me.

Blum: Were they all much younger?

Tigerman: No, not so much younger because those guys had gone to four years of college and they were in their fourth year of architecture school, and some had been in the service. I mean I was probably a little bit older than half the class, but by two, three years, three, max. And there were a few older than me. But I was virtually the oldest guy in the class, but not by much. But I had all this experience, so I could design very well. I had been in the design department at Skidmore. And I could draw like an angel. So, the first week, Rudolph gave, as he always did, a sketch problem for a townhouse on Beekman Place in New York City, which was where he ended up living. You may or may not know that his house on Beekman Place in New York is now up for sale. He gives us a townhouse project, or in-fill thing, and I did this neo-Miesian, very beautifully, beautifully drawn. Jim Stirling was on the jury, Craig Ellwood was on the jury, very good people, and of course, so was Paul. And it was a blow away. It was a beautiful project, everybody loved it. The next day, he put the grades up. I had failed.

Blum: Failed?

Tigerman: Failed. And, I went home in tears.

Blum: What was that all about?

Tigerman: Oh, I knew exactly what it was about. I knew then. After I thought about it overnight, I realized what it was, he was not going to have a guy come in, as

some sort of hot shit, and be a paradigm to anybody. I mean, he was a killer. I loved him. The guy made my life. So then I got the clue. I buckled down and I went to work. And then I did very well, after I buckled down.

Blum: But drawing was your strength.

Tigerman: Rudolph didn't like the talent.

Blum: Because it was so easy for you?

Tigerman: Because it was so easy for me that I just did it. He didn't like that. He didn't want that to be any sort of model at Yale. So, he flunked me, and I understand that. And then I buckled down and I did extremely well. When I finally got to Yale, even before that first week—I guess it was even the interview, I don't remember anymore—he said, "What do you want to take here, what courses?" I said, "Well, I want to take you for design studio." And he said, "You can't do that because I always do the master's classes." It turned out that he hated the master's class that year, it was very—what you would refer to as controversial at the University of Illinois, Chicago. That comes straight away from Paul Rudolph. You know very well, because you know me very well—and you are not fond of these attributes or the nature of my persona. I tell the truth, I don't euphemize a goddamn thing. I am very direct, okay? I was at UIC, I would do it again tomorrow, in a heartbeat. If people are shit, you treat them like shit. Period. That's in my nature. It is like Bruce Graham, a certain kind of guy in this field that is not political. Beeby is political, I am not. And I am very direct. I got that from Paul Rudolph. I think it was probably innate in me, but he brought it out big time. Paul was extremely direct. And he was great, he was a fabulous teacher. So, when he said, "What other courses do you want to take?" and I wanted to take his studio, but he was in the master's class, he blew off the master's class because it was a shitty class and he went down to the bachelor's thesis class. So, I had him both years. And I worked for him. I mean, I was his guy. I was the man.

And so he treated me always like shit because if he treated me badly, the school fell into line. I understood him extremely well. Even at the very end when I got my master's, I made a huge mistake. I finished these, sixteen thirty-by-forty ink boards a day and half early, and he came around to my board before the jury and said, "Why aren't you working?" And, like an asshole, I said, "Well, I'm done." He said, "Really? Why don't I sit down and take a look at it. Do you mind?" And like an asshole, I said, "Be my guest." Because I had done this great project for the University of Illinois in Chicago which was what Netsch was working on at Navy Pier. These drawings are here somewhere. They're either in storage or with you all at the Art Institute. I think they are there. You'll get all that stuff.

Blum: Was this for your bachelor's?

Tigerman: No, this is my master's. I am jumping from the beginning of the bachelor's year to the end of the master's year. Where he nailed me again, when I showed him these drawings, he called the class over. To make a long story short, he basically crucified me. He said, "If you don't change these drawings, if these are the drawings you are going to show tomorrow or two days from now at the jury, you're flunked." So, of course, everybody was shattered, went back to their boards and drew like hell. And I changed everything. Of course—I mean the guy was—he was great.

Blum: He sounds unduly difficult.

Tigerman: He was terrific. Do you remember the movie *The Paper Chase*, about Harvard Law School?

Blum: I don't think I saw it.

Tigerman: It is a great movie, Betty. I mean, there was a guy at Yale who committed suicide; there were guys who were on shrinks' couches. One of my master's

classmates, after a devastating jury where Rudolph crucified him, got drunk and left for the Philippines, never to be seen again, working for a hospital architect. I mean, these guys, it was tough. If you got through it, you did well.

Blum: You have said about Rudolph, “He is a real teacher, good role model. He was in the avant-garde. He surrounded himself with architects of differing persuasions to engender controversy and critical thinking.”

Tigerman: He was a great teacher. Well, it was more than that. I am not going to excessively defend Paul’s persona. He was a very tough guy. Yale was always, during my time and before and after, populated by the most well known American architects and foreign architects as visiting critics—displayed as jewels—including Mies van der Rohe. He brought in every single architect. You name it, Philip Johnson, Ulrich Franzen, Ed Barnes, every fucking—I mean the top people of the day—Eero Saarinen, Jim Stirling. What did he do with them? He beat up on them at juries, big time, to assert himself. This was the case, he used them.

Blum: Was this a personality difficulty? Was this a good thing professionally?

Tigerman: Well, I don’t think it was either. He was a young man who was very young when I met him, let me get this right, he was born around 1920 or 1918, and I met him in 1958, so he was about forty years old. He was trying to make his way. You really have to think about what the time was like—it was not a gentle or simple time. It was very competitive, as it is always in architecture. And he was young; he was premature. And so, unlike Lou Kahn... I mean, very few architects... Frank Lloyd Wright is one. Mies, I mean, Christ, he came to the United States when he was fifty-some-odd years old. He had done four or five buildings. But Rudolph was thirty-eight when he was made chairman at Yale. He was a very young man. So here are these heroic figures in architecture and he was going to use them, in a way, to bolster up his career. He was going to criticize them through the vehicle of juries. But like

Gropius before him, who was his teacher at Harvard—well, Gropius turned out... Well, look, there were only three schools that were interesting. One was Harvard, one was Yale, and one was IIT. IIT was a cookie-cutter, not that Mies made them cookie-cutters, on the contrary, but they all fell into line. Think about who these people are. These are people who, without Mies, you never would have heard of. If Mies had never existed, would you have ever heard the name George Danforth? In architecture? Unlikely. I mean, face it.

Blum: George didn't do as much new building as he did restoration and teaching.

Tigerman: He built like crazy. Brenner, Danforth, Rockwell was a successful firm, they did a lot of work. But you wouldn't have heard of the firm. You wouldn't have heard of any of them.

Blum: And Brownson?

Tigerman: Yes, Brownson, well, that is different. You would have heard of Gene Summers; you would have heard of Jack Brownson. Of course, there is always unique, eccentric talent. And I am not going to say that all these guys are talentless, that is ridiculous. You would have heard of Myron, of course. But the bulk of the people teaching at IIT, you would never have heard of if there had been no Mies. Okay? But then you went to Harvard, under Gropius, and you came across all these names that didn't do Gropius kind of work. I saw Victor Lundy over the weekend in New Haven. You know who he is?

Blum: I know his name.

Tigerman: Well, for Christ's sake, the guy was incredible in the fifties and the sixties in the East: in New York, in Connecticut. And Rudolph, and Barnes, and Franzen, and Philip, and Pei. All of them were students of Gropius's. So, then you think about Yale. Who were students at Yale? Well, on the right wing, if

you wish, there is Allan Greenberg, Tom Beeby, Bob Stern, Jack Robertson, et cetera, on the one side. On the other side, there was Norman Foster, Richard Rogers—I'm only mentioning the most important names. In the middle, there was Jim Polshek, Hugh Jacobsen, Charles Gwathmey, and so forth. Basically, here it is, nobody is a genius. You are influenced massively by your environment.

Blum: But are you also saying there was a caldron of talent there?

Tigerman: There was a caldron of great talent, yes, but the place was a pressure cooker. You either made it or you didn't. Because he was ruthless, as I am sure Gropius was. I am certain of it. Mies, on the other hand, who I knew very well, was not a pressure-cooker kind of guy. He was in many ways, a very sweet man. Mies was a very nice man.

Blum: How did you meet him?

Tigerman: It is a long story. Well, I did a project. After I flunked out of MIT, the dean, Bill Wurster, got me a job with George Fred Keck as an apprentice. I wasn't even nineteen, I was still eighteen and I went to work for Keck for a year. You know, on these occasions you get to think back about what transpired in your life. Fred Keck was a very lucky break for me, that the first architect I worked for was a tremendous architect and a really great talent. Bill Keck was the office pencil-pusher. He was the guy who moved the convenience outlets from here to there. But Fred was fabulous. He was utterly and totally fabulous. He was brilliant, in the mold of Wright. He wore white suits, white stockings, white bucks, and a big, black, flowery bow tie, and a white shirt. He could draw like an angel. He did these beautiful watercolors. You've seen his stuff. The guy was the best.

Blum: I've heard he was also very difficult as a person.

Tigerman: That never came across to me. I thought he was great. He did have the reputation of sleeping with a few of his clients, that I had heard.

Blum: That was not the difficulty I have heard about.

Tigerman: No, I never found him difficult at all. He was very kind to me. I mean, I was an eighteen year-old kid, working in his office for, if I can really even remember, for fifteen dollars a week.

Blum: Was that good pay then?

Tigerman: No, it wasn't. But I could draw. I did presentation drawings for Keck. And I did some very nice drawings, for sure. I was there for a year. And it was great. I mean, imagine being eighteen years old, suffering the embarrassment of flunking out of MIT, lying to your friends, whatever, not being able to admit that you flunked out. Wild, wild! And working for this, not self-endowed, but admittedly by everybody's standard, basically a genius, an "artiste," an architect as bohemian, as brilliant. He was a terrific designer. And there was a guy there then who I managed to help to bring forth when we did "Chicago Architects," Bob Tague, Robert Bruce Tague. I sat directly in front of him and he's the one who basically taught me architecture. I went to the Institute of Design at night and studied with Tague and he was at the I.D. Tague was fabulous, this self-defeating, alcoholic, brilliant architect, who has never had much recognition. I felt so good when we did "Chicago Architects" to bring him into the limelight, and he was so thankful because nobody had ever done that. He was the kind of guy, he was with Corbu after World War Two, he was brilliant, and he was a wonderful, shy, and self-effacing guy. He was the chief of design in this little, teeny office that had Fred and Bill, and I suppose his secretary—I don't remember her—and Bob, and me, and Jim Lindenberger, and Clarence Rudolph, and Michael Young. It was an eight-person office. If you remember, that in one of those shows I did

for John, I did the genealogy. So I know a lot of stuff, like old guys you get to know a lot of stuff.

Blum: You've described the Keck office, you spoke about the people who were there, was there anything of lasting value you picked up from the way in which Keck practiced?

Tigerman: Quality. The concept of quality.

Blum: Is this with you even today?

Tigerman: Absolutely. Again, it is sort of like an art. Occasionally, you'll find an Ingrès, you'll find somebody who has premature ejaculation, who when they are very young, like Picasso, or Wright, are utterly brilliant. But the rest of us are, in many ways, the product of environment, not some gene pool. And if you have the opportunity in your very first job of working for—and I am using the word carefully—a great architect, it rubs off on you. The fulfillment of the Howard Roark figure, in other words, Keck was nothing if not that. He absolutely was the architect as this brilliant designer and individual and who really was respected, but he never ostensibly seemed to seek it. He was not a member of the AIA. He was not interested in—the metaphor would be Kierkegaard—group religion. He was the individual. He was an individual in the crowd. Harry Weese was in that same office building—then at 612 North Michigan—who later I then worked for. Okay? Here are these terrific people and I was eighteen years old and I had never been exposed to architecture, at all, I mean, except at MIT. But I never really knew what architecture was, even in the first year at MIT because there were no architecture courses in the first year at MIT.

Blum: We are sort of working backwards. Can we go back to 1948, the year you spent at MIT?

Tigerman: Go back even before that to *The Fountainhead*. I loved the book and when I put the book down, I was in the eighth grade.

[Tape 1: Side 2]

Tigerman: I wanted to find the best school to study architecture. I don't know how I found my way to the AIA, I would have had no way of understanding. Somehow, I must have talked to someone. Somebody told me to contact them, and they said the best school was MIT but that was the worst advice I ever had.

Blum: They didn't know you well.

Tigerman: No, what they did was to reinforce some insecurities that I had academically, or if not insecurities... I was a spoiled kid.

Blum: In what way were you were spoiled?

Tigerman: Spoiled. I was an only child. You can be poor and be spoiled. You don't have to be rich to be spoiled. And if you are in a boarding house with a whole bunch of people who fawn over you, that'll do it. So, I was fawned over as a kid.

Blum: And you were cute. Didn't you win a beautiful baby contest?

Tigerman: In 1933 at the Century of Progress, that's true. So, I was spoiled. I was willful, which was a product of being spoiled. And I wanted to do what I wanted to do. So I found out about MIT and I applied to MIT in the eighth grade—applied for when I was [graduating]. I found out the curriculum, the requirements, the prerequisites to get in. One of them was not language. So I took tech courses in high school: shop, drafting, and architectural drawing.

Blum: Was this at Senn High School?

Tigerman: Senn High School. Which was the worst mistake I ever made, the worst. I never took language, so I never understood the etymology of written or spoken language, which was a huge, huge blunder. Because MIT didn't require it, I didn't take it. And when I was in high school, one of the courses I took was architectural drafting. In this drafting course, there were three other guys: a guy named John Norgard, a guy named Bruce Bryson, and another guy, was it Quinlen? I don't remember. There were three guys who were way better draftsmen than I was, they could draw better. And I know this because when my mother died in 1961 or '62 like all Jewish mothers, she saved everything. I went back and looked and she had some drawings of mine from high school and they were shit. They were not—we're not talking innate talent, whatever I am today. In the drafting class there was three guys and the instructor was a guy named Ward Robertson. And it was a good class. I mean, a really terrific class. One guy John Norgard, who went straight into the R.O.T.C. To make a long story short, they were more talented.

Blum: More talented in drawing than you were?

Tigerman: For sure, yes, for sure. I've always gone to my high school reunions. I just went to my fiftieth reunion. In an earlier reunion—this was when it was only guys that went to these—there were three guys, actually my Senn High School yearbook is here somewhere. Years later, like at a twenty-fifth reunion, these guys were at the reunion and it was an incredible point of the story. One had gotten out of jail, one drove a cab, one was a manager of Jewel Tea store, but they had all followed my career because they were basically living themselves through the one guy who became an architect. It was very poignant, very poignant. I understood right then and there that the way you had to do this was to work. So, I am proud of not only innate talent but of work. It was the same at MIT. I mean, the guys I knew who were in architecture were upper classmen. I was in a fraternity. If I mentioned the

name, you wouldn't have heard of any of them. It was a question of work. If you work hard, you can do it. Period. That is why Rudolph was great for me. Because you really had to work, you had to put in time—I don't how many hundreds of thousands of hours. I still work until nine o'clock at night. Margaret and I go out for dinner and we work. I work. And I love it. Because I have been trained and I've trained myself to work. Talent doesn't mean shit. Actually, talent is problematic, because if you are talented, if things come too easy for you, then you don't work. And if you don't work...

Blum: It is a trap.

Tigerman: It's a trap. I learned that very early on—incredibly early on—that you really have to work. So I am a product of work. Period. And I know that. And I am not ashamed to say that there is more behind me than talent. My ex-wife, Jo Ann, once said energy builds energy. And that is true. If you work, you don't get tired. If you don't do anything, you get tired. That's why I don't understand retirement. Paul McCurry, when he was forcibly retired, it ruined him. It really ruined his life, because he just stayed at home. You know, what are you going to do? It is so crazy, why would anyone ever retire? You are supposed to be able, as an adult, to go into a field that can sustain you for life, that you can really enjoy. I mean, even to this day, I feel like I am cheating, but it is true. We get paid for things that aren't work at all, that I love doing. So, why would anyone ever retire? Paul McCurry, Bruce Graham, they get retired because they are partners in firms who retire people.

Blum: Bruce sustains a small practice today in Florida.

Tigerman: I know, but SOM retired him. As they did to lots of people. Again, like Paul McCurry. Armies of people, Perkins and Will ultimately put Brubaker to bed. Ultimately they'll put Ralph Johnson to bed. Anybody that is in a big firm. That is the other thing, I want to own my firm. Nobody is going to retire me. No one is going to retire Beeby. I can name what I consider the top architects

in the world and nobody is going to retire them. And they are not going to retire. Can you imagine Zaha Hadid retiring? That zaftig, great broad who I love? Work, the work ethic, the good things, and good design, and quality can come out of work, yes.

Blum: And you think that some of this you got from Rudolph?

Tigerman: Well, it is a whole bunch of things that transpired.

Blum: And some of it you saw in Keck?

Tigerman: Saw it in Keck. I saw it in my grandfather, this Talmudic scholar, which was why I wrote *The Architecture of Exile* and I dedicated it to him. And the next book, which is coming out early next year, on the Kabbalah and architecture, called *Failed Attempts at Healing an Irreparable Wound*, is dedicated to my grandpa, again. It says "To Max Tigerman, again." Because he worked. He didn't work—my grandmother worked for a living—he just read Talmudic exegesis, but he did it from six in the fucking morning till midnight. That is what he did. He didn't work, but he worked. Okay? The work ethic was instilled in me probably by my mother. No question about it, I'm sure. So, you get these things instilled in you and you understand that you can out-distance talent. And it goes to sports, even today. It's wild. I have taken up golf. This is a great story. Margaret has played golf all of her life. Margaret is a very good golfer, Margaret normally beats me because she hits the ball farther and so forth. But she is wild, she will hit the ball in the trees in the woods, she will hit the ball in the water, slice, everything. And I go right down the goddamn middle of the course. It's the tortoise and the hare. And when I beat her, it's when she is all over the lot and I'm just going right down the middle of the fairway. So, I am a product of work. I am working very hard at golf to be better, in the same way that I do all this stuff. It is all the same. That's why I write books. I mean, I get bored, I have no attention span.

If I can do these three days without throttling you, it will be an amazing thing because I have no attention span.

Blum: I'll give you some breathing space, if you continue.

Tigerman: I'm saying it metaphorically, don't take umbrage. So, I am saying, that to me, to be good at something it is like practicing the piano. That's why we call it architectural practice. If you play piano long enough, you get good. It's not a question of talent. Yes, there are talented people, no question about it. And there are talented architects, there is no doubt. I am not one.

Blum: If you were so taken with the Keck office, why did you leave? You were there for a year? You've called it part of your "greening".

Tigerman: Well, I was there for one year and during that year I met two guys who worked for him as well. A guy named Michael K. Young, who I am not sure is still in practice today, who went to IIT, and a wonderfully capable and sweet man named Clarence Rudolph who was much older than me, from some place like St. Charles. At the end of the year—we used to have coffee and lunches together—we decided to start our own practice.

Blum: How could you do that with no degree and no architectural license?

Tigerman: I had nothing. I was nineteen years old. It is like the Rudolph story, talking my way into Yale. It was chutzpah. We started a practice. I was trying to get work. They were still working for Keck, I was the only full-time guy in the practice. We opened up a little one-room office. So, I left Keck and they stayed.

Blum: What did you call your firm?

Tigerman: It was called Tigerman, Rudolph, and Young, in fact.

Blum: And it has escaped notice in all of the biographical profiles of you.

Tigerman: It is true. In the course of my trying to get work, I came across a young man, a former rabbinic scholar like my grandfather, and his name was Herbert Greenwald. And he was in a little office in 332 South Michigan, with what's-his-name—who was the guy that Mies did the house for in Elmhurst or a western suburb?

Blum: McCormick?

Tigerman: McCormick. Maybe Robert, one of the McCormicks. I went into this room—they had no reception room. Mind you, this is 1949 and they were doing their first development. What was their first development? Promontory. The guy said to me—Herb Greenwald—"Who are you?" Nineteen year-old kid, I said, "I'm Stanley Tigerman. We have a firm called Tigerman, Rudolph, and Young, and I'd like to do work for you because I know that you are very good. It was unbelievable. But out of the ridiculousness, we became friends, believe it or not. So, I joined the navy in 1950 because this practice was going nowhere. In any case, I had been drafted. So I joined the navy to avoid being drafted. When I got my draft notice, I tore it up. I went right down to the navy and enlisted. I was not going to go in the army, it was the Korean War. So, I met this guy and shortly thereafter, he moved his office to 135 South LaSalle in the penthouse. He had this beautiful secretary, who I fell madly in love with. I thought she was the most gorgeous person I'd ever known. We still lunch—it's Joanie Weinstein, who owns Ultimo. She was Herb's secretary. She was so great, she still is great. We go back a very, very, very long way. You know who she is?

Blum: No, I don't.

Tigerman: Okay. The woman who owns it, who is “Ms. Boutique” in Chicago, is named Joan Weinstein. She was Herb’s secretary. I got to know Herb real well because when I was in the navy, I started writing a book that never was published and never will be. It will never be shown to anybody either, although I have it at home. It was called *Architecture in Sand*. It was the puerile work of an egocentric, prematurely undeveloped young man. That’s the review by the author. But I sent copies of it to Herb and he would edit it from time to time. I got to know him very well and I really liked him. He once said to me, “One day Mies will do my big buildings, and you will do my small buildings.” And the next time I saw him was in the late fifties, when I was with Skidmore and Myron was working on the hotel for him on South Michigan. Then he died prematurely in a plane crash in 1959 and his business was taken over by Barney Weissbourd.

Blum: So what happened with the promise Greenwald made to you?

Tigerman: Curiously, almost like a self-fulfilling prophecy, one of my projects, one of the things I’ve done—not a great project—was with Mies’s office on Nun’s Island in Canada. Mies did the tall building, and I did the townhouses, the small buildings. It is only interesting because of the background of what Herb said—that was very nice. He was a very nice man, he was an extremely nice man. And then his son, who became a developer, Bennet Greenwald, was unfortunately unlike his father. At that point Bennet was the very spoiled son of a very rich man. But I did a lot of work for Bennet in the Southwest, in Tucson. And he was a sweet guy and I liked him, but he was never Herb Greenwald.

Blum: Stanley, when you were with Keck, you mentioned Bob Tague. You said that he was teaching at the Institute of Design.

Tigerman: At night.

Blum: Did you go to the Institute of Design when he was there?

Tigerman: Yes, and I was a student at night. And Bob sat behind me in the drafting room during the day. He also had a huge impact. As you know, I collect architectural drawings. I have a fabulous Bob Tague drawing; I have a Keck drawing, too, of course. Bob's is a working drawing and it is so beautiful. You can just sit and look at it. The guy was so precise and talented and pristine. Did you ever meet him?

Blum: Yes, I did, but towards the end of his life and he was in sad condition.

Tigerman: I know that. It was really tragic because he was really well known independently from Keck. Keck befriended him. He was an alcoholic from his days in Paris with Corbu and Denise René. Tague was a disaster. He would be in Keck's office, he'd get a telegram from some museum overseas who wanted to do an exhibition of his work and he would go down to Riccardo's and just get drunk and lose the telegram. And you talk about self-defeating, you have no idea. He was like a Toulouse-Lautrec, trying to drink out some tragedy that I never knew. But he was a gentle soul who was I can not tell you how talented. I can not. Subjectively, he was a great talent.

Blum: People who know him have said the same thing. The problem is that he defeated himself.

Tigerman: Keck tried to save him, Fred Keck.

Blum: Bob gave us a photo of himself when I asked for one for our files. The picture he gave me was one that Moholy had taken years ago, and he was a very handsome man. He obviously knew people who were important.

Tigerman: No kidding, nobody mentions that. He was in the army in the Second World War and, like some Americans in the pre-beat generation, he stayed in Paris.

And he became a part of a group that self-publicized, a bit like the Chicago Seven—self-promoted, I want to say. And they had a little journal, a little magazine that they did, and one of those people was Corbu. I'm just saying to think of 1946 in Paris—Corbu was of course, very famous, and he was still involved in the architectural community. So, Tague was very connected when he was in Paris at that time but then his drinking started to beat him up and Keck saved him basically by giving him a job. Nobody wanted to touch Tague. They said he was unreliable, unreliable even to showing up. He wasn't always there at Keck's. I mean, we'd get there whenever you'd get to an office, at eight, eight-thirty, and Tague might be there because he had been there all night or he might come in at two in the afternoon or he might not show up for two weeks. But when he was there Keck really respected him and he was a great influence on Keck, let me say, absolutely. The Corbusian side of Keck, this stuff that he had done earlier was really influenced by Tague. By the time I got to Keck, he was doing more rational solar houses—the Kunstadter house in Highland Park and all of that—but Tague was trying to bring Keck back to this other period of International Style modernist stuff.

Blum: It is curious the way influences can flow.

Tigerman: That is why I did the genealogy because genealogies are interesting. It's about who worked for who, about who was sleeping with who, who influenced whom under what circumstances, right? That is very important, much more important than some sort of innate notion or notion of innate talent. Tague was great.

Blum: What did you learn at the Institute of Design?

Tigerman: It wasn't from the Institute of Design, it was from Bob who was both my teacher at night, and my mentor during the day. What I picked up from him was precision, the pristineness about architecture, was about devotion and, once again, the craft of the work. He was nothing if not devoted and he was a

great craftsman. Also, in the office, was this brilliant draftsman, who I never got along with, and I have only made up with recently, a one-armed draftsman named Ralph Rapson. So, you can imagine an office filled with Ralph Rapson, Bob Tague, Fred Keck, and an eighteen year-old kid. Kids—untrained, uncultured, and uneducated, the worse kind even—will know quality when they come across it because it comes through. And so I was incredibly influenced.

Blum: You put yourself down a lot. At that point you had been surrounded by these accomplished people for a while.

Tigerman: All these years I am aware of who I am and when I walk down the street in New York or Paris or anywhere and people say, “Oh, you are Stanley Tigerman!” I mean, I’m not into that. I don’t like that. We went to a party in Aspen last week and Judy Neisser was basically showing me off as her trained dog.

Blum: Her trained architect?

Tigerman: Well, the trained dog. So, we went to this cocktail party where all these people were fawning over me and I really don’t like that. I find that I’ve got things to do. It is fucking playing golf, I do not like that. So, when I put myself down, I do that because I am not a believer in myself. It is the insecurity of origins that drives me, in actual fact. So, I don’t want to be the well-known or famous or notorious Stanley Tigerman. That is bullshit. I hate it. So, with all these rich people at cocktail parties I’ll become very rude. I don’t want their jobs. I don’t want to befriend people simply because they are rich. That goes back to my mother. It is all psychologically driven. I am not saying it is rational and I am not saying it is right, but I am saying it is fact. I know who I am. I didn’t like that in Aspen. So, when I was in Keck’s office, I mean, who was I? I was an eighteen year-old kid who could draw. Make no mistake, I could draw.

Blum: But you had a reason, an interest in what all these people around you were doing. You were learning, you were growing.

Tigerman: I was learning. I was a fucking sponge, there is no question about it. It was very important, I'm telling you, to be young and to have worked for really good people. Bob Tague, I really think, to recognize all the people in the office—he was a serious guy. Ralph Rapson, I didn't like him at all because he is a very tough guy—but he was talented, he could draw. I grew up as a draftsman. These guys were all draftsmen. They were my best teachers. You've been in this office before?

Blum: No, I haven't.

Tigerman: You have never been here? Let's take a break. What I was saying about the office is that we don't run a nursing home, nobody stays here. It is like a post-graduate school.

Blum: In what sense?

Tigerman: In the sense that these guys haven't gone through puberty, architecturally speaking. It is like a post-graduate school. Except for Melany Telleen. People stay here—they have been averaging three to four years because I am not interested in keeping them. That is it. I want them to move on. Look, as long as I have practiced, I've also taught, the whole time, here and there, not just at UIC. So I want them to grow up and go away. All these guys, like Booth and Nagle, worked for me. I am not interested in creating a nursing home. So, it is a nursery, that is better. And it also gives me the chance to stay young. Because you have all these young people, whoever you hang around with, you become like in a way, even me.

Blum: Would you speak more about your navy experience?

Tigerman: When was December in 1950. Why is because I was drafted and I didn't want to go in the army. Then I talked—remember I told you that one of those kids that I grew up with became an English professor, a guy named Alan Rose—I persuaded him to join the navy with me. Let's see, in December 1950, he had one year at Colorado College and then he was going to end up going to Wisconsin and then get his doctorate at Columbia in English lit. But he had one year in Colorado and he was ripe. And he was my best friend at that time, so we joined the navy together. We went to boot camp at Great Lakes. The navy was great.

Blum: What did you do in the navy that could have furthered your interest in architecture?

Tigerman: It is interesting, I started out with nothing to do with architecture. I started out in Key West, Florida, after boot camp as an airman. I was an enlisted man the entire four years. I was sent to Key West from boot camp and I ultimately became a radioman gunner in a navy fighter training jet during the Korean War. We were training guys from Pensacola for all-weather flight training and then they would have carrier landings and take-offs, as well, off of Key West. I did that for two years of the four years. Then I went to Seabee school, the construction battalion in California, and ended up running the architectural drafting studio in Norfolk, Virginia. Then I went back to architecture. While I was there, at night in Norfolk, I was working for an architect, who was a wonderful old Renaissance gentleman named T. David Fitz-Gibbon. He was a very well known classical architect. I did that for two years and then I got out. I was in the navy for four years.

Blum: How did it come about that while you were in service that you were in able to work in his office?

Tigerman: You know, the navy, unless you are actually in combat, basically it is an eight-hour a day job. So, what do you do with your time? When I was in Florida, I played piano in a strip joint and when I was in Norfolk, I worked for this architect. And he was a terrific architect and a gentleman.

Blum: What kind of work had he done?

Tigerman: The addition to Norfolk Museum. Actually, it was interesting because I went back, because this was a different time in my life. I was asked to for the Tidewater AIA, so I accepted in a heartbeat. So, I was picked up at the airport by this beautiful young woman, so I said, "Where am I staying?" And she said, "We have put you at some B and B that has been reserved." I said, "No, you cancel the reservation, and put me in a commercial hotel where the navy guys hang out." She said, "This afternoon I want to take you around and show you all the preservation work." I said, "Lady, I don't care about preservation, I want to go to the navy yards, I want to see where the carriers dock." I am an ex-navy man, I only came here to see this shit. I mean, I didn't come here to look at preservation, I don't care about that. So I had the best time, I went aboard one of the nuclear carriers, it was great, because I am nostalgic as a type. I love stuff like that. It is interesting, when I was in Seabee school, I met a guy named Charles Quinlen, like the guy in grammar school and high school. And this guy was a Soleri-type. We were in Seabee school together and we remain friends. He just retired from teaching architecture at San Luis Obispo, Cal Poly. I knew I was going to be an architect, there was no question about it. I was trying to do the best thing I could for myself while I was in the navy. Ultimately, if I were to have gotten into NAVCAD, if I would have been a fighter pilot—but it didn't work out with my eyes—I would have stayed in the navy. I definitely would have been a pilot. I would have saved architecture a lot of grief.

Blum: I have read that it was at that time in your life when you began to paint and sculpt and to exhibit.

Tigerman: Yes, I started to draw and then paint when I was in the navy, actually.

Blum: How did you arrange an exhibit? What kind of work were you doing?

Tigerman: I did have an exhibit somewhere in Norfolk. Let's do this chronologically. Much earlier, in 1941 or '42, when I was eleven or twelve, somehow again I got to know the work, through books, of Mondrian. And I thought that I loved it, I absolutely loved it. It was about the time of *The Fountainhead*. It is the only artist that I understood, that I knew about in a certain way. And because I was a spoiled kid I found out that Mondrian—it is the same chutzpah thing—was living in New York and I persuaded my dotting mother that we should go to New York so I could meet this man.

Blum: You were a very precocious twelve-year-old.

Tigerman: It was the year before Mondrian died. And surer than shit, we went to New York and when I was eleven or twelve I met Piet Mondrian.

Blum: You sure were spoiled.

Tigerman: Very indulged. And here was this man, almost like a monk, living in this very small apartment, 57th, between 5th and 6th, if recollection serves. In any case, I mean, he was very kind.

Blum: How did this happen? Did you phone and ask for an appointment or did you just appear and knock on his door?

Tigerman: I called and made an appointment. And I came to see him. I look back and I almost cringe in embarrassment at the kinds of things that I basically got away with. But I did get to meet Mondrian.

Blum: And you saw some of his work in his studio.

Tigerman: Yes, at his studio. So, I became a great Mondrian follower and reader, so I know quite a lot about Mondrian and the whole theosophy thing.

Blum: Is that something that maybe attracted you to Mondrian?

Tigerman: Yes, which goes back to my grandfather. It has this sort of almost religious fervor. There was a guy named Dr. Schoenmaekers from the Netherlands who became Mondrian's apologist. He was a great supporter of Mondrian. He was a well-known theologian. The whole thing in the Netherlands and Denmark, you think about Kierkegaard and all these incredible, flat, compressed places like the Netherlands. Well, even before that there was Madame Blavatsky.

Blum: Was all this mysticism sort of in the air?

Tigerman: Yes, there was Ouspensky and all that crap. So I became a reader of all that stuff, on my own. I mean, I had a lot to make up for because I didn't get this shit at college. So all of this pretentiousness about writing and philosophy and theology comes out of a lack of education. I am trying to educate myself. So I do it by writing. So then I thought, Well I can get this shit published. The Mondrian thing, it led me... Of course when I was at Yale, many years later...

Blum: Did we finish your experience at Yale?

Tigerman: No, I didn't finish the story—Rudolph asked, "What are the courses you want to take?" "I want to take your studio and I want to take Albers for his color course and for painting studio." And I did. I wanted to take Bob Engman for sculpture, he was a great sculptor in the manner of Diego Riviera. "And I want to take George Heard Hamilton"—one of the Société Anonyme—"along with Marcel Duchamp and Katherine Drier for art history.

That's it." He said, "Wait a minute, you've never taken a structures course, you've never taken mechanical equipment, you've never taken the history of architecture. You should take Scully." I said, "No way. This is what I want to do." And so he said, "Okay." And so I have yet to take any to this day.

Blum: You just buffaloed your way through.

Tigerman: Absolutely. So, I have never taken any architectural course, except for design, never in college or graduate school. I had two degrees with three years above high school, one of which I flunked out. And graduating very high, winning the Alfred Kahn Award, I did very well, then. The point is that painting, that whole reductivist thing... I got a Graham Foundation grant when I came back to Chicago from Yale to travel and to study Op Art. So I was doing paintings like that. I had two one-man shows with Buddy Holland. After I came back to Chicago. They were all Albers, Mondrianesque.

Blum: And very architectural?

Tigerman: Yes, it's all architectural, there is no question about it. So, here they were. Actually, Charlie Murphy, Junior, bought one of my paintings. And then, because he had to give everything back, he gave it back to me—I have it now at home. And the sculpture that I did at 2 Illinois Center, this Formal Generators of Structure... I mean, I was always doing Albersian, Mondrianesque kind of painting. Yes, for sure.

Blum: So, you exhibited, you painted. And it began when you were in the navy.

Tigerman: Right. For sure. In the navy, in fact, in my little exercise room at home, I still have two of the ink drawings that I made at that time. This was in Norfolk, so I want to say it was 1952, when I was twenty-two years old. I'm sorry, I have a lot of gaps to fill in. So, I used my time at Yale, later, not in the architecture school, but in the philosophy department and the comparative literature

department. I took courses from Cleanth Brooks, the poet-critic. I mean, I knew what Yale University meant. Beyond Paul Rudolph in the architectural school, the faculty was dreck. It was just Paul Rudolph and these visiting critics in architecture. The permanent architecture faculty was mostly ordinary. But it was Yale University. So, there was this great wealth of coursework that you could do. I took Paul Weiss, who was this brilliant philosopher.

Blum: And you wanted to rush through it in two years?

Tigerman: Yes, that was also a mistake. But, at least I took the right courses, that I can tell you. Albers was great. He was a great teacher. Another brutal, yet poetic teacher, a very tough guy. I had him in the very last year he taught at Yale. Then, he retired. A lot of painters who are famous today—Bob Mangold, Dick Anuszkiewicz—were there with me. I took a color course with him and I took a painting studio with him at Yale. Both years, I took philosophy—people like Cleanth Brooks: writing, criticism, rather than art history.

Blum: And Scully?

Tigerman: No, art history with George Heard Hamilton. Absolutely not Scully. I always understood Scully for what he was—which is basically what ruined his career—as a manipulator of contemporaneity, which is what he did. He did something so awful at the recent Pritzker Prize dinner at Washington at the White House, I can't tell you. He gave a lecture and all the architects, including Tom Beeby, their eyes were rolling around in their head. He was using the occasion with President Clinton and the First Lady as a captive audience to put forth his current agenda, which is the new urbanism, which is bullshit. It is a return to classical architecture, basically. I must say, Hilary Clinton was great. She then stood up afterward and said thank you, because, of course, they went to Yale. So she knew who he was, for sure. She said, "Thank you for your lecture, Professor Scully. Of course, it was a bit

subversive.” And everybody applauded, because they understood what Vincent was doing. No, I didn’t take Scully. Scully and I have always had a checkered relationship, actually.

Blum: He wrote an introduction to a recent article that appeared in one of the magazines or journals on your work and Margaret’s.

Tigerman: Recently?

Blum: Well, I think it was in the nineties.

Tigerman: No, try sixteen years ago. It was on our house in Michigan, he did an article in *Architectural Digest*. If you check it, I think you’ll find it is on our house.

[Tape 2: Side 1]

Blum: Do you still paint and draw?

Tigerman: I still draw. I draw like mad.

Blum: Do you plan to include some of your drawings when you give another batch of your work to the Art Institute? Those are lovely.

Tigerman: No, these stay with me. The Art Institute gets basically everything, but it doesn’t get this. Those things stay with me.

Blum: You were in the navy until 1954, came out and you got a job with A.J. Del Bianco. How did you find him or did he find you?

Tigerman: Well, I found him. I went to work. And he was terrific. I mean, his buildings were awful, but he was terrific because he was a runner-up for the Paris Prize to Saarinen. He was very talented and drew beautifully. So I went to his

office. You know, all these guys had degrees and, again, I had no degree. I was a draftsman, but I was a very fast, good, draftsman. That is one thing you won't find me having any modesty about. I could draw, and I knew that. It was a sweatshop. You basically cranked out plans for builders and we did a set of working drawings in two days. Two sheets, two days. Unbelievable! And I was faster than those guys, I could do that.

Blum: Did you go to his office to ask for a job, knowing the kind of work he did?

Tigerman: No, no.

Blum: So how did you wind up with him? You had all of Chicago to choose from.

Tigerman: You know, I don't remember, truly. But I got a job with him. I don't know, maybe he put an ad in the paper, how do I know? But I ended up there and I remember all those guys' names, even today: Dick Donatoni, Fred Schwartz, a guy named Fred Johnson, and the guy that ran the office—sort of Bill Keck for Del Bianco—was a guy named Jack. I'm not going to remember it now. And it was a very collegiate sort of place. Del, which is what everybody called Del Bianco, was this very talented man, who just basically misused his talent, but he was very effective at what he did. In 1954, when I got out of the navy, I think 10,000 houses were built with his registration stamp on them! He was incredible. I, myself, was one of two that did all of the working drawings for Elk Grove Village, for Rolling Meadows. I did all the drawings for the single-family houses. I was very fast. And he was great, he was a great guy. And he was very hurt when I left him. I was there for two years.

Blum: You were there for two years, you did the drafting, the drawing...

Tigerman: The working drawings.

Blum: And for whom was he working?

Tigerman: Yeah, for builders. Del went to the University of Illinois at Champaign-Urbana. When he graduated, which I want to say was in the late thirties, he married the daughter—he was Italian and he married an Italian girl. What the hell is her name? Her father was a guy named Joe Valenti, so the daughter was named Marge Valenti. And the father was a builder. The father, to help his son-in-law, gave him projects doing spec houses, tract houses, crap, you know, ticky-tacky. But Del did it very well. I mean, I could run you through the 'burbs, he did a lot of... He became a star. In fact, when I wrote the essay for the little show John Zukowsky did on "The Postwar American Dream," I put Del in it.

Blum: I remember.

Tigerman: And Del was great. He was very talented. And he drew... The guy drew like an angel. I did a very bad thing with him. I left him to work for Milt Schwartz, and I was unnecessarily mean. I will regret it to my deathbed. I basically didn't tell him off, but I told him how disappointed I was that he had misused his talent.

Blum: Did you mean it as a compliment?

Tigerman: No, I meant it not as a compliment. And it was the wrong thing to do. It was just a stupid young guy, twenty-six-year-old, I mean, I had no right doing that, and I regret it today.

Blum: It is curious how a remark of years ago stays with you.

Tigerman: No, it was very bad. Because he drew so beautifully, and he was so talented. Believe me, to be the runner up for the Paris Prize is just serious shit, man. I mean, he was a massive talent. In any case, I worked for him for two years and I really liked him. I hated the work, because I knew what it was, by then.

That's it. I save all these, none of these go to the Art Institute, either. That's a guarantee.

Blum: This is your sketchbook?

Tigerman: Yeah. When my first wife and I were divorced, I took my kids to the Venice Biennale in 1976, the first one that I was in. And I took my kids to Venice with me and then we spent six weeks in Europe and this was the sketchbook of going through Europe, of going through France. Six weeks in France, driving—Carcassonne, whatever, all these, all this crap. It ain't going to the Art Institute. It's staying.

Blum: Well, your children share these memories, too.

Tigerman: So, that was that. And then, after all that time—that was then, right? And then I started again, because I went back to Paris with the AIA Committee on Design years later.

Blum: There's not much break in the drawings, except for the dates.

Tigerman: Yeah, it was still the same... Actually, there is a terrific drawing...

Blum: What is that, the Place des Vosges?

Tigerman: Yes and here is Frank Gehry's building, the American Center.

Blum: That building suffered a sad fate.

Tigerman: I know it is very sad. So, I still do this shit. So I must have, God knows, how many of these little books, but I wanted to put in it the same stuff that the earlier books had. So, in any case, Del Bianco was this great talent and he misused it. I was there for two years. And I really wanted out.

Blum: Why?

Tigerman: Because it was lousy work. So, I go to another less than wonderful architect named Milton Meyer Schwartz. He was doing the work for Jerry Wexler. I worked on the working drawings for the Executive House. And I wasn't there long. How long would I have been there?

Blum: You were there for a year, or a little less, in 1957.

Tigerman: Yeah. I decided I can't do this anymore.

Blum: How did you come to Mr. Schwartz?

Tigerman: Then I was married to my first wife and I got—I mean, it wasn't much money, but I got a hell of a lot more money than when I was working for Del Bianco. I was making, I think—I don't know, Betty, I want to say I was making \$8,000 a year, something like that, in 1956. And then I realized you can't do architecture for money. So, I had an opportunity to do an interview at SOM. The guy that first interviewed me was a guy named John Christian Hoops, H-O-O-P-S. He is a really good architect, but probably dead now, who had done work in California, very capable. He was number three in command at the United States Air Force Academy under Netsch. The number two was Ralph Youngren. And so John Hoops wanted to hire me, but as a junior designer at a much reduced salary.

Blum: From what you were making with Schwartz?

Tigerman: Right. Much reduced. So, I went home and talked to my wife. And, again, there was a little family conference, where it was my mother, my father, my mother-in-law. They all were against it because I would be making less money. And I tried to persuade them by saying that whatever you do it's like

“you are what you eat,” or whatever. Whatever you do is what you became, is what you become known for. I can’t do shit or else I am going to become known for it. And then I’ll get work and maybe I’ll have a practice and I will end up doing shit, because that is the only way people identify with who I am, which I still believe. So, they were against it, but I said, “Fuck that. I am going to do this.” So, I went and then Ralph interviewed me. Walter didn’t hire me at all. It was ultimately Ralph who hired me.

Blum: In what capacity were you hired for the Air Force Academy job?

Tigerman As a designer, as a junior designer. This is all under Netsch, and I got to tell you I hated Netsch because he was a manipulator. He would come to my board and he knew I was a White Sox fan and he and Dawn are great White Sox fans. And so he’d look at my drawing, a design that I was doing for something, whatever it was, and he wouldn’t like it, but he wouldn’t say that. Instead, we’d talk about the White Sox and just shoot the shit, and ultimately I would come to understand that this was not a good thing and it should be done this other way. That was him manipulating me. I understood that and I hated it. So, when Bruce Graham became the chief of design and we moved to the Inland Steel building. I worked for SOM in the beginning on the Air Force Academy at 37 South Wabash, which is where the Air Force Academy team was, okay? They had a bunch of offices, but they were shitty, nothing much. But SOM consolidated, we moved to Inland Steel when the Air Force Academy was done and Bruce took over. He took the whole Air Force Academy design staff and fired them, except for me, which meant Gert Kerbis, Lou Rocah, Don Ryder, now in New York, Roger Margerum—now in Detroit—Jim Maida. They are very talented people, but Bruce just got rid of them because the only one he wanted to keep was me. See, with Netsch, the manipulation, it’s like political stuff. I hate politics. And what I loved about Graham is that he said what was on his mind. It was great. I mean, he and I have had our fallings out, for sure, then and now.

Blum: Can you give an example?

Tigerman: Oh, yeah. That's a great story that transpired. When Graham took over, Graham would come up to my desk and say, "That's shit." And I could look at him and say, "You're full of shit." And we could have a real argument, basically, about people who speak English, who don't manipulate, all right? I admired that immensely in him, and I still do. I mean, there are lots of things I don't like about Bruce, but I certainly like that.

Blum: So, what you resented is that Walter didn't tell you straight out? He sort of let you come to the realization yourself?

Tigerman: Yeah, he is a manipulator. He is a manipulator and I always resented that terribly, terribly. I hated it. So, Bruce took over and fired all the other guys and I was put in the design department under Bruce then. Right? I loved it because it was like a breath of fresh air.

Blum: Did you ever know why Bruce fired Walter's entire team except you?

Tigerman: Well, they didn't have as much work. That's another thing that influenced me. Except if somebody's really incompetent here, I tend to not fire people. I don't like doing that, because I think it is not nice. And I don't think you should build your staff up because you have a big job and then when the job is over, you fire them. I mean, I have had to do that on occasion but I don't like it, so I don't. One of the reasons that we remain small, which I consider successful, is because if we have a big job and then we don't, then what do you do with these people? I don't like that. So, I like remaining small. I truly do.

Blum: By small you are talking about fifteen people?

Tigerman: Well, no, it could be smaller. It could be bigger, but probably not more than twenty. Any time you get more than that then you start feeding the office—you have to get work and I don't market. I mean, I publish, for sure, but I don't direct-market. If I know there is a job, I don't go after it. Somebody has to call me, basically. And that's the best way. We just got a great job for the Public Building Commission because Ben Reyes called me and said, "How come you don't like me anymore?" I said, "What are you talking about, Ben?" He said, "Well, you never try to get a job with the Public Building Commission." I said, "I don't do that." I mean, I just sit here, whatever walks in the door, I make a judgment if it is something I want to do or not want to do. So, he came to me.

Blum: Have you never been hungry enough to go after jobs?

Tigerman: Actually, Betty, I never was, even when I was a one-man office. I'm not interested in that. I want to get the work because people like what I do. I don't want to go after work. Even Paul Florian, who's a damn good architect, he markets, he sends things to people, including me, about "we just published this and that." I hate that shit, I hate it. It is not nice to do. So, Bruce was very direct. Yes, he fired them because he had to reduce the staff. When he became a full general partner in 1956, he was in charge of design, not Netsch.

Blum: They had two different studios.

Tigerman: But he was the partner in charge of design. Netsch had his jobs, but the guy in charge of design was Bruce J. Graham. Make no mistake.

Blum: It was my impression that Bruce was the authority or the head guy over his studio and maybe the business part of the office and Walter had the final say in his studio.

Tigerman: Yes, but it wasn't quite that way. Basically, if you can remember what 1956 was, that epoch, I mean, in general, the fifties, and Skidmore's ambitiousness, the firm, related to the development of the tall office building... So, the bulk of the work became the tall office building. Hartmann, who was the partner in charge of the firm, marketed the office building because Skidmore, even pre-computer, was very good at that. They knew what they were doing. Fazlur Khan was there then. I mean, there was no question, they knew what they were doing. And Netsch was doing their so-called institutional work.

Blum: Libraries?

Tigerman: And universities, and all that shit—UIC, Regenstein Library, Northwestern, Crown Center, whatever—and other places outside of Chicago, as well as the Air Force Academy. Skidmore was, at that time, a terrific firm. There was an article by Sigfried Giedion—it is worth looking up in *Bauen und Wohnen* describing SOM at that time—I'm going to say, somewhere around '56-'57. But Skidmore was also a firm interested in profit, the profit-making major facet, the constituent future of free-based capitalism. So, Netsch didn't make a profit on shit. Bruce did. Bruce did very good work. I don't like Netsch's work, but Netsch, for the purpose of this discussion, certainly is a very good architect, but he didn't make a profit. Bruce made a profit.

Blum: I understand what you are saying and I see where SOM's emphasis was during that period.

Tigerman: You see where I am coming from. Bruce became the darling, no question about it. He was very effective. He was a bully. He could crank the drawings out of people that worked for him. And the work was very good. Netsch did it by manipulation, it was more complicated, beginning with the Air Force Academy chapel. I used to hang out with Netsch and Youngren at their apartment because they shared an apartment. They shared a penthouse apartment at 1360 Lake Shore Drive. When Youngren came up for a general

partner at SOM, Walter didn't support him. I know you hate these things, but it is true, because Ralph was a really talented man.

Blum: No, I am just surprised. I thought they were very good friends.

Tigerman: They were. But he really never supported Ralph in the way that he should have and that was the travesty. Bruce, on the other hand, supported you. The whole time I worked for Walter—let's see, I went to work in May of 1957 and we moved into Inland Steel somewhere in 1958. When I worked for Walter I was making \$115 a week as a junior designer and working from 8:30 in the morning until somewhere around midnight. And we got no overtime, we just got a straight salary, \$115 a week.

Blum: But you got dinner.

Tigerman: Big deal! We had dinner, yes. So, when Bruce took over, I was still making \$115 a week. I got a raise three months later. I got a raise six months later. I got a raise nine months later. I kept getting raises because Bruce supported his people. Walter didn't. It's well known at Skidmore. Myron will tell you the same, anybody that worked there knows this. The guy's a manipulator. Now, on the other hand, I'm also well aware that because of the complexity of Walter's work there was no fee that would ever be enough to support that development in the office. Right? That's the bad thing about the Skidmore organization, because even then, the fee, after all, is the fee. That influenced me conversely to the way to run a practice. I resent Jack Hartray immensely because he is there with Jim controlling the fees, controlling the dispensing of the fees. You know what I am saying? Nobody is going to tell me how to spend the fucking fees. We get very good fees, but we spend it like mad. We do three times timecard, but we don't make a big profit. There is no windfall profit here. We spend it like crazy. All those models, and all these beautiful watercolors and shit. We don't make money. My idea is to not make money, but to plow it back into the work. Okay? Nobody can pay you enough of a

fee to make your work good if you really want to do it on a timecard basis. So they load that shit on Walter, but you know he didn't make the profit. Now, I am going to take Walter's side of this. Because he didn't make a profit, he wasn't *de rigueur*, they didn't regard him well. He talked in an arcane superior way. He was pretentious. But he was doing innovative work, whether you like it or not. I don't, but you know what, who cares? The fact is it was groundbreaking work. And so, you couldn't make a profit. See, Walter was innately not talented whereas Bruce is innately talented. So, not only was he innately talented and could turn out good work, he didn't have to put in a lot of time doing it, so he could make a profit. So, he became the darling of Bill Hartmann and the money boys in the firm. That's the truth.

Blum: Well, they were good friends, Bruce and Bill.

Tigerman: No, it wasn't just good friends, I am just saying he represented a profit center and good work. The other guy represented good work, but it wasn't a profit center. So, you tell me, if you are the managing partner in the firm—managing meaning money—which one are you going to support? Right. That's the story.

Blum: I understand.

Tigerman: So, that's how Walter basically lost favor and that's how Bruce curried favor. Because the times were such that office buildings were coming online, and Bruce could crank them out and do really good buildings. And, from my view, he's a better architect than Bunshaft. I mean, Bruce is a very talented man.

Blum: And this is what you learned about the SOM operation? Between those two studios?

Tigerman: Right. Well, it's true. When I married my second wife, Jo Ann—this is very interesting story—I invited Bruce and Jane over. By this time I had left SOM, I was back from Yale, I had worked for Harry Weese, I had my own practice, and so forth. In fact, I just saw Kitty Weese at Aspen and we were reminiscing about those times. So, we had this dinner party, Jo Ann and I. I was in 910 Lake Shore Drive and we had them over and Bruce came to the dinner drunk. He and Jane were at some cocktail party and he was full of himself and bragging that he had twenty-two studios—design studios at Skidmore—and he controlled twenty-one. In other words, Netsch had one studio.

Blum: Well, I think Netsch knew that.

Tigerman: Well, I know. It almost killed Walter. I mean, Walter started having these heart problems and bypass surgeries. But that's also Skidmore.

Blum: When you were at Skidmore, you certainly understood that Bruce was the stronger force in the Chicago office.

Tigerman: He was a killer.

Blum: But did you ever have the sense that he looked towards Bunshaft for a final approval?

Tigerman: Absolutely not. Absolutely not! If anything, it was Netsch that looked at Bunshaft. Bunshaft came to the design studio on the Air Force Academy to say yes or no. But Bruce didn't give a shit about that. No, Bruce was the man.

Blum: Did you ever meet Bunshaft?

Tigerman: Yeah, of course. He was a terror.

Blum: How do you remember him?

Tigerman: As a terror. And, by the way, Margaret also remembers him because Margaret was at Skidmore for a very long time, for eleven years. He was a terror. On the Air Force Academy, he would sit there puffing on his pipe and Netsch would waltz around trying to persuade him— he loved Netsch's work on the academy but he hated the chapel, because he saw it as a departure. When, Netsch did the chapel this sort of Field Theory crap came along, right? Everybody at Skidmore knew it would not represent a profit center because it took time. And so, I mean, even though I may have lots of problems with Walter, I admired him for doing it, because he was doing something.

Blum: The chapel?

Tigerman: Not just the chapel, the whole Field Theory thing. It began with the chapel, yes. So, we were being paid okay. But we knew that we were doing something important. Okay? And that Netsch was doing this within the context of SOM was, in my view, heroic. It's the same fucking *Fountainhead* thing. When a guy doesn't sell out, when a guy's not doing it for a profit... I truly hate Hartray because he loves to mock-design and he is a very smart guy. And I've known him forever. But that's not what architecture's about. He makes sure that they make a profit and that they build well. But, for Netsch to sort of go against the grain of a profit-making big organization, you know, which has 1200 people on their payroll during the time of the Air Force Academy. I mean, it was monstrous. It was a huge firm. And so they had to make sure that they were going to make money. I mean, they were borrowing... The reason they went into the tank during that funny time after Bruce and Eyerman left, in the late '80s, is because, in part, they were borrowing money. I mean, Eyerman was almost financing junk bonds to meet the payroll. It was a fucking nightmare. So, in a firm like that for Netsch, although he only had this one studio, yes, Bruce controlled the other

twenty-one. And Bruce was much more than a commercial architect, Bruce was a goddamned talented architect. Bruce's best buildings are really good buildings. Like First Wisconsin Bank in Milwaukee is a really good building. Like the buildings along the river—the west bank of the Chicago River between Washington and Monroe—there are these black steel-framed... They're beautiful buildings. He's a very talented man.

Blum: Is that Gateway Center?

Tigerman: Gateway Center. Those are really good buildings. But he could also make a profit. So, it's not a negative against Bruce, it's a commercial firm. I mean, firms that today market are trying to get work to feed a firm. So, I resented, I resent all that shit. I think it diminishes the field. I mean, that's ultimately when I went back graduate school.

Blum: I'm surprised, feeling the way you do and realizing that Walter was going against the grain, that you didn't stick with him.

Tigerman: I admired him. I did. I didn't like his work. The reason I didn't like the work—somewhere between a Walter Netsch and Bruce Graham is a real architect, which means a person of talent, which is Bruce, and a geometer, which is Walter. Walter is not a talented man. If you look back, I mean, I think it's funny. I think it's sort of like the administration building of UIC, which is basically Walter's body upside down. If you've ever seen Netsch, he is pear-shaped—his head is like this and his hips are yet wider—I mean, he is very awkward looking guy. So, he needs a system and I don't believe architecture is systematic. And so, he went to the Field Theory. This other guy is a really talented man whose work looks like it is systematized, but nothing could be farther from the truth. Bruce is really talented, truly. I mean, I think Hancock, which Fazlur gets credit for, is actually Bruce. I mean, they had a hard time. There are a lot of stories about that that are devastating. But, in the end, Bruce is a truly talented architect. Actually, if you ever talked to

Stuart Scott, the guy that is the head of LaSalle Partners, I thought his perceptions were brilliant. He and Walter and Bruce were good friends and he thought of Bruce as a sort of fallen hero, because Bruce caved to the profit-making thing. But, in the end, was a truly talented architect. When we did the world's fair of 1992, the one that never happened, I was very involved with Bruce, as you know. For example, I told him, I pleaded with him, I begged him, I said, "Bruce, we're all with Frank Gehry, we're all with Bob Stern, we're all working on this project." I said, "Only you can come out and persuade people. You have to give lots of lectures and make yourself, your voice, heard." And he couldn't do it because he might offend one of their clients.

Blum: He was very political, it seems.

Tigerman: And I was troubled by that. So, it's the reason I went back to graduate school, too. I saw that the political game at Skidmore was such that it wasn't my game. I couldn't do that. But I must say that I admire... Each one of them was admirable in their own way. I prefer Bruce's way, I'm the same kind of guy.

Blum: You understood him better.

Tigerman: I understood it very well. And chemically, I liked him. As a guy, he's a strong guy. And I like strong guys.

Blum: Did you ever meet Nat Owings?

Tigerman: Yeah, once.

Blum: How do you remember him?

Tigerman: He was an old guy at that time. He was already in his seventies.

Blum: He must have been living in California at that time.

Tigerman: In Big Sur. Maybe more than once. See, I know I met him, and it was again on the Air Force Academy. It was a great time, though.

Blum: And John Merrill?

Tigerman: I saw John Merrill once, I saw Lou Skidmore, Senior. Lou Skidmore, Junior, you know there was a son? I don't even know if he practices architecture anymore. They basically got rid of him. He was in the Chicago office. He was at Yale with me. It's a great story. He is a very nice guy, but he is awkward and arrogant and he has a wonderful wife, Margaret, if they are still married, wonderful woman. When he was at Yale—to show you the nature of Yale, it says something about everything—the juries at Yale were big spectacles. They were unpredictable and bums from the Yale Hope Mission would come to the juries for the wine. It was filled with townies and Christ knows who else. Phyllis Lambert was there then. It was a wild place. And the juries, you never knew who was going to be crucified. One day—not in my class, in Bob Stern's class—was Lou Skidmore, Jr., and there was a jury and he was presenting this god-awful neo-Ronchamp sort of Corbusian crap. It was wild. It was a terrible project. And Rudolph, who was this dictator, wild man, said, “Mr. Skidmore, I don't understand this project. Up until now you were doing neo-Miesian kind of work and we all thought that was appropriate because we know where you came from and we know where you're going.” And he said it just that way. “Why are you doing this, then?” And Skidmore, in his haughtiness, again, rich spoiled kid, said, “Well, I wanted to study Mies for obvious reasons and I feel that I've learned everything there is to know about Mies. And so, I want to study Corbusier.” Well, you could see the blood rising into Rudolph's face, and he said, “Mr. Skidmore...” He was furious. “Mr. Skidmore, I can tell you you know nothing about Mies, but I am going to give you the chance to find out, because as of right now, you're flunked

out for one year." So, everybody, because they all hated Skidmore, they all applauded. That's how the juries were at Yale.

Blum: Oh, my gosh, that's scary.

Tigerman: Definitely, because you never knew when that was going to be laid on you. Isn't that wild?

Blum: But you knew him?

Tigerman: I knew Lou Skidmore, Jr. for sure, oh, sure.

Blum: And the father?

Tigerman: Father I met, that's all. Bunshaft came through quite a lot.

Blum: In the juries?

Tigerman: No, I am talking about back at Skidmore. Bunshaft came through quite a lot on the Air Force Academy, no question about it.

Blum: When you were at Yale, did they use texts such as, Giedion's *Space, Time and Architecture* or Jane Jacobs's *The Death and Life of Great American Cities*?

Tigerman: No, no. That's the down side of Paul Rudolph he hated books. He only appreciated talent. Actually, the way he ran the school was wild. Because we are going to get to this when we come to UIC—there's no question about it—I was the same. Rudolph ran the place and the provost at Yale University despised him.

Blum: Despised Rudolph?

Tigerman: Yeah. Because of what Rudolph would do. If you were truly talented and you never attended any class—you either flunked everything or you never showed up—if you were really talented, you won the Alfred Kahn medal, you won a traveling fellowship, you graduated number one. You were the man. If you had a hundred A's in every other course at Yale but you were a shitty designer, he flunked you out. I loved it. That's the way I think an architecture school should be run. I just loved it.

Blum: That's a hard system to master.

Tigerman: But, that's the way I was trained, it's what I understood. So you can imagine even before Yale, when I was at Skidmore, here comes Bruce Graham, here's Walter Netsch manipulating, and because he... I understand it very well. And I appreciated it because Netsch didn't have the budget, the fee, to do this kind of work that the chapel implied.

Blum: And maybe not the power within the SOM firm.

Tigerman: Right, he didn't have the cachet because he wasn't a profit center. I know all that. But he was a manipulator. And here comes Graham, who was this killer, tough guy, really tough, who'd fire you for nothing. I mean he was a tough critter, no fucking around with that guy. I mean, talk to Gert Kerbis or Lou Rocah, any of these people—they were all fired. They were because he didn't think they were talented, he didn't want them around anymore. I mean, he just got rid of them. Boom, you're gone. Flunked them en masse. The whole Air Force Academy design team was fired, every one, except me.

Blum: And why do you think you were kept?

Tigerman: Bruce thought I was talented. That's all. Does that mean I was talented? Not necessarily. It was just a judgment call on his part, but he ran the place. He

could run it and Walter couldn't run it. He couldn't even give the appearance of running it.

Blum: Isn't that the advantage of being in a place like SOM, that you don't have to worry about the business end of it?

Tigerman: There is a problem. If you're not a strong designer, and none of them are now, none of them... Poor Joe Gonzalez fell by the wayside. Adrian has the semblance of talent, but basically there is no talent at Skidmore. If there is a strong person, like Graham, you can get very good work. If there is a weak person, you can't get good work. Skidmore has another thing, which is very difficult—I found it when we worked on King's Cross development in London with them much later with Frank Gehry and all of them—is that everybody gets a shot to design at Skidmore. It is very democratic, actually, which is not good for good building. Good building, in the words of Whitney Griswald, the long since deceased President of Yale, once said to me (ca. 1960), "No group ever made art." That's a quote from Whitney Griswald.

Blum: "No group ever made art?"

Tigerman: Right.

Blum: No decision by committee?

Tigerman: Yeah. And so, Skidmore allows the most junior designer to business partners—everybody has a hand in the design of the building. So, it gets neutralized, it gets neutered, it gets watered down. That's the problem. But, you know, when you are a kid, you learn all these things. I loved working at Skidmore but I was not going to make a career out of it.

Blum: Well, it should have been a good example for you to either to follow or do differently.

Tigerman: It was a great example. It was. Betty, make no mistake, if I could learn from Del Bianco and even Milt Schwartz, I can learn from anybody. Working for an architect, you didn't have to be a great architect, it could be any architect, you see what's good, you see what's wrong, and you make your own decisions.

Blum: Helps you find your own ideas. When you were at Yale, was there any attention given to social issues like...?

Tigerman: No, on the contrary.

Blum: Urban centers?

Tigerman: Absolutely no. Nope, not during Rudolph's tenure.

Blum: Low-cost housing?

Tigerman: No, absolutely none. That came with Charles Moore and Bob Venturi, after Rudolph.

Blum: So, you didn't have any instruction or example or even discussion?

Tigerman: Nothing. That whole side of my work came about from much different sources. It didn't come from Yale, it didn't come from Skidmore, it didn't come from Keck, it didn't come from... It came a little bit from Weese, when I worked for Harry, when I came back from Yale.

Blum: How did you wind up with Harry? It was my impression that while you were at Yale...

Tigerman: He was a critic of mine?

Blum: No, but that you said you were on leave from Skidmore.

Tigerman: I was. So, the first time I went back to SOM. Then in my master's year, I came back from SOM, again, for a couple of months and Harry offered me a job as chief of design. So I left. But I didn't realize that Harry... I just told Kitty at dinner in Aspen two nights ago—Judy had a party for Margaret and me because we did her house—so everybody was toasting and everybody knew each other because Victor Lundy's wife was at the dinner and various intersections were apparent. I pointed out that I worked once for Harry as chief of design, never realizing that Harry needed a chief of design like I need cancer. So, Harry was not great to work for as chief of design.

Blum: Why were you hired with that title? Did you ask for it?

Tigerman: No, absolutely not. He offered it. Ben was there, Jack was there, Hans Neumann was there. It was not a very big office, we had probably ten-twelve guys—very capable group. Yes, I was hired to be the chief of design.

Blum: What kind of jobs did Harry have?

Tigerman: Well, I worked on the Northern Baptist Theological Seminary, which was then built. It's out there in Lombard, a western suburb. I think he was still working on the stuff for Zeckendorf in Hyde Park.

Blum: The apartments?

Tigerman: The apartments, but also the townhouses. I think he was still working on them, I am not sure. They were working on that duplex thing on Eugenie, which Ben did. You know what happens, at some point... Kids always ask me, "How do you ascertain when you are ready to start your own practice? Shouldn't you have saved some money? Don't you need a client? Don't you

need a teaching job to support your practice or be, in any case, independently wealthy? When do you open a practice?" And I know exactly when it is, and it is none of those things.

Blum: When is it?

Tigerman: You open a practice when you're no longer employable.

Blum: Employable?

Tigerman: Yes, when you can no longer take direction. When you're no longer worth anything as an employee. I basically wasn't employable. And I recognized that. That's when I started my practice

[Tape 2: Side 2]

Blum: I had the sense that maybe you'd say, "When I wasn't learning anything more."

Tigerman: No. When I was disgruntled. It happens to everybody. Margaret was fired from Skidmore. Why was she fired? Because she kept coming in late, she kept doing it to herself. She was no longer employable, she didn't like being told... She thought she had better taste or whatever the fuck it was, you know what I am saying? When you're no longer employable is when you start a practice. Now the question is, what you do before you start a practice? And that also came to me all the way back from Keck, Fred Keck, because Bill Keck had nothing to teach anyone. Fred said to me, it was great. He said, "Well, I want to show you my desk." He said to me, "Avoid,"—mind you, I was eighteen years old—"avoid designing for as long as you can." This is very pre-computer. "Just do working drawings. Do architectural production. Learn to build. Don't design at all until you can't stand it any longer, until you are ready to throw up. Just sit and do working drawings." And I bought that, so I

became an architect through the working drawing way. I didn't design a fucking thing until I went to work for Skidmore in 1957. And I started this whole business in 1949. So, for eight years, including in the navy, what was I doing for that guy in Norfolk? Working drawings. And for Del Bianco, working drawings; and Milt Schwartz, working drawings; and Keck, presentation and then working drawings, always.

Blum: Was that good advice?

Tigerman: Absolutely.

Blum: What was the advantage to doing it that way?

Tigerman: You learn how to build. I heard one night many years later—I want to say I was at Skidmore, so say 1957-'58—there was a crazy in this town called John Pawlakowski who was at Skidmore with us. He'd had several nervous breakdowns and so forth, and is a tragic case of a guy unfulfilled. So, Mies used to have these little sessions. And because I knew some people at IIT and I adored Mies, I would sit in on these things. He would tell stories about how the Bauhaus ended, these were fabulous. It was just great. And he would sit there with students and young architects sitting on the floor at his feet and drinking martinis. It was great. It was a great time, Betty. In any case, Pawlakowski said one night, in his very pretentious way, "How do I become a good designer, Mies?" Everybody thought they'd fall through the floor. It's just not the kind of question to ask. And Mies understood in a flash that this is a crazy. And he said, "Jah, first you learn how to draw, zen you learn how to build, und zen you're an architect." And it was almost like a Gertrude Stein saying "a rose is a rose." And everybody went... Me, too. Because I've always thought... These reinforcements supporting the fact that I've never gone through it in the right way, not educated properly, and so forth. Anybody that reinforced the craft way, the apprentice system, I was for and still am. That's never changed. I believe in building. I mean, I get my jollies

going out on a construction site. I love it. There are two projects of ours, big ones, under construction, which is one of the reasons I have to cancel the Wednesday appointment. I never miss the construction meeting on the site, no question. We'll have a guy from the office that will be out there a lot, but I go to all of them.

Blum: Why is that so important to you?

Tigerman: That goes back to Keck, to the very beginning. In other words, the craft, the technique of craft, of the making of buildings, is important to me. Even though I draw and paint and all that, making something is... And in fact, in a much deeper level, in my own work, because I don't think that I make great spaces. There are two kinds of things in architecture: there is space and there is mass. I don't make great spaces, but I do wonderful things with mass. I know how to build. And to me, that is what counts. I did one great space, which was in Fukuoka City, that courtyard.

Blum: Which one was what?

Tigerman: The Fukuoka City apartment house project in Kyushu, Japan. In the courtyard there's an atrium. It is a beautiful space, it's the only one. The rest of them are shit. But I do wonderful things with materials and I know that. Why? Because that's the way I was trained. I was trained to make things. Nobody can train you to make a space. You either have it or you don't have it. I don't think I have it. But I can detail beautifully and I can make things well, at any budget. So, that for me is where my life has been. It starts with drafting, it ends with drafting. It's about the craft, it's about building, it's going to job sites. It's great.

Blum: The moment when you left Harry and opened your own practice came in 1962. You put up your own shingle.

Tigerman: Right and with this guy who I knew from Skidmore.

Blum: Before we move on, you said you wanted to insert a comment about Serge Chermayeff. You ran into him or he was teaching at Yale when you were there, is that correct?

Tigerman: Well, I first bumped into him in 1949 when I was a student at night at the Institute of Design. And, it's just one of those things. We had a chemical imbalance, we didn't like each other. I don't know how you can like or not like a nineteen-year-old but, in any case, he didn't.

Blum: He has a reputation for being a difficult man.

Tigerman: He was a difficult guy. So, he didn't like me, for whatever reason. I don't know why. I am sure I wasn't even intelligent enough to annoy him. But in any case, that was my first exposure to him. The second time...

Blum: When you were at the Institute of Design what kind of exchange did you have with him that led you believe that he didn't like you?

Tigerman: I don't remember but all that stuck was that I sensed that he didn't like me. Okay? Then, when was it? 1949? Eleven years later at my bachelor's thesis jury at Yale, he was on it, okay? I had done—whether or not one takes this arrogantly, it certainly isn't intended, but everyone recognized it at that time—my bachelor's thesis project was a really good project. And, among other things at the jury, beside the twelve thirty-by-forty ink drawings was a very large model. It was, in fact, a little taller than I was, that I had actually made. There is a photograph around here of it somewhere. And, before anybody could say a word, Serge Chermayeff stood up and said, in what I considered to be an arrogant way because I thought he was an arrogant man, he carried on for quite a while about the project, that he really hated the project. And it was wrong for this and that reason, all of which was okay

because that's what juries are all about and you have to expect those kinds of comments. And then he said—because these juries are always packed with people, they were at those years at Yale—he said, “Now, young man, just between you and I, if you had to do it over again, you wouldn't do it this way.” And before I could say a word, Rudolph stood up and said, “Of course he would, you ass. Next project.” And that was that. In other words, Rudolph had it quite within him to take apart the people on the jury, not only those whose work was being reviewed. Okay? Well, I thought that was great, of course. There's no question about it. Chermayeff was always very difficult. When he was at Yale, he was incredibly difficult. He was very haughty, this high “to the manor born” white Russian, and he just pissed me off. He just annoyed me. Now, on the other hand, one of his two sons, Ivan, the graphic designer, is an incredibly good friend of mine, who has none of those attributes. I mean, he is a very sweet guy. The other one, Peter Chermayeff, of the Cambridge Seven, is just, I don't know, a little brain-dead perhaps is the best way of describing him. I got to know him fairly well. In any case, neither of them had those awful arrogant attributes of the old man. I realized the old man was in England before the war and was very well thought of, and for good cause, because he was a good architect. I don't remember much about his time in Chicago at all because I was so wrapped up in what Bob Tague was teaching me at night. I didn't have a lot of contact with Chermayeff. But whatever contact I did have, it annoyed me whatever it was.

Blum: Did you ever have him in the classroom at Yale?

Tigerman: No, no. He came on my bachelor's thesis jury, which was 1960 in May, let's say. And I was there for my master's year in 1960-'61. He wasn't there. He either came the next year or he came after Rudolph left, when Charles Moore was there. I am not sure. When did he say he was at Yale? Do you remember?

Blum: He said he was at Yale beginning in 1962. He alternated between Yale and Harvard. And he, too, was a very independent person in the sense that he didn't want to be bound by tenure to any university.

Tigerman: Well, I don't think he would have ever been offered it under Rudolph. I think it was under Moore that he was there. Weren't we beginning to talk about when I started my practice?

Blum: Yes, and now on to your own practice. You organized one with...

Tigerman: Before that, when I came back I worked for Harry Weese. And Norman Koglin, which is K-O-G-L-I-N, I had known pretty well at Skidmore in the late fifties. Now this is early 1962, I worked for Harry for about six months, that's all. And ultimately didn't like it, which is when I started my practice. So, Norman was in production at Skidmore. He was a job captain or whatever. We were good friends and we talked about starting a partnership. We didn't have any work, we didn't have any clients.

Blum: Did you talk about it before you actually did it?

Tigerman: No, no. When the opportunity was there in the fall of 1961 we started talking. We had no clients, we had no money, but my mother died and she left me \$2,000. And Norman borrowed \$2,000 from his mother-in-law. And we started a practice. We got stationery, we opened a practice at 100 West Monroe, which actually is where Skidmore had been, as well. Skidmore's main office was at 100 West Monroe and their Air Force Academy office was at 37 South Wabash and then they moved in with one another in the Inland Building at 33 West Monroe. It was great to work there. It is a terrific building. Actually, I testified for Inland Steel just last week because it is up for preservation. When I testified on its behalf I pointed out to the people sitting on the panel that I really liked it, and I wanted to be perceived of as being believable, I said that I liked it in spite of the fact that I liked neither

Netsch nor Graham, right? So, because it was about the building, it's a terrific building—it was and it still is.

Blum: And it has been maintained so well.

Tigerman: It's been kept up very well. In any case, we started a practice and we hired a receptionist who was quite beautiful.

Blum: Was a requirement for the job?

Tigerman: Well, it was just in our head, you know? I remember her name. Her name is Nancy Samuels. So we set up shop and, lo and behold, a client walked in. They always do. I mean, that's what young people don't understand, if you just open a practice in a place—not out of your house at night. If you take the trouble to actually open a practice, the real thing, 8:30 to 5:30 kind of thing. There it is. They come. Clients just come.

Blum: I can understand that for established architects that that could be the case, but for new and untried architects?

Tigerman: But they do, they come. The first guy that walked in was a guy that I knew from grammar school and high school who wanted to do a townhouse project. The second one that walked in was Norman's distant relative who wanted to do a house in Nottingham Woods, which is near—what's the town that if you go straight west to the Fox River? Aurora, near Aurora. And that house has been published a lot. It was quite a nice house. It was a wonderful project. He was a great guy. His name was George Habenicht. H-A-B-E-N-I-C-H-T which is German for "have not." Habenicht, all right? Which we made sure he didn't have much of at the end of the project. Well, I mean, we never made any money at the practice at all. We were in practice for two years and my first employee was Larry Booth, who was in Greece after finishing up in the army, where he had been a lieutenant. He and Pat were in Greece—I

think she was pregnant with their first child—and they came across Netsch and Larry applied to SOM for a job and they sent him to me. So, Larry was my first employee.

Blum: How did you and Norman divide your responsibilities?

Tigerman: Well, it was just what we knew each other to be. I was the designer and he was the production guy, it's that simple.

Blum: It sounds like a good marriage.

Tigerman: Ah, no... Margaret and my partnership is far better because it's almost two autonomous beings. In other words, she is there, on that side of the office doing her work, I'm on this side. We rarely do things together. We do crit each other's work from time to time, not as a matter of course.

Blum: Are you more gentle with your wife's work than you are with the work of others?

Tigerman: No. You can ask Margaret. When I look at something and if I don't like it, I would say to her, and I still do, "It's shit." And she'd say, "Why?" And I'd say, "I don't have to tell you why, I'm just telling you it's shit." So, I'm the same way with everybody.

Blum: You're a hard guy to live with, I'll bet.

Tigerman: I am. I've had three wives. And I'm not so great at a partnership because I had three wives. I'm not much of a team player at the end the day.

Blum: When you were in partnership with Norman Koglin, there were several residential projects that were published.

Tigerman: Lots, lots.

Blum: You were also active in the American Institute of Architects at that time. And related to your residential work, you were very verbal in the AIA as chairman of the Planning and Urban Affairs Committee.

Tigerman: There is a lot more specific stuff than that about that planning committee.

Blum: Well, let's hear it.

Tigerman: Lewis Hill was the commissioner of the department of planning of the city of Chicago. And I was chairman of the AIA planning committee because young men and women in this field, when they start their practice they're very involved with things like the AIA. Obviously when you get older there are other things that you do. But there is no question that one is involved. One of the things that I did, which was, I think, exemplary, but in any case, I did it. At that time, it was the time of urban renewal that was not a good thing as it turned out with respect to black people. For sure it meant "urban removal," which is what it was known as, not so jokingly. Up till that time, if you were a developer and you wanted to develop a piece of land, the Department of Urban Renewal would put it on the market and it would be bid. You would bid for it, and the highest bidder, well, it was the one who gave the most money to the city who would end up with the property. So, when I became chairman of that committee, I had lunch with Lew, who became a good friend, and I said, "Why don't you also have something connected with the quality of work?" In other words, have some sort of competition, which at once has a money side to it, a bid side. The city by law has to do that, but qualify it with a jury on each of these projects, your parcels of land, and ask that preliminary designs are submitted. And you have a jury of good designers that makes a judgment. And that plays heavily, or weighs heavily, into the mix. And he did it, which was very, very, very good.

Blum: When you were doing was it under the auspices of AIA?

Tigerman: AIA, yeah. So, the first thing they did was the stuff on 47th Street, 47th and the Outer Drive on the west. Lew used to live on the south side of 47th where there is a whole bunch of newer townhouses. All the jazz clubs and bars and stuff, are on the north side of 47th. Ben built that tower on the south side of the street.

Blum: Oh, yes, yes.

Tigerman: That's a funny tower—a Ben Weese kind of thing, in fact. And then there's a series of townhouses, and whatever. And there is a building by Keck, not such a good building, because by then Fred was very old and Bill had more or less taken over. Bill, in my opinion, was not a man of great quality in terms of design. He had no great design strengths. But before that, that was a product of coming out of a jury, okay? And I was on that first jury. And I think Ed Dart was on the first jury. And I am not going to remember but there were probably one or two others, there were probably three or four of us. And it was very interesting because at the end of the jury, Bill Keck complained bitterly because he lost a project to Lou Rocah, or someone, but whatever. But nobody knew whose work it was. When it turned out that he lost the project he went public with the fact that he lost. He didn't like the jury concept and complained bitterly about me, very specifically, because I had done, or was in the process of doing when I was in partnership with Norman, a not very good building for his developer. He's not a very good developer, who'd I rather not mention. No point to hurt someone unnecessarily because of something like this. And he said that I had it in for this guy, and therefore, they didn't get the project, which was bullshit. As a result of that, there was a big article, "architect accused of," whatever.

Blum: You just had a phone call and something came up that perhaps we should speak about.

Tigerman: Betty, this is a little out of context, but I just had a call about a problem we're having currently. It's not that I enjoy it, but I won't turn my back on problems as they come up and I hate cowardice when people talk behind your back in pejorative ways. If they have something to say, let them say it. And that's happened on three occasions: one that's going on right now through a contractor in town whose name I don't want to mention and another one with Bob Bruegmann, the historian at the University of Illinois in Chicago. When I was still there, maybe after, because I was controversial, I was trying to accomplish something. All this I'm sure will come up later, which is fine and it should, because it should be talked about. I have no problem with it. I curated a show, an exhibition, called "Ten Untenured Faculty," which is a very interesting exhibition of the most avant-garde guys at UIC. And before that time, I had heard from several sources, including John Zukowsky, that Bob Bruegmann, the historian at UIC—admittedly the respected historian, properly deserved—was bad-mouthing me behind my back. So I went up to him at the opening and said, "If you have something to say about me, or things you don't like, I'd appreciate if you'd say it directly to me. If not, I would consider you a coward and behave accordingly." And I walked away, okay? Another example, because this kind of crap goes on all the time. Particularly with a guy like me who is controversial and very much out there and an easy mark to take a shot at, in a certain way, because we're published a lot and so forth. I mean, I'm not an unknown quantity. So, another example is that little "bourgeois frog" Lucien Lagrange and I've also told him the same thing. I hear it from my clients, I hear it from everybody. Right? I find that an act of cowardice and it just annoys the hell out of me, okay? Now we can get back to where we were. So, where were we?

Blum: We were in 1962-64 and you were talking about the jury you suggested for urban renewal projects.

Tigerman: Oh yeah, the jury that happened... So the result of that jury with the Department of Urban Renewal is that Bill Keck behaved, in my view, really badly and complained to the press. There were a series of articles. The good thing that came out of it is that the then president of the AIA, Jack Train, went to Bill Keck and said if he has nothing to substantiate it, he needs to apologize publicly. It was a very good act. Every so often, the AIA, in those years, did good things. They don't much anymore, because they are not really interested in morality and ethics and all that. But they were then. So, either Jack caused Bill to apologize, which of course ended up on the last page of the paper some weeks later. But it was there, okay? And he caused it to happen, which I thought was great.

Blum: Who else was on this jury?

Tigerman: Ed Dart was one. I think Lew Hill was one.

Blum: I read somewhere where you were instrumental in recommending a design jury, but the people on it were Harry Weese, Bud Goldberg, Walter Netsch.

Tigerman: It may have been. Right. I think it might have been those very people. And I think Ed Dart was on it, too. Yeah, it was a very distinguished list of architects. Because I wanted quality, I was interested in quality. I mean, every architect is, nothing unusual about that. But I was trying to get the city, in addition, to doing things economically, getting the best price for parcel of land, to also see what would be there. And that was a good idea and it was supported obviously, by the AIA. So, that went on for many years until very recently. It was the local AIA, not national, national is awful. But local AIA has had pretty terrific people as presidents, like Cindy Weese, like John Syvertsen, who have really tried to make sure the quality and the way architects contend with things. Margaret was on the jury for the library that Tom Beeby won to try to get the developers to pay the most possible money. Liz Hollander was not so great about this, she was the former Commissioner

of Development and Planning. I mean, nobody in this country really understands value connected with architecture, okay?

Blum: We're really far afield, but as long as you brought it up, wasn't the library one of the first projects where the team of the developer and the architect and the construction was responsible for maintaining the price for their design?

Tigerman: For the entirety, right.

Blum: And if there was overage, they ate it.

Tigerman: Something called "turnkey." But they didn't want to pay a lot of money to the different competitors, right? Which is bullshit.

Blum: But they did, eventually.

Tigerman: They ultimately did, because the AIA forced them to do it. It went public with complaints that they wanted it basically for nothing. So, the city ended up paying, I think, \$75,000 per team, which still doesn't cover costs but they did. Of course, it never covers the work that you do for that kind of thing. So, in any case, back to that 1962-64 time. Yeah, I was very involved with the AIA and the planning committee particularly. Something else happened then, which is actually pretty interesting. By that time my partnership was about over with Norm. Say in 1964, after the partnership broke up—and I want to talk about the partnership breaking up. It is germane in a way as a continuation of my relationship with Lew Hill and that jury, the idea of juries, which became *de rigueur*. The Department of Development and Urban Planning then had juries that you'd submit the designs for a project.

Blum: So they had a measure of quality control.

Tigerman: Some sort of—it played a part in all of that. After the partnership broke off I had begun on a very big project—the biggest project I had at that time, for sure, one of my biggest projects, ever—something called Woodlawn Gardens. This was a low-rise FHA 221D3, which to decode means low-cost housing, but above public housing. What’s called “just below market rate housing,” it used to be Section 8 in this country. On the Midway, I should say on Cottage Grove, both sides of Cottage Grove, between the Midway and 63rd, I started that project. I realized that because it’s a project it was for The Woodlawn Organization (TWO), which after all, Jesse Jackson had been peripherally attendant to. I mean, he was a part of that. And there was Reverend, now Archbishop, Brazier, B-R-A-Z-I-E-R, Arthur Brazier. He was the client,. And TWO—The Woodlawn Organization, which has become a very powerful organization—it was founded initially by Saul Alinsky, in contradistinction to what Saul felt was the University of Chicago’s land-grabbing ways south of the Midway. The Midway always is the demarcation between the U of C, which is north, and the black community to the south, which was Woodlawn, right? And they kept grabbing up land, witnessed by the fact that the Social Service Administration by Mies, Eero Saarinen’s Law School, and other things—Ed Stone’s whatever department that is—buildings came up on the south side of the Midway. So, there was a great resistance and Alinsky, who was into social involvement, one of the early ground-breaking guys...

Blum: Hyde Park was taking shape at that time, the shape that it was going to have for a long time.

Tigerman: Right, and so, in any case, it was a very interesting time. And I was doing this project which, in a way, galvanized TWO. Originally I was trying to persuade Brazier and the other guy, Leon Finney, to do mid-rise, taller buildings, and they, properly, didn’t want to do it because they felt it was like public housing. So, they wanted low-rise, but they wanted big density, okay? And I was able to achieve it, through a lot of struggle. I realized, coincidentally, that the density that I was achieving was the same density public housing had in

tall buildings. In other words, the tall building required more open space at the ground, the low-rise less open space, and the aggregate was there are about forty-five units to the acre, each one. And so I made that public through the planning committee, the same planning committee, as an antagonistic move against the furthering of public housing. Okay?

Blum: Against public housing or public housing in a particular form?

Tigerman: Public housing as a particular typology.

Blum: The high-rise?

Tigerman: The high-rise, I was against the high-rise. When you discover that you can keep people low to the ground, so the mother can yell out the third-story window for Sammy to come in for lunch and she can't do that from the twenty-second floor, that was a good thing. It began a sort of movement that still goes on today that's antagonistic to the tall buildings for very poor people because it takes them away from the ground and is alienating. Much has been written about it, there's no need to go into all that. So, that was an early thing about social cause that I was involved with if you want.

Blum: When was this?

Tigerman: At the end of the partnership with Norman and beginning my own practice. I would say it was 1964.

Blum: Was this a result of having read Jane Jacobs book? Did she influence your thinking in any way?

Tigerman: Well, no she didn't.

Blum: Because it was contrary to popular thinking at that time.

Tigerman: I know. I did read her, but she didn't particularly influence me, she was not influential in that way. She did talk about that, but it was...

Blum: She talked about the streets.

Tigerman: She talked about "eyes on the street" and so forth. But she didn't really talk about the issue of density. That you can achieve the same density in low-rises that are achieved in high-rise, was something—I don't want to say a breakthrough, but it helped people clarify things. Everyone thought, well, if you did high-rise you could get greater density, which was a racist thing of keeping poor people, black people, under view in a tall building. Because if they lived on the ground, it would be harder to control them. I believe it was racist to actually produce the tall building to contain a certain kind of person.

Blum: This was an idea that came out of, Corbusier where he had a "tower in the park?"

Tigerman: No, Corbu was the problem. Because he created the Voisin Plan for Paris that showed the tall building in the park and everybody thought it was a marvelous idea, because it is a marvelous idea, except when you add a sociological mix and you discover the children and no doorman. It is one thing to say Mies's 860-880 Lake Shore Drive was—or any tall building—in a good neighborhood, doorman, good area. But then, no doorman, and no doors on closets in the public housing, and so forth and so on, and you quickly come to realize there's a problem. Even the Kecks—Fred Keck, not just Bill—in their Prairie Avenue Courts, the housing they did south of 26th Street between South Parkway and Prairie Avenue, the one oriented to the south. When I worked for Keck earlier in 1949-50, he was trying to talk Elizabeth Wood, who was then the head of the CHA, into doing a single-loaded corridor, not a double-loaded corridor. It was interesting, the solar benefit he wanted to get. So, he used the gallery, the single-loaded corridor,

as an overhang for the floor below, letting in sun in the winter, keeping it out in the summer. It was a very good idea. For safety, to avoid people falling off or jumping off the balcony, he thought of putting on chain link fence to protect them. Well, of course, the inhabitants perceived it correctly—how else could you perceive it?—as if they were animals and this is a zoo and they were being penned in. It began the antagonism, which would cause all those projects to come down, like Pruitt-Igoe in St. Louis. Okay? So, I remember very well, I was working in Keck's office, Elizabeth Wood came in one day, Fred was trying to persuade her. Fred enlisted Mies—this is all on the record, everybody knows this—to talk her and they talked her into doing the single-loaded corridor. It was all done in the spirit of optimism, but they were naïve. When one was doing something and is a good architect—Fred Keck was a really good architect, I would dare say a marginally, a great architect—and you get people like Mies van der Rohe to take your behalf, it's all done in the spirit of optimism. But you are not thinking it through and you are not thinking sociological behavior.

Blum: You know, today, we have the benefit of hindsight.

Tigerman: Of course. No question about that.

Blum: It seems your position in the sixties has been proven correct. When did this idea come to you in the sixties?

Tigerman: From working on Woodlawn Gardens, because when I worked on Woodlawn Gardens, I wanted to do a taller building to get greater density. The reason I wanted greater density was that density is good, and then it gets to Jane Jacobs idea of the street. But she doesn't talk about minorities needing power. This means they would represent their constituency that's represented in the city council by an alderman, let's say. I don't care if it's at the state level, in congressmen and senators. You know how many congressmen are there in Wyoming? Two, the same as senators, I mean,

because there is nobody there. So, you get a huge amount of congressmen from, let's say, California, New York, Illinois, Ohio, but you get shit in Montana because there is nobody there. So, you don't get anybody with any representation. They have no power in the Congress, in the House. Everybody gets two senators, but in the House, they are based on population. The House, in many ways, is a more powerful body because it's representative of the population. So, for black people, they always turned out to vote because Alinsky trained them in Woodlawn. They need power in the Chicago City Council. It was about power and the representation of power. So, I wanted to get as many people in on that, four blocks, both sides of the street.

Blum: So density means representation means power?

Tigerman: Yeah, but it was a lot of people. And it was through urban renewal, Lew Hill was still there. I mean, it was all parts of a larger piece. And so when I was working on it, I realized that for lots of reasons the taller building was wrong, the elevator building, then I worked on the low-rise alternative, and I was determined to get in a really big density. Well, the big density produced the same density as the tall building. When I realized that I had done that, I shared it, for sure, through the vehicle of the committee that I was chairing, the Planning Committee of the AIA, for sure. And it was published quite a lot.

Blum: From what's been published, not only did you equal the density but you surpassed it a little bit.

Tigerman: By a little bit, and it's perfectly reasonable housing. I hasten to add, now it's condo, which is what it should have been in the beginning.

Blum: Well, doesn't that prove its durability?

Tigerman: It's durable, no graffiti—it's all families. So, this business which is also racist and stereotyping... You say, well, you build for "them," meaning for black people, and they ruin it, they graffiti it up. That's not true. People say the same thing about Mexicans. You go to Mexico, everything is perfect. Their work ethic is phenomenal, as you see in Pilsen, with the Mexican-American community. I mean, it's all racist, these white people looking down on everybody who isn't, typically. So, yes, there is a social reason.

Blum: So, you were motivated by political, economic, and social reasons to produce this housing?

Tigerman: Yes, for sure.

Blum: You did this when you worked with the Maremont Foundation?

Tigerman: Right. This was a Maremont Foundation project. The Woodlawn Gardens project was for the Maremont Foundation.

Blum: What was the connection with The Woodlawn Organization?

Tigerman: TWO, The Woodlawn Organization. It's interesting, when I came back from Yale... No, let me go back further. In 1957, before I went to Yale, when I was at Skidmore, like every young architect that has always been and I'm sure will always be, I was "moonlighting." Whether I had a client or not, I was doing stuff on the side.

Blum: You and Frank Lloyd Wright.

Tigerman: Everybody does it, okay? And one of those projects for no client was a townhouse with an atrium, as a schema, as an imaginative project. It's very Miesian, English cross-bond, cross-wall, courtyard. It was a nice project. In any case, it was the first project that I ever published. And it was published

in *Arts and Architecture* in about August of 1957. I didn't know John Entenza. I didn't know who he was. I just sent the project in the blind to the magazine because I thought it was a terrific project. Sure as shit, he published it, okay? So, time passes and when I come back from Yale and open up a practice in 1962, I get a call one day from some secretary at the Graham, "Mr. Entenza would like to meet you." So, I thought okay because then I knew who he was, I knew about the Graham Foundation and he is the Director of the Graham Foundation. So, I went to meet him and he was incredible. Did you ever meet Entenza?

Blum: No, I didn't.

Tigerman: Incredibly arrogant, haughty. And I thought, this guy is an asshole. Of course, I was totally wrong. He was a great man. He became, in a way, my godfather. He took me under his wing. When he died, he left me his library. I have his library, which is about 2,000 books. You probably know this. Margaret and I took him after his stroke. Well, first of all, at his stroke... It's a great story, I mean it. It's a nasty story, but it's a great story. When you become mature, maturity is the repression of childish behavior, let's say it's a good-enough definition of one of the aspects of maturity. A stroke takes away that protective thing.

Blum: Maturity?

Tigerman: Yeah, it takes away the things you repress. Okay? So, here I have John Entenza, and the last person in the world I would ever hurt is Entenza, because I truly loved him. He was a really good man, in every way. He was the most civilized, cultured person I ever knew. However, you have these protective coatings when you're an adult, and when you have a stroke, it removes a layer, okay? So, one day I get a call from Henry Tabor. He was the guy that ran the architecture book section at Kroch's and Brentano's.

[Tape 3: Side 1]

Tigerman: Tabor called frantically. Apparently, John had had a stroke in the store. He knew that John and I were good friends. He didn't know where to send John because the ambulance was coming. I quickly called my doctor and he was sent to Northwestern. As soon as the ambulance came, I went to the emergency room at Northwestern and I intercepted them, with Entenza on a pallet, poor guy. The other people that were there, because Henry Tabor had called them, were some of John's lady friends, who were the society ladies in Chicago—Pussy Paepcke, Harriet Welling, and Suzette Morton Zurcher. These three distinguished old WASP ladies and I are standing next to this pallet with our dear friend lying there. You've got to remember that Entenza was from a background of great aristocracy in "Barthelona." Old lineage, number one. Number two, he was immensely intellectually endowed. So, on the one hand, there was this gene pool. Thirdly, as a Spaniard, he was—but repressed it—anti-Semitic. Fourthly, he also repressed his sexual ambivalence. So you have all that complexification, right? And he's lying there on the pallet and he can't speak. He can only get a word out every ten mumbles. But when you're close to someone and you really care—you see it with a grandmother or somebody who's had a stroke—you understand everything they're saying because you just understand it. You know what I'm saying? So Entenza, through all of this, we're all trying to make him feel better. It's an awful moment, a stroke is awful. And somehow he gets it across to me to ask what's going on, currently, architecturally. He's the director of the Graham Foundation, a truly brilliant man, immensely well read. I went through this song and dance, that such-and-such is doing this, and there's this lecture, and, by the way, Peter Eisenman is in town. He's lying there—he loathed Peter—and he's trying to get out a word, just a word, that describes his loathing for Peter.

Blum: You knew about this before you told him Peter was in town. Were you trying to provoke a reaction?

Tigerman: Well, I knew he loathed him, but I didn't realize what was about to happen. This wasn't a set-up, no way. He finally said, in the presence of these three ladies, by way of describing all of his antagonism toward Peter, he managed to get out one word, which was "kike." We all were stunned, and then we all broke out laughing. It was a very interesting, very poignant—believe it or not—even tender moment that a guy using that kind of vulgarity, nonetheless, was trying to express himself and the depths of his feelings. I've told this to Peter Eisenman, by the way.

Blum: If you think he was anti-Semitic, deep down, how was it that you were such good friends?

Tigerman: Hey, we can now switch characters and ask about Philip Johnson. He was a member of the Nazi party—all of which has been written about—and was Father Coughlin's guy. He followed the German army into Warsaw and Paris and wrote these incredible anti-Semitic diatribes—which I can quote to you—how come, he is incredibly supportive of Richard Meier, Peter Eisenman, Bob Stern, and me? And Frank Gehry. All of whom are Jews. How come?

Blum: Did he grow up? Did he change?

Tigerman: No, he didn't change at all. Philip is still... Whatever qualities or characteristics you have, they remain, they never change. Never.

Blum: Is there much anti-Semitism in the architectural profession generally?

Tigerman: Well, there is an article, but you may not have read it. It was in the *New York Times* a year ago by Herbert Muschamp, who is not our friend, frankly. Herbert is also Jewish and he was writing about Jews in architecture, which was very interesting. There is about to be a significant piece in *Architecture* magazine on Jews in architecture. One of the first significant Jewish

architects—if you want to categorize people as women architects or black architects or Muslim architects or Jewish architects—was Lou Kahn. I know I'm going all over the map, but in aggregate it will pull together. There's a good friend of mine named Fikret Yegul—he's a Turk. He a terrific historian and he teaches at UC Santa Barbara. He's married to an even better friend of mine, Diane Favro, who's a brilliant architectural historian and who was at the American Academy in Rome with me. When I was the resident architect she was there and she was Spiro Kostoff's student. Fikret wrote an incredible book called *Gentlemen of Instinct and Breeding*, about the American Academy in Rome. It's a book that Victoria Newhouse refused to publish because she was on the board of the American Academy in Rome, the Architecture Foundation refused to publish it—no slur against Victoria, who's a very good friend of mine, a good woman, for sure. But you'll see why she didn't want to publish it. The book was about the first real, honest history of the American Academy in Rome. Now, you're aware that the American Academy in Rome was founded just before the turn of the century with Charles Follen McKim and, among others, Dan Burnham from Chicago. Because Charles Murphy, Senior was Ernest Graham's secretary, all that is known and when they started the Graham Foundation, it was, in a way, to be like the American Academy in Rome. It was to be a school, which is why it got in trouble when there were questions about funds with Charlie Murphy, Junior. You must know about some of this, it was published quite a lot. Its charter was to make it a school. In fact, when Entenza was the director, I was trying always to get him—which wasn't in him to do—to dirty it up, to bring in students and to have charettes and this and that, instead of laundered lectures for progressive sandal-schlepping types. So the American Academy was founded before the turn of the century, just after the Columbian Exposition, after all those guys coalesced—George B. Post, McKim, Burnham, and so on. The first woman to be a fellow, Norma Merrick Sklarek, was the same year that Michael Graves was a fellow, 1962. So, basically, for seventy years, there were no women. He reveals the correspondence. There were basically no Catholics, there were no blacks, no people of color, and there were no Jews. The correspondence of the

juries of the American Academy are incredible anti-Semitic diatribes, all of which show up in this book. So, yes... It's not because I'm Jewish, but anti-Semitism, racism, sexism—it's going to be a very long time before things innately change, a very long time. I even joke with John Zukowsky that, "Gee, the spelling of your name is not the Polish way with the 'i' at the end. It's Jewish." He always points out that even though it ends with a "y" that he's not Jewish. He's a little funny about that, too.

Blum: I've never heard him say anything about that.

Tigerman: Oh, yes. Well, he and I are good buddies, as you know, so I hear stuff. So with Entenza there has always been... Architecture is the descendent professional practice of an English aristocracy after the Renaissance. That's what architecture is, of the privileged. It's people of privilege and class and taste—people who, like Philip, have an autonomous income. Like people, I would say, in museology—museums don't pay enough for people like Jim Wood and others to do that, unless there's some other independent income, some resource that comes out of trust funds. So, basically, you'll find that that transpires. Architecture is the same. Now it's different; now it's great.

Blum: When did it change?

Tigerman: After World War II.

Blum: Well, it changed in museums, too. Now we have professionals, along with...

Tigerman: Along with the others, yes. It's also true in the Ivy League schools. I mean, when was the first Jew admitted to Yale? Was there anti-Semitism at Yale? Absolutely, no question. They are very rare at those positions—Princeton, Harvard, Yale, let's say those three. But it's always been that way. And, by the way, it wasn't just at Yale or the Ivies or the American Academy in Rome, it was of a piece. It was a country that only recently developed in a more

populist overall way. So now in architecture, in graduate schools, for an M.Arch, it's 50 percent women students, right now.

Blum: And you think that reflects the broader attitude?

Tigerman: Yes, absolutely. And Jews—now you have, after Lou Kahn, my God, then have all of these architects. There's Eisenman, Gehry, Jim Polshek, Jim Freed, me, Bob Stern. It's an endless fucking list. I mean, I can go on and on with Jewish architects, for sure. People always stereotyped that if you were a Jewish architect obviously you were in it for the money, of course. I actually even from time to time hear that today, which I find funny and ridiculous.

Blum: Do you feel it lurks beneath the surface?

Tigerman: John Entenza was definitely anti-Semitic, but he managed to repress it, for sure. You could also say, which is true, that Jews and blacks and women are incredibly sensitive and sensitized to these issues, and I would say, yes, that's true. Me too. Except that it's with cause because you're faced with it unexpectedly all the time.

Blum: Do you feel you have you been discriminated against in your career?

Tigerman: Absolutely. Particularly somebody like me or Bob Stern, vis à vis Serge Chermayeff's remarks or my interpretation of his remarks. People like Bob and I are highly visible and we're notorious because our work is published all the time and we're quoted all the time. If you're out there... I have a hate mail file.

Blum: You have a hate-mail file composed of letters you've received over the years?

Tigerman: Yeah. Of course.

Blum: Are they directed at your work, or directed at you because you are Jewish?

Tigerman: Both. Some at my work, some at my religious preference, some at my notoriety level, because my name is... In Greece, a long time ago, Plato was a very intelligent man—much more intelligent than people give him credit for. Socrates, as you know, took hemlock. Why did that happen? He was a cult figure and cult figures build up resentment. Plato began every statement of his by saying, “And Socrates said...” trying to keep the heat off of himself. Plato never had to take hemlock. When you are out there in your own name... There is a reason why Miesians—the descendants—are secure, because they can always turn back to Mies and say, “Well, Mies said...,” or “Mies did...,” or “Mies thought...,” as opposed to when you do it yourself and you don’t have anybody to fall back on. So you become visible and you become the target, right? I’m well aware of that—you have to be, after a certain number of years. So, it goes with the territory. As they say in capitalism, it’s the cost of doing business. I’m aware of that.

Blum: Well, you seem to be a fighter on many levels.

Tigerman: I think you have to be. Now, unless you’re privileged and come from the aristocracy and build for your own kind, basically in Lake Forest and Winnetka and Kenilworth—not a problem. Even my less-than-scintillating now deceased father-in-law, I remember once—it was humorous, but I knew what he meant, for sure. There was a state AIA convention, held in Rockford, in about 1976. In that year, I received two state design awards, three AIA design awards from the Chicago chapter, all presented at the same place. I was sitting, only by coincidence, at the same table as Paul [McCurry]. And I had started dating Margaret, whom I met in 1975—it was not important, nor was I kissing his ass because I was dating his daughter—I really didn’t care for him very much. But we were at the same table. So the first time my name was called to go up and get an award, he looks up and doesn’t say anything. The second time my name is called... And so forth. By the time it was the

fourth time, he said, "My, we are busy today." In other words, I got it. He felt that, as people from Lake Forest knew, architects should be seen and not heard.

Blum: Well, you were doing things another way.

Tigerman: Right. I was becoming visible, or, if you like, notorious. And that's not what architecture was. Architecture was always a very quiet, well-mannered affair, a product we inherited from the English.

Blum: Can we go back to John Entenza for a minute? I have heard that you were very good to him in his later years.

Tigerman: Of course, I loved him. He was a great man. Margaret and I took him to California after he had the stroke. He stayed at home for a while and there are stories I don't want to go into, which are just awful, that happened, that were laid on him by his lawyer and his so-called son. I'm not sure about whether he was his son or if it was another kind of relationship. He lost a lot of money and there was a great tragedy connected with all of that. Margaret and I took him to La Jolla, as did Maglet Myhrum, who was also very close to him. She took him out there and we then went out and helped him set up in this retirement home. It was a retirement home/assisted living/nursing home composite.

Blum: Did he ever recover from the stroke?

Tigerman: Nope. He ultimately had a second stroke and was found dead in an elevator in that complex. I dedicated the show "Late Entries to the Chicago Tribune Tower Competition," which played in La Jolla after Chicago, to him. But there were a lot of other things.

Blum: That show and one issue of the *Chicago Architectural Club Journal* was dedicated to him.

Tigerman: Entenza was the most civilized person connected with architecture, not because he was the director at the Graham Foundation or was my friend—those are all tangential things—but he was truly a man who made a remarkable difference in his field. He bought a crappy trade publication called *California Arts and Architecture* in 1938, I think. If you look back in the years in the late forties—let's say after World War II—the only magazine that was doing modern architecture was *Arts and Architecture*, not *Forum*, not *Record*, and not *Pencil Points*. The only one doing really modern stuff was John. So he was really ahead of his time. He also used his own money because he, at one time in his life, although he was not independently wealthy, he was pretty well-heeled. He pissed it all away doing the Case Studies house program. So you've got to love a guy like that who would do something for a field... That's why I get crazed with people who market and who diminish this field, because there are guys like Entenza who ennobled it and who basically threw away their life's savings trying to make better architecture. Jesus Christ, that's a phenomenal thing. He was a great man. And he was my friend. He didn't think Margaret was good enough for me, which really annoyed her no end, right? He was like a father. We had dinner all the time. He was great. He was a terrific guy.

Blum: I know that he gave you his library.

Tigerman: Oh, I was thrilled. It was great.

Blum: Stanley, could I go back for one minute to Woodlawn Gardens? Was this job done with Norman or not?

Tigerman: Both. Entenza and I became fast friends in 1961, when I came back and was at Harry Weese, before I had started the partnership. Arnold Maremont, who

was an incredibly difficult man, had this foundation. Its first executive director was Dick Newhouse, the state senator for whom the Newhouse Competition is named. Dick Newhouse was great—now he's got Alzheimer's and it's terrible. He was a great man. The second one was not so great. His name was Victor de Grazia. Victor was a political guy. Entenza was a very good friend of Arnold Maremont's. When Maremont started the foundation, it was about social... You know, it's very interesting talking to you, Betty, because we will ultimately come to Archeworks and you will inevitably say, "How did these things happen?" These are the reasons, which I never thought of until this minute, in truth. There are always reasons why you do something, but they are not always in your head when you do something like Archeworks. But they are so deeply embedded that they come out. That's why this is interesting. So, anyway, Maremont was a good man even though he was difficult. He wanted to start a foundation to rehab places on the south and west sides, case by case. So Entenza said, 'Well, who are you going to use as an architect?' at the opera one night. Maremont said, "I don't know. Who do you recommend." Entenza said, "Stanley Tigerman." Why? I don't know. Maybe it's because I had started my work in Bangladesh, which we'll get to as well, which was about social causes. So in any case, we began remodeling and renovating work in Lawndale and Woodlawn, all in African-American communities, for the Maremont Foundation. Then came Woodlawn Gardens and de Grazia's connection with Leon Finney and Art Brazier. This was a very big project, which was also a Maremont Foundation project. It was done with Metropolitan Structures. So Entenza was starting to recommend me. It's interesting, no man is an island. Everybody needs people who think kindly of them, but he did something much more significant for me, which never took. He tried like hell to clean up my act, to not be difficult, to not be controversial. I said, "John, I love you. You're a terrific man, you're a civilized guy. It ain't going to work, it's embedded in me. It's too late. I'm a bad dude, just forget it. But I'll tell you what I'm going to do—I'll try." And I tried, but it never took. He was a good man. He actually cared about people.

Blum: I wondered if it was through Norman Koglin that you made these connections with the Chicago Dwelling Association, The Woodlawn Organization.

Tigerman: No, on the contrary. Norman didn't have any... The Woodlawn thing definitely was begun during our partnership. When we split the partnership, I took that project and Norman took the Harris bank. He was doing all this tenant work for the Harris bank, which carried him for years—he's retired now. My work for Maremont ended with Woodlawn because they never did anything after that.

Blum: Your wife Jo Ann was the interior designer for the project?

Tigerman: Yes, Jo Ann did some interior design for the model apartments, that's right.

Blum: Was she an interior designer?

Tigerman: No. Jo Ann was a legend in her own mind. She thought she was an interior designer, so I said, "By all means, you can do the interior design for the model apartments. Go ahead." And she did a good job.

Blum: Well, it looked very much of its time.

Tigerman: Yes, it was very much of the time. Jo Ann is a whole other story. I just had lunch with her after all these years. It was crazy. But, that's life.

Blum: Stanley, you said that Woodlawn Gardens was the first of several projects that you did with a social concern, with a concern for the disadvantaged, the disabled.

Tigerman: I don't get any credit for it because I've done a lot of projects. The only one I get credit for is Archeworks because that was a conscious thing. These others were projects that came into the office.

Blum: Your Library for the Blind got an enormous amount of coverage.

Tigerman: No question.

Blum: You did a lot, as I understand it, to inform yourself of what the needs of non-sighted people were.

Tigerman: Yes, I did. I did. The library came about in 1977 or '76. By that time, you've got to remember that my first project that had a social impact, that was meaningful from a behavioral and social point of view, was Woodlawn Gardens. All of the rehab that preceded it, on the one hand... I also opened—you may not have found out about it—a clinic in Woodlawn and Lawndale staffed by black architects. It was my office. There was staff and we were doing free work. Later a former student of mine, John Tomassi, did it through the AIA, the Chicago Architectural Assistance Center, CAAC. I started that in 1965 or '64. Our office was doing the work and after the work to remodel, say, an older apartment. We set up a clinic in Lawndale in a place called Fifth City, and one in Woodlawn to assist individuals and families who wanted to remodel. We did it for free.

Blum: In one of the articles about Woodlawn Gardens, it was clear that African-American subcontractors were used.

Tigerman: At one time, my office was predominately black. I mean, probably two-thirds of the people were black. You can't work on projects like that and not staff it appropriately. You can't, it doesn't make any sense. There were a lot of guys, Gus Jones, Richie Franklin. Christ, I don't know how many guys there were in the office.

Blum: Are they still in business today?

Tigerman: Oh, yeah. For sure, for sure. Actually, at another time in our office, the office was predominantly female—maybe two-thirds to three-quarters. So it's been an interesting office in terms of make-up.

Blum: Taking the long view of projects that you've done with a social concern, certainly the roots of Archeworks are evident.

Tigerman: Totally. There's no question about it. But the project that actually, outside of Woodlawn and the Maremont Foundation, was early in the beginning of a life-long involvement with social causes goes back to my time at Yale. I met a guy in my master's class, in my second year, who was Bengali, Moslem. I met Muzharul Islam, who was a friend of Fazlur Khan, but somewhat older. Fazlur was about my age and this guy was seven years older. We became incredibly close friends, I mean, incredibly close. When you are a student in architecture school and you're really close to someone, you always dream that you'll work together some day. Of course, this guy was halfway around the world, right?

Blum: Make no little plans?

Tigerman: No, I think it's because you like working with people whom you like. You know I hire in this office only people I like. I don't care about their capability or talent, because you can always drum that into them. If you don't like the guy, what the hell do you want him around for? The same with clients—if I make the mistake of allowing myself to be hired by a client, that's my greed, because normally you never want to work for people you don't like or be associated with, et cetera. This guy and I were really good friends. This guy, later—I suppose I have some Marxist tendencies in me—he was, he became, head of the Marxist-Leninist party in Bangladesh. So I met this guy and we

became tight. We corresponded and he finally went back to Dacca, to what was then East Pakistan. He was the father of architecture in what was then East Pakistan. He was the first educated architect in that country, of now 150 million people. So, of course, he's also resented even today—he's seventy-five years old. He's got a bad heart and whatever.

Blum: Prior to him...?

Tigerman: There was no such thing as architects. There were engineers but there were no architects. He was the first architect educated abroad. I met this guy at Yale in 1960-61. After he graduated Yale with me in 1961—he was a classmate... He was Corbusian as a type, design-wise. He was on a Rockefeller grant, or something, and spent another year away from his family in England. Later he taught at UIC because I got him a job as a visiting critic—actually he came back for that in 1964 or '65. When he was back in Dacca, on a World Bank visit, they wanted to do an expansion of the Agricultural University in East Pakistan in Mymensingh and to do five Polytechnic Institutes. So he brought Paul Rudolph to do the Agricultural University and me to Dacca in 1964. I was now just about finished... It was the summer of 1965. I built the partnership in the beginning of June or the end of May. I opened an office at 664 N. Michigan Avenue, where the Terra Museum is now, on the second floor. It was a little, teeny space, nine by twenty. It was a great space on the second floor, facing Michigan Avenue, with a little balcony. I hired Larry Booth, who had already gone back to California when I broke the partnership and he had worked for us, so he came back. Jim Nagle joined and a kid named Gordon Crabtree, whom I'll get to in a minute—he was a terrific kid. I found this office, opened it up on July 1st and on July 2nd I left for Europe and for the subcontinent of Asia. I met Paul Rudolph in Rome and we flew from there together. It was the beginning of an incredible relationship. This same guy, Muzharul Islam, was the one that recommended and fought for a Jew to be the architect for the second capital, Lou Kahn. Lou Kahn had been his critic at Yale. So all these things

came together, right? We came there in 1964 and it was the beginning of what is, up until now, twenty-one visits. So Paul did the addition to the Agricultural College in Mymensingh and Muzharul Islam and I collaborated to do these five Polytechnic Institute in five jungle villages in what was East Pakistan.

Blum: But were they left unfinished?

Tigerman: No. You've got to hear out the whole story. It didn't work out that way. So, I started working on the projects. I was the design architect and Muzharul was the contact architect, he was there. I had a bunch of very interesting people working on it in Chicago, one of my colleagues at Skidmore, a guy named John Hartmann, a woman named Ida Baird, who was fabulous but completely messed up. It was a wonderful time. But as that was starting—the visit was in 1964 and the projects began, I want to say, in 1965. In the meantime, in that period of time, a man named Sheik Mujibur Rahman was fomenting a revolution against West Pakistan to become an independent nation. The number three-guy to help him do that was Muzharul Islam, who by that time was heavily into politics. So I became privy, I became involved, in hearing late into the evening, with these slow-moving ceiling fans, all these young men wanting to overthrow the government. So, I was part of that. It was fabulous, it was a fabulous time.

Blum: Do you think that could have been inspired you conceptually with the Chicago Seven?

Tigerman: This was much more important than the Chicago Seven. I realize it is the reason for doing this interview, but the Chicago Seven is not exactly the most important moment in my life. I want to say somewhere, much less, Christ Almighty. We'll get to that—I'll bad-mouth Stuart Cohen soon enough.

Blum: So what happened to the institutes that you were working on at the time?

Tigerman: I was working on those polytechnics. The client was the Directorate of Technical Education and the director himself was a wonderful man from West Pakistan named Dr. Waquir Ahmed—a terrific guy. They were very receptive. You may or may not have read the *Architectural Record* article on this master planning. There was a huge article on this project and the master planning. There was one very big, thick, long article that was in *Record* that was about environmental, cultural, climatological, behavioral, social, planning. We did a huge master plan before we ever did the building. The book is somewhere here—it's very thick and it's a big document, an important document. In any case, I started that thing. Meanwhile, revolution was fomenting and people were getting killed. It was a serious thing. The projects began construction, I want to say, in 1968 or '69, something like that, but things are built very slowly in a place like Pakistan, needless to say. Then the War of Independence broke out in 1971 in March. This is much more deeply about social cause than probably anything else I've ever done. As it broke out, I went to Fazlur Khan, who was, after all, Bengali, from what was then East Pakistan. I said, "Fazlur,"—you have to understand that he and I were very close, always. In fact, my son, J.J., dated his daughter, Jasmine, briefly—they both went to the University of Michigan. So he and I were very close—I couldn't stand his wife, who was this dirndl-clad German, Liesl, ugh—but he was a great man, truly a terrific man. Splendid, splendid, splendid. He didn't have a mean bone in his body.

Blum: Did you meet him in the context of this project?

Tigerman: No, he was at Skidmore with me much earlier. When I did my Instant City project, Fazlur was the consultant. He didn't want me to use his name because Bruce would kill him for interacting with me, that was one of our hate periods which ended only with Fazlur's death. So I went to Fazlur and I said, "We have to raise money for guns to help the Bengalis." They had an underground army, called the Mukti Bahini. This is a poor country and they

wanted to raise money and they didn't have any weapons. So, I got a "no" and Fazlur and I started the Bangladesh Defense League. We started raising money for guns, straight out.

Blum: What was happening to the project in the meantime?

Tigerman: The project was building.

Blum: Oh, the project was built?

Tigerman: No question about it. Then, at one point during the war, it got really serious. My friend, who I always referred to as "mujibhai,"—Mr. Islam's first name is Muzharul—it's Muzharul Islam—but "mujibhai" means "my brother." "Muz" is the way it sounds in Bengali. So, "bhai" means brother, B-H-A-I. So, he's the best friend I have, then and now. He's a fabulous guy, a fabulous guy. It's a great story. So, during the war, we started raising money for guns and, finally, it got to the point where Muz had to flee the country. He went to Calcutta, because he would be killed, there was no question. Do you know how this whole thing started with the "separation of 1947?" On the one hand, Gandhi, representing the Hindus and Mohammed Ali Jinnah, representing the Moslems, partitioned the country and sent the Moslems here and here and Mother India, the Hindus, were here. So it was West Pakistan and East Pakistan, which is now Bangladesh, between Burma and Calcutta, that country. So they were separated and the Moslems from the West, the West Pakistanis, were basically committing genocide—they were trying to reduce the country to an agrarian society. During the war, they were killing all the intellectuals, all the professors at the university. They lined them up and shot them in the head, coup de grace. I saw that. They would take Hindus, they would go into the old city of Dacca and lift up the guy's lungi, and if he wasn't circumcised, he was a Hindu and he was shot on the spot. If he was circumcised, he was a Moslem and he was okay. It was incredible.

Blum: You were a witness to this?

Tigerman: Absolutely.

Blum: Were you ever approached by the guys with the guns?

Tigerman: Absolutely, no question about it. I went back. What happened was I went back to resign the commissions because one of our guys was killed. One of the Moslems working in our office in Dacca. Many were beaten up on the site and so the project came to a stop, a halt. I thought, I can't do this, I can't work for a government that behaves that way. I can't subject the people that work for me to that sort of bullshit and I really don't want to work for people like that. That goes on in this office even now. I mean, I had a project in Belgrade for the Serbs before the troubles broke out, like IBA [Internationale Bauausstellung], the project in Berlin. Then, all that broke out and they were killing all these Moslem women. I wrote them a letter that said, "Fuck you, I'm out." Life is too short, I can't work for bad dudes. So, basically, I went to Bangladesh to resign the commissions. A sidebar—great story—I was married to Jo Ann at that time and I was going to go by myself to Dacca and resign the position—Mr. Islam was already in Calcutta—never thinking that this could be trouble because there's a war going on. So I cabled Dr. Waquir Ahmed and said I was going to go. The night before I was to leave, Jo Ann and I went to a party—it was nothing to do with this, just coincidence—in Lake Forest, a fancy party, Susie Falk, who was a client of mine at the time and I was going to do her house. She was, at that time, married to the descendant of the founder of Baxter Laboratories, Ralph Falk, and Bruce is at the party.

[Tape 3: Side 2]

Tigerman: I said, "You know the projects in East Pakistan that I've been doing?" He said, "Yeah." "I'm going there to resign the commissions because all this crap

has happened.” He said—and this is a quote—“You are out of your fucking mind.” The way Bruce always talked, he poked you in the chest. “You’re out of your fucking mind because they’re going to hire somebody not as good as you to finish the project. And it’s stupid. Why would you do that?” So, rather than argue with him, I said, “Okay. You’re probably right.” So, of course, I went there and resigned the commissions. About six months later, which is short-circuiting the story, I was reinstated to finish the project over the objections of the World Bank and the United States State Department.

Blum: Who was your employer then?

Tigerman: The World Bank. They didn't want to rehire me, but the Bengalis insisted because I took the Bengalis' part. We'll get to that. In any case, after I was reinstated—it was public knowledge that now it was the People's Republic of Bangladesh—I saw Bruce Graham again. Again, it was coincidentally at some function and he said, "Aren't you glad that you followed my advice?" In other words, he was taking credit for the fact that I had done this, but the fact is that he had advised me to not do it, he had selective memory or amnesia. That tells you about Skidmore again. There is a certain nature of expediency.

Blum: The letter, a very straightforward letter, that you had written addressed to the powers-that-be in Bangladesh when you left the project was published.

Tigerman: I'm going to get back to that part of it. What happened was that I went to Dacca and witnessed all this stuff and I knew I had to resign. I then went to see Dr. Waquir Ahmed—this is in September of 1971—and said that I'm terribly sorry but I just can't do this anymore and I'm going to resign and I'll write you a letter. I have to do this. He was very upset, genuinely upset. I felt badly because he, himself, was a good man. He was West Pakistani, a Pathani, but he was a very good man. I was very sad. In the meantime, Muzharul Islam was in Calcutta, so, finally, I leave the country and I fly to Bangkok, because you can't fly at that time from Dacca to Calcutta. I take the

plane and go to Bangkok and then go back to Calcutta, which is a very long way. I saw Muz and I said, "Muz, organize a press conference. I have written out a statement." He said, "Are you sure you want to do this?" And I said "Absolutely." The letter that I wrote, which is a very straight-forward, but actually fairly moving letter, was a very big moment in my life. Architects don't normally resign projects, it's not what you do normally. I held this press conference and it was published all over the fucking world, like a shot.

Blum: Well, it was a very heroic letter.

Tigerman: Yes, it was sort of heroic, I suppose. But in any case, I resigned the commissions and the World Bank was furious because I had become political. And I understand that. The only other American who had ever come out in favor of what became Bangladesh—East Pakistan—was Teddy Kennedy. Nobody else. In fact, if you remember, there was something called the Anderson Papers in the early 1970s. You have to remember, Nixon was president, Kissinger was the Secretary of State. Kissinger was trying to develop in realpolitik terms, pragmatic terms, a relationship between the White House and Mao Tse-Tung, China, where we had no relationship. It was done through Islamabad, through Ayub Khan. The quid pro quo was that we would surreptitiously provide weaponry to the Pakistanis to conduct this war. The war was on and Anderson revealed these papers that proved that the Nixon government was developing a détente with Mao Tse-Tung in Peking, vis à vis Islamabad and Yah Yah Khan and Ayub Khan in Pakistan. For America, what was East Pakistan? It was a fucking dot on the map halfway around the planet and nobody cares. So, it didn't mean anything to anybody so they supported the government without knowing. Then the papers came out. See, the only people who had ever come out and done anything in favor of what was East Pakistan, were Teddy Kennedy and I. So the result of it is that today I am in their history books because I did something for them. In this big powerful government, nobody in this country came out and supported their position. But I did.

Blum: Did you feel any repercussions—good or bad—here?

Tigerman: Both good and bad. Number one, until last week, I've never gotten another project of any government nature. Not at all. And I have enough of a reputation to have been on State Department lists for embassies. I'm sure I'm on a CIA list, I'm certain of it.

Blum: Do you think it was because of your activities in Bangladesh?

Tigerman: In the Bangladesh affair, that's right. That put me on a blacklist, I'm certain of it. I've had too much work, I'm too published and too well known, and have too many awards not to have at least been on some federal government lists. I've gotten nothing, zero. That's okay, I can survive. I make do. The good part, at the end of the war—I didn't try to be rehired when the war ended—I went there in March of 1971 and the war ended in September of '71. I got a cable almost immediately at the end of the war, I'm sure through Mr. Islam, from the government, the new People's Republic of Bangladesh, saying "We want you to come back and finish the work." They knew that I had quit because of these things, but now they want me to come back because the government that I supported is now in power and they want me to finish the work. The World Bank fought it like hell. They said, "No, we don't want him back because he became politically involved." The Bengalis are fabulous—they say, with a hand gesture, "What to do? We can't help it. We have to have him back because he started it." And they forced the World Bank to acquiesce. So I finished the projects. The projects were done in 1974. I went back there with Jo Ann, whom I was married to. It was very moving, at one of the places, a place called Bogra, there was a dedication of the building and during the dedication, a young guy—he must have been twenty-three or twenty-four, had been in the Mukti Bahini, the guerilla army—he presents me with this plaque about what I did for the country. But in the meantime,

he's sitting in a wheelchair with no legs. So, it was just unbelievably touching. So I became a figure in Bangladesh.

Blum: I suppose you're proud of that.

Tigerman: Oh, yeah. It's a story that's still unfolding now.

Blum: More institutes?

Tigerman: No, it's a very interesting story. For years, Mr. Islam was out of office. He had no authority or power whatsoever because, like many parts of the world, East Bangladesh became a Muslim fundamentalist country. He was head of the Marxist-Leninist party, so he was out, outré, he was gone, persona non grata. Then, a year ago, a new prime minister was elected, a woman, the daughter of Sheikh Mujibur Rahman, the guy who was the founder of Bangladesh, and who I met in 1971 when she was twenty, a young girl. So when she came into power, Muzharul Islam was back. All of a sudden, he's the man.

Blum: He came back as what?

Tigerman: Well, as nothing in the beginning. Now he has gotten probably the world's biggest project. She has assigned a commission to examine and basically redo Dacca, which means pollution, environmental, behavioral, social, low-cost housing, master planning, on and on. He's the man. I didn't even know about that, but I decided that I hadn't been back there since 1974—it's a long time, it's twenty-four years—and he wanted me to come back, but he never said why. He just said, "It's been a long time, we have to see each other." So, on last Christmas Day, Margaret, Eva Maddox, her husband, and I went to Dacca, and, incidentally, to Bombay and Bangkok, but the purpose was to go to Dacca. So now, I'm back. I'm going back in October, I'm going back in February, and I'm going to be helping him building this project.

Blum: Are you going to be doing work?

Tigerman: Doing this project. Basically, it will be certain people whom I've known for years—they are Bengalis. There's a guy named Farouk Ameen, who will be leading the urban planning thing, Mr. Islam will be leading the architecture thing, and I and Eva—but it will be predominantly me, I suspect—will be doing the Archeworks kinds of things, the short-term, stop-gap, small-scale, really small-scale stuff.

Blum: What, for instance?

Tigerman: I don't know yet.

Blum: What could you imagine that Archeworks might possibly do for the project?

Tigerman: Well, for example, right opposite where Muz lives is a ten-acre compound with 200,000 people—a slum. You can't believe 200,000 people in ten acres. There's no way to comprehend what that means.

Blum: Do you mean because it's so dense?

Tigerman: It's so dense, all one-story shacks. It's just impossible. I don't know. I mean, Archeworks is doing stuff in West Humboldt Park about marketing and very small-scale stuff to keep people's hope up while they're waiting for Godot, while they're waiting for buildings and larger-scale stuff. This is self-endowed. I'm going to do this. Muz wants me to help him with the architecture, which I'm happy to do, but I really want to work on this other kind of stuff.

Blum: Do you envision taking your students there?

Tigerman: I think, ultimately, yeah—I think some. Our work, basically, is here in Chicago. We've been invited to go to Amsterdam—Eva and I gave a lecture there—and we've been invited to go to Boston. I don't want to do it. I don't know about the students. But in any case, I'm back. So, my connection is still going on.

Blum: Do you see Archeworks in a direct line from this experience?

Tigerman: I've wanted to go back there because there's a lot of reasons why Archeworks came into being. But the Bengali stuff was really heavy-duty stuff. Of course, as soon as we got off the plane, all these guys from there met us at the airport and dragged us immediately to an opening of an exhibition on Mogul architecture from medieval times until now. Actually, I have a picture of all of us. So, that was a big part of my life, it was a very important thing. You know, it's also scary—it's all this stuff you can imagine. See, Archeworks, I only want to say that ultimately, where I'm at now—all that really happens near the end of your life is that you're able to clarify.

Blum: You're looking at *Versus* in the section with the Bangladesh projects. What else is in that section of the book?

Tigerman: There's also the low-cost housing, the Chicago Dwellings Association and the work with Ira Bach, and so forth, Woodlawn Gardens. But this is the project. It may not be a great project architecturally... Here's the text of that press conference. So, that was a very moving time. Then, at the end of the press conference—see, Mr. Islam's also very funny guy, incredibly anti-American, anti-capitalist, of course.

Blum: And he went to Yale. Is there a contradiction there?

Tigerman: Of course. I point it out to him all the time. You can imagine, I'm the same guy as you know me in Chicago. I'm as much of a pain in the ass to him as I

am to anybody else. But we truly love each other—he really is like a brother. So, the press conference finishes at the Oberoi Grand Hotel in Calcutta, the war is on, and you have to go on to the next thing, which is, I'm leaving. I'm going back to Chicago. I was going to stop in Paris. So, I get an Air France flight that went from Calcutta to Karachi to Cairo to Paris. So Muz takes me to the airport and it's this really poignant time and I'm all choked up and all that shit and he says, "Listen, if I were you, when you get to Karachi and there's a layover, stay on board the plane, because I'm sure that the Pakistani government heard the text of your press conference on the radio." This is him fucking around, but as it turns out, it was true and it scared the shit out of me. So when we got to Karachi and everybody's supposed to get off the plane and go to a transit area lounge, I said, "No, I'm staying on the plane." It was an Air France plane. They said, "Okay." I was there four hours and I was just fine. So it was his ironic way of...

Blum: Well, that sounds like the experience of a lifetime.

Tigerman: Well, it was a great thing. It was the right thing. So the result of it is, because I've written plenty in Archeworks journals, and the book that we got a Graham grant for about Archeworks and stuff, is going to be on the subject of morality and ethics.

Blum: Is this going to be an annual journal?

Tigerman: No, it started out that way, but now it's going to be a series of books. The first book is the one that we got the grant for, so it will be my take on Archeworks. Then Eva's writing one and it will be her take on Archeworks, a different take. And Somol will do one. And Doug Garofalo will do one. It will be the people in the order of who founded it. So my interest in it all is ethics and morality, which comes right out of the Bangladesh experience. It was very good for me to quit the project because you can't talk out of both sides of your mouth. At least, I don't think so. So, you can begin to see out of all this

why I behave as I do. If I behave badly, or whatever, if I'm arrogant or controversial, I have very deep beliefs in architecture and they're rooted in morality and ethics. I don't think you can be an architect unless you do that. If you're not moral and ethical in your work, then I just have to point it out to people, because I think it's wrong, okay? So, for me to quit that project was absolutely right. And fucking Bruce Graham—it was almost a joke that that kind of behavior would take credit for something that he advised me to go against. You think to yourself, My God, Bruce, I understand you entirely. I told him that, I said, "You're really a cool dude, because you're so fucking expedient, you can do anything. You're able to actually do anything, because you're simply what the last person told you. That's all you are." But I told him that at the time we were very close. So from that project, to carry forward a little bit about Bruce, I come back and Fazlur Kahn, who was a dear man. By that time, Bruce and I were no longer friends. Fazlur kept saying things like, "You have to get over this. You have to become his friend." And he would say to Bruce, "Forget this bullshit about Stanley." And then he died. At the funeral home, which is now where the Driehaus Foundation is—Richard Driehaus is the guy who has been supporting architecture and he actually has been supporting Archeworks. There used to be a funeral parlor on Rush and Erie in a fabulous old mansion on the southwest corner. Mies and everyone—when an architect died, that's where they go. So Fazlur died and I got to the funeral parlor with Margaret and there's Liesl and there's Jasmine and we all fall into each other's arms and in comes B.G.—the big guy—with all the partners from Skidmore. I thought, What now? We walk up to each other and it was great—we gave each other a big hug. And thus began the love part of our relationship, which has since deteriorated. Well, there was no separation. As a result, Bruce and I then began talking about the world's fair, the Central Area Plan and blah, blah, blah. At a funeral parlor, it's hard to carry grudges.

Blum: Everyone's a little vulnerable.

Tigerman: Everyone's a little vulnerable.

Blum: So it was your friendship with Fazlur Khan and Bruce's friendship with Fazlur...

Tigerman: Fazlur's death was actually what brought us together. Now, it's interesting because Yasmin is writing a book on her dad, which is great. I just saw her in San Francisco, where she lives, and I'm going to do the introduction—she asked me to do the introduction. He was a dear, sweet man who got caught up in the complexity of a corporate firm. He had troubles.

Blum: But he did some really outstanding things and SOM provided that platform.

Tigerman: I know that, no doubt. But, I've got to tell you, in the case of Sears, once *Newsweek* was doing a thing on Sears and they wanted to meet with Bruce but he out of the country. Magazines being what they are, wanted to get it done and so they met with Fazlur. After that Fazlur was never heard from again by the press. Bruce squashed it because that's also Bruce. On the other hand, do I admire him? Am I fond of Bruce, no matter what the current circumstance is? The answer is absolutely, unequivocally yes. There's no question. I think he's a significant, really important figure and if he and I have had our troubles or even have them now, which we do, that, too, will pass. The fact is, he's an important guy.

Blum: I couldn't help but think that as much as you've been published, I saw almost no mention of your bachelor's thesis, which was pinwheels and mathematical studies and is similar to Walter's...

Tigerman: No, not that. My bachelor's thesis was this—that was not my bachelor's thesis. This was the plan, it was in Lake Meadows. It was a tower, an apartment tower. It was a very important work for me to have done. It was on a pinwheel plan. Yes, it did lead to this, which is from the book and is

called *The Formal Generators of Structure*. It was done from 1965 to 1968. This kid, Gordon Crabtree, was a student of mine at UIC, where I had already begun to teach. He was—and he wouldn't mind being referred to this way—he was a nerdy little guy with glasses who was a wonderful guy who I loved. That office was—imagine this space was nine by twenty—there was a conference table and Booth and Nagle and me and then Crabtree would come in at night and do these goddamn drawings. This was published in this French journal, *Leonardo*. There's a great long piece—there's something like seventy-six drawings or whatever. They're based on form, which is the square, the rectangle, the cruciform, the pinwheel—which comes from my bachelor's thesis—the linked figure—which is *Inland Steel*, if you like—and the lozenge or diamond. Those are basic, Western forms and I wanted to see where they went when they were done in columns and buttresses and in walls. So these were done axonometrically and optically. I was painting that way, so they were done so they were reversible. They're quite interesting, in my view, even now. I love them. I started doing paintings like that, et cetera. Then one day, probably in 1968—it's a known, big joke with Booth and Nagle and everybody who knew him—one day, they came to an end. There was nobody funding this—I was paying for this. By that time, Crabtree had bifocals. I said, "Crab, now we begin the world of polyhedra!" In other words, polyhedral forms. Crab looked at me—at least apocryphally—with his pupils rolling around in his eyes, put down his instruments, packed up, and walked out, never to be seen again. It was just too much. Poor baby. He couldn't handle it. So, Booth and I or Nagle and I—every so often we see each other and we'll joke about *The Formal Generators of Structure* because they were there and they saw this guy go bananas. They were very important forms, though.

Blum: Well, *The Formal Generators of Structure* was only one of a few that struck me. Your master's thesis was the University of Illinois—a project that Walter was already working on.

Tigerman: Netsch was involved in it in the master planning phases, when the site, as we now know it, was one in a series to be selected.

Blum: Your mega-structures...?

Tigerman: Well, obviously, because this was done in 1965-66, and this was later in 1965-68...

Blum: Well, what struck me was the similarity between your mega-structure and Netsch's Air Force chapel, a relationship between Netsch's Field Theory and your Formal Generators of Structure.

Tigerman: I think there's some of that. But, I'll tell you, consciously, I never thought of the chapel with respect to Instant City, because the chapel, which is a wonderful structure, is not... This is using tetrahedral forms logically, while this is not. You can see there's a vast difference about how the inner chords are not continuous.

Blum: Oh, I think there are differences, of course. But my overall impression was one of similarity.

Tigerman: This was done as a series of individual trusses, while this was done as a piece. So there are things that are more like this than the chapel, but I don't mind you pointing this out, because I'm sure that subliminally, because I worked on the chapel, there is something to it. I'm sure that there was a connection between my work and Netsch's, for sure. Now, [pointing to a different, unknown illustration from his book] is there Field Theory in this? I don't think so. Netsch's Field Theory began in a whole other way and actually related more to John Hejduk's work. John Hejduk was really pissed when he saw Walter's Field Theory. Absolutely.

Blum: Well, let me continue this thought with one more example, which is the St. Benedict's Abbey Church. It strikes me as the Field Theory in three dimensions.

Tigerman: You're absolutely right.

Blum: Now, you are always very generous in giving people credit in terms of who influenced you for various projects, but I have never seen you credit Walter.

Tigerman: Because I never saw it as a source, actually. If it's there, and I'm interested that you bring up the chapel, honest to God, I wasn't conscious of it. That doesn't mean that it wasn't a source, subliminally, but it was never repressed, because I try, always, to credit sources, give credit to guys who worked on projects, because it's my nature to do that. I'm sure that there was a subliminal thing and it probably got mixed up in the fact that I really dislike Walter personally. So there may have been something—I'd admit to that in a minute—that stopped me from crediting something. Now, I'm trying to be excessively generous but I never really sensed him as a resource. When I did this, I never thought of his Field Theory. When I did St. Benedict's Abbey Chapel, I never thought of Field Theory. Or when I did Instant City or any of these mega-structure projects.

Blum: Well, it almost struck me when I saw your project, the scaffolding, in a way—just the inner structure—and this.

Tigerman: Yes. Except when you look at the chapel's trusses, they are individual trusses. What you're looking at in section is not something that's continuous. It's an individual truss and then the glass, which is here... The individual trusses are so different in this that they're not comparable, except if you look in that section, because this is not a continuous structure at all.

Blum: Oh, I think there are big differences.

Tigerman: It's fair to ask, because this has a direct relationship to Mies's project in Detroit, Lafayette Park, which I always credit where these things come from.

Blum: This is your Boardwalk project?

Tigerman: The Boardwalk project. I do give credit. Hejduk had a much greater influence on me, I thought, than Netsch. Now, I will say this: I knew very well, because one of my art history professors at Yale, Robert Lewis Herbert, pointed out to me very early that the artist, like the architect, is the very last person to listen to in terms of where they say their sources come from.

Blum: But you always have a string of sources for each project. You say, "I was influenced by this person and this person and this person..."

Tigerman: Well, you brought up the Netsch thing, because I think there is something to it, and it never occurred to me. But now that you say it, I can say, "Sure." I can see that. Maybe turnabout is fair play, since he tends not to give credit to anyone else.

Blum: Well, SOM has had a code of anonymity.

Tigerman: Well, not really, because Netsch and Graham, both, in their own ways were very clear about who did what. For example, the Inland Steel building—again, I know it chapter and verse—it came out at the hearing. First of all, Kevin Harrington gave a little talk about it in support of why it should be designated as a landmark. Richard Longstreth came to Chicago to testify.

Blum: Is this for national landmark designation?

Tigerman: It's up for Chicago landmark designation. Obviously, the owner of the building doesn't want it to be designated because fiscally it's restraining. But

it's going to receive designation anyway because there's no reason not to. You can point to the owner or the developer that bought it, although he's maintained it very well, and it's about money. Of course, there are other issues. It deserves designation; it's a great building. But who did what is sort of like the Charnley house with Wright and Sullivan, you know? Who was responsible for what? It's always interesting.

Blum: Well, I think that Bruce and Walter have an idea of how far Walter went, what Bruce inherited of Walter's design, and what he changed.

Tigerman: Right. Actually, the model that's in the department of architecture at the Art Institute, that's Walter's model.

Blum: That's correct.

Tigerman: Actually, one thing that Bruce changed, which was not to the better, I got to tell you, although I think that everything else that he did was fabulous. Walter had the idea that was a brilliant goddamn idea, brilliant. He wanted the heating and the ducting and all that stuff placed between the glass.

Blum: Like the Pompidou Center.

Tigerman: And very much like Goldberg's building, the Astor Tower, which was compromised by Carl Hunter, who's working with Debbie Doyle. It's been changed and it's really a goddamned shame. It had some of those same attributes. So I'm saying that that part—listen, I would never deny that Walter Netsch was ingenious—but not a genius. Unfortunately, he was also ingenuous, no question about it. Architecture—how can you ultimately dump on a guy like Walter when it's been a passion for him as well? I mean, guys for whom this has been a passion, it's just not fair to dump on them.

Blum: Architecture has been his life's work.

Tigerman: There's no question about it. It's extra-rational stuff and it looks to mathematics and systems, and therefore the whole aesthetic of things is like a big blank for Walter. But as far as his ingenuity? The question doesn't arise. As far as his systematic, tenacious, insistent mathematical stuff, who's going to deny it? But I don't think that architecture ultimately is just that. Then Bruce comes in and Bruce is the old-fashioned kind of guy. Walter's the new guy, because he does it systematically. Bruce is actually the old-fashioned guy, for whom architecture is an aesthetic deal and is not systematic. Even though you think, Well, it's all neo-Miesian, that's bullshit. Some of his best work is absolutely beautiful. You can never accuse Walter of producing beautiful work. Producing systematic work? Sure. But beautiful? I don't think so. Bruce produced beautiful work, but then Walter is the artiste, the systems guy, lying back, doing these crazy and sometimes quite interesting and fairly wonderful things. But the other guy, who is a commercial guy, Bruce, also then turns out absolutely, on occasion, beautiful work, truly beautiful work. Those were the two guys. Owings let them beat the crap out of each other. That was the way that Skidmore worked. The one guy ended up medically unfit—Walter. The other guy had peritonitis—he's had his physical problems too. At a political firm, it takes its toll. You can imagine Joe Gonzalez—who knows, he must be like Dorian Gray with the inside of him all wrapped up in crap...

Blum: Well, Nat Owings early on said that he thought that competition brought out the best in people.

Tigerman: Yes, except that it got so violent and vicious. I can say this but until you witness it, you have no idea. They were brutal with each other, brutal. And, ultimately, the fittest survived, which was Bruce. Walter broke down and left.

Blum: Well, Bruce left, too.

Tigerman: Bruce left, too. And he left before his retirement age. He left in 1989. In any case, he retired a little early.

Blum: That's right. Stanley, you did what looks like a stunning building—I've only seen it in pictures, not in the flesh. I think you titled it Harlow by the Lake.

Tigerman: That's the metal and glass house.

Blum: Yes. It had an observatory and I understand that it's all mechanically controlled.

Tigerman: Computer controlled.

Blum: The observatory struck me as similar to Paul Schweikher's model for the Eliason house.

Tigerman: God, you're really trying to be an historian, trying to figure... Well, I didn't even know the goddamned Schweikher thing, can I tell you?

Blum: The Schweikher design was never built. This is a picture of the model. And this drawing is of the interior. It was to have been a prefabricated kind of thing.

Tigerman: Well, the interior of this looks like the guy who did the house for Roger Brown, his dear friend. He used to work for Helmut Jahn and he's a very good architect. The trusses are exposed but my project is not that at all.

Blum: I saw a similarity in the elongated side and the observatory on the corner.

Tigerman: Well, if you actually look at it, these are punched out and it's totally different. It's a great try, Betty, but it doesn't... You see the similarity only because of

the observatory. But if you look at the system of the glass that goes to the floor, as opposed to punched openings, it's just not comparable.

Blum: Isn't it unusual for a house to have an observatory?

Tigerman: I understand that, but that observatory dome, how it's folded—I didn't know this Schweikher thing—if you saw the house that was Roger Brown's in New Buffalo, on Riviera Drive, the exteriors, the exposition of trusses, the exposed trussing on the inside, that's a whole different character. Unfortunately, that's better than the inside of our house, which was done by a decorator, which is not so thrilling. I got him to buy some better art and selectively photographed it, but it's not so thrilling.

Blum: Yours is a very seductive-looking house. Paul's was just very unusual for its day and even now.

Tigerman: What you're relating to is just the domes. I don't even know this house, truthfully.

Blum: It was designed years ago in 1932 when Schweikher was very interested in the solar studies with Keck and all that.

Tigerman: I wish I could say that I knew it.

Blum: While you were at Yale did Paul teach any classes or conduct any juries?

Tigerman: No. They hated him at Yale. He was persona non grata.

Blum: Well, he concluded that he was the wrong man for that university. But he was the right man at Carnegie Mellon.

Tigerman: He was, definitely. He was perfect at Carnegie. It was a different kind of institution. He was the wrong man for Yale. He was mocked, they really disliked him. He was amongst a lot of heavy-hitters and it didn't go well for him.

Blum: You designed a building called Frog Hollow and said that it was your last serious building—that was published in two articles. What did you mean?

Tigerman: I said that Frog Hollow was my last serious building? I know I made that statement.

Blum: Frog Hollow was in the early seventies. Was that the result of Venturi taking effect on a lot of people in the architectural profession?

Tigerman: Maybe. Some. But probably more Moore than Venturi. Not in the early seventies, but in the mid-seventies—1975 to 1980—I was very interested in humor, no question about it. Irony. And so I might have said that about Frog Hollow in that context.

[Tape 4: Side 1]

Blum: You said that the glass and metal building was your last serious building. Was Venturi entering your life at about that time?

Tigerman: No, no... Venturi never, in a real way, entered my life. I mean, it was not about Venturi at all. He never really did what I would call humor. The architect of our time who did a lot of stuff that was about humor and irony was Charles Moore, not Bob Venturi. Charles, after all, did his face on a waterspout in Piazza d'Italia in New Orleans. And Bob's stuff was never, never really humorous because he was always afraid of being seen as being literal, where Charles Moore wrote about how he wanted to be literal. So Venturi always considered himself actually as a modern architect—duck,

shed, notwithstanding, okay? So I will say that if there was an influence to engage then it would have been Moore. Now, also at that time, I was doing what I will call my prurient phase. Prurient. The Daisy House, the Zipper townhouses—there is a whole bunch of stuff, okay? And it's really about surrealism, at a real level. Which is my take, in a way, on Charles Moore's stuff. Frankly I suppose I'm a great admirer of Bob, not Denise, in what he wrote. But in terms of his work, it's distinctly less interesting to me, personally. His words were very powerful when he wrote *Complexity and Contradiction*, but not when she and he then later wrote *Learning from Las Vegas*. That's less interesting. But the book was very strong and a very... Did it really influence me? Sort of.

Blum: You were saying that Venturi was not an influence on you, but Charles Moore was.

Tigerman: Ah, somewhat.

Blum: But the surrealist phase that you were toying with...

Tigerman: At least that's what's in my head, what do I know?

Blum: A lot of your square buildings had become very curvilinear at that time.

Tigerman: Soft-cornered, yes... True.

Blum: Now, would you say that that was surrealism working on you?

Tigerman: Well, it's a lot of things. I think lots of them were about irony. You know, I've played the piano forever, so you think of piano shapes which are threads running through. Can I get a copy of *Versus*?

Blum: *Versus* is a rather complete catalog of your work up to 1982.

Tigerman: So, I could go through all of this. Christ, the architecture of the absurd, 1976 to '81. Okay? Then the historically illusive phase, 1976 to '81, as well. Then, the surrealist phase, which was also a lot of soft-cornered stuff, was 1969 to '79. So, then I went to the Biennale in 1976, and then again in 1980, a lot of this stuff was there. Soft-corner, the Daisy House...

Blum: Are you saying that this is what you brought to the table or is this what you saw in other people's work at the time?

Tigerman: Your sarcasm—it was in my work. It's what I brought to the table in those years—so, I'll say, from 1970 to '80, somewhere there. Okay?

Blum: There was another feature that showed up in your work at this time, and that was the mirror image.

Tigerman: It is about split symmetry. Making a symmetrical form and cleaving it, cutting it in two. That was very conscious. Why?

Blum: What did that mean to you to take something and cut it in half?

Tigerman: Look at the cover of this—it was leading, although it was several years before it was published, from 1980 or '81 to *The Architecture of Exile*. What this is about, and where it leads, is to my Jewishness, and I say it in the book, postmodernism is the Jewish one, but architecture is not. Architecture is not for the Jews, it's for the goyim. Don't do that, don't make faces, Betty—it was true. It's absolutely true. Because architecture is rooted in Hellenism and Christianity. Believe me, much has been written about it, whether you agree with it or not. A guy named Thorleif Boman, et cetera. That's B-O-M-A-N, Thorleif. Just like it sounds. A Norwegian. So, it's about hierarchy, it's about faith. Judaism is about interpretation, it's the lack of faith. Christianity is about faith. So architecture is about hierarchy, a belief in aesthetic forms, in

numerical ratios that are more akin to the human body, the Vitruvian figure, and so forth. The bottom line is this, in the English language, I don't believe in architecture. I don't believe in any one overriding aesthetic or whatever. I don't believe in it. I shouldn't have become an architect. Margaret is an architect. Forget that she is an Episcopalian, she's an architect because she has the long attention span, the high threshold of pain, believes in tradition. You can see it in her work. She believes in all of those things that are rooted in faith. So, it's no accident that she's Christian. It's easier. Jews tend not to do that. When I say Frank Gehry, Richard Meier, are breaking buildings apart, deconstructing them, that is a part of what I'm getting to. The bulk of Jewish architects are ambivalent about the traditions of architecture. It's been written about. There'll be more written about it.

Blum: Do you think it's because these architects are Jewish, or that they're living at a certain time, in a certain place, and they are influenced by their environment?

Tigerman: Both. You're living in a time—it's sort of like why we started Archeworks—you're living in a time where society is being, and has been, deconstructed—where Rome is burning, where the cities are a disaster, where there is AIDS, et cetera, okay? So the happy ending—is not universal, make no mistake. For every architect who rips things apart, like my breaking buildings in two, Frank and Peter by deconstructing them—for every one of them, I can name an equal and opposite Jewish architect like Bob Stern, who basically is not Jewish as an architect, whose pretensions have always moved him towards Christian beliefs. He says it himself. I mean, even Sorkin when he wrote the piece on Bob's private place in the *Village Voice*. Do you know the TV series called "Pride of Place"? Sorkin writes about it and Bob will admit to it. The fact of the matter is that Bob and others like him—I'm going to stick with Jewish architects, but not so many—tend to fall within the traditions of architecture, a more conservative view. But the bulk of Jewish architects are either modernists, like Richard Meier—I'd say that modernism is based on

Mies's, and Frank Lloyd Wright before him, an asymmetrical view of things. Not symmetrical, asymmetrical. You get Richard and all the Corbusian modernism, which is about asymmetry. You get Frank and Peter Eisenman deconstructing things. You get me cleaving things, shearing them. So they get cleaved, they get sheared, there's a certain violence implicit in those kinds of acts because if you don't believe in the traditions which ultimately are Hellenic and are Christian...

Blum: Can you find your counterparts in the non-Jewish architectural community?

Tigerman: I can find both. I can find those that break it apart—if you like, Stephen Holl. But I can find those like Michael Graves, who backed off from modernism and went into postmodernism, if you call it that, where it's about fragmentary classicism. So I will say there's no general rule for any of this. But I can name more Jews who are architects that are ambivalent about the traditions of architecture. I can name Beeby as a Christian architect. I can also name Allan Greenberg, who was his classmate at Yale, who is an absolutely classical architect. But Greenberg, of course, has this kind of fascist classical background.

Blum: Well, he was born in South Africa.

Tigerman: Yeah, like Denise. So, Judaism, when countered by—I mean, there's exceptions to all these things—when countered by an apartheid government will often turn to classical roots. All I'm saying, and I don't mean to be simplistic about it, because there's no general rule, but if I were to make one, invent one, I would say that Jews have a problem with tradition. The reason the Talmudic exegeses were burned in the Middle Ages by Christians was because the Jews had no faith and Talmudic exegesis was about interpretation of the Torah, the Bible. They don't believe it. They keep challenging the divine being. Everybody in theology knows this to be true.

Blum: How much of what you've said were you aware of in 1970, '72?

Tigerman: Well, I've been doing this, breaking things apart and so on, I want to say for almost a quarter century.

Blum: Are you aware of the reason for your need to break things apart?

Tigerman: Yeah, in my lack of belief. In my general lack of belief about one right way of doing something architecturally. I don't believe it. For all that, then I can turn right around and say that I really believed in Mies van der Rohe. But Mies van der Rohe was very interesting because he also deconstructs. He does this in Europe. That's all he does, he breaks things asymmetrically. Here, he appears to be symmetrical. Except if it looks asymmetrical, like Wright's stuff before him, which Mies was very influenced by, as were the rest of the European architects, by 1910 or 1912 Wasmuth exhibition and portfolio of Frank Lloyd Wright. Frank Lloyd Wright was the first one to break it apart. That's known. Mies, irrespective of the Chicago descendency of Mies—they hate the fact that he had any formal or Schinkesque background or that he read history, as it were. But Mies did, he was a brilliant man, self-taught. He knew very well from whence he came and what he was doing. He knew very well. The point is then to get back to subjectify him. Yes, for me this has been conscious for many years, otherwise, I wouldn't have written *The Architecture of Exile*. I wouldn't have written my first book, which was called *Versus*—this versus that—which has a drawing on the cover that has faith, sacred, synthesis, deduction, immortality, on the one hand, the Christian thing. And it has reason, profane, analysis, induction, and mortality, the Jewish thing, on the other hand. I wouldn't have done it. So this was published in 1982, but the fact is that it was written in the seventies.

Blum: But you were building buildings in the sixties.

Tigerman: I know that. Betty, I'm not about to say that I was in possession of this knowledge in the beginning. You know, when you're a young kid and you don't have a proper education, which I didn't have, but I was building the early stuff.

Blum: Then when patterns emerge, do you ten or fifteen years later sort of categorize these things and find reasons for them?

Tigerman: You're really cynical! Yeah. Well, I find reasons for them. Maybe these were reasons that finally came out, that I was fighting something in me that was trying to resist architecture, and I finally found formal counterparts in order to do it. Now, the reason that that happened was because I started writing. I wrote from the beginning. So, in other words, I was trying to put into the English language, such as it is, issues or belief systems or lack of belief systems. I've done a ton of writing, my God, for papers, and lectures, and six books.

Blum: I've seen your lengthy bibliography in small print.

Tigerman: I mean, I've done a lot of stuff. And the writing was a way of testing what I was doing, using language to test it.

Blum: What was the relationship between writing and building for you?

Tigerman: Well, let me get back to Venturi. My problem with Bob Venturi has always been that the words and the work have a disjunction. That's also been written about a lot. I was building, I was teaching, I was writing, I was lecturing, I was designing and drawing—because drawing has always been a part of me—and so, back and forth they went. You design a building, you get a client, you write about such-and-such issue-of-the-day, you teach. I've always been—which will ultimately come out with respect to UIC—I've always been very hostile to those who say one thing and design another thing, who talk

out of both sides of their mouth, as it were. You know, Mies was consistent—he wrote one thing and he built the same thing. So there is a fabulous consistency about that. At one point, in my life, in my work at some point—I don't know when—probably if I came back from Yale in 1961, surely by the late sixties, no doubt, I was beginning to question a lot of things. I was. And you can see that in my work.

Blum: Well, if you look at the decade between, say, 1964, when you began your own practice, and 1974, one thing was very different from the next and the next one was different from the last.

Tigerman: A lot of turbulence. Well, but that's my resistance to what I will call "signature work."

Blum: Doing the same thing over and over?

Tigerman: Yes. If I mention the name Frank Gehry, if I give you a little Rorschach test—and I love him, so this is not pejorative—and I show you a bunch of buildings and they're by Frank, you will know. Or if I mention his name, you can conjure up God-knows how many—what it means, Frank Gehry—what the words, the name, means. If I mention Peter Eisenman, you can do the same. If I mention Richard Meier, you can do the same thing. If I mention Bob Stern, you can do the same thing. If I mention Charlie Gwathmey, you can do the same thing. And on and on and on. They do signature work. So when I wrote this book in 1982, I did these different chapters, because how else do you put all this crap together? How do you make sense of all kinds of different stuff?

Blum: What is the overall umbrella for everything in that book?

Tigerman: There isn't any.

Blum: You've identified nine separate categories.

Tigerman: Yeah, I make nine different chapters. So I try to talk about manipulist modernist phase or manipulated modern, or whatever. I remember very well when I wrote this book, I was already married to Margaret and on the dining room table where we live now—in the Mies building at 910 Lake Shore Drive—I laid out a bunch of photographs. You know, you look at everything and, Jesus Christ, how the fuck do you organize this?

Blum: Are they all so different?

Tigerman: The work is entirely different. I mean, even at a local level, if I mention Beeby, after a certain period of time, you can conjure up what it means. If I mention Helmut Jahn, you can conjure up what it means. If I mention Stuart Cohen, you can conjure it up. You know what I'm saying? You can conjure up people's work because the tradition of—if I mention Margaret McCurry, the same—the tradition of architecture is based on the "drop of water" thesis, that in a drop of water, you know everything about history and philosophy and culture. I resisted that, I didn't see that. So I kept doing all this bizarre work. Now, were you to ask the other question, it's a kind of "j'accuse." "Well, is that sort of Dr. Doolittle, Svengali? You're really a chameleon." And the answer is, "Yeah. I guess that's right." And then I started to write, with the intentionality of testing, in the English language, what was in architectural language, to see if there is something underpinning it.

Blum: You're saying you were testing in writing what you had done in bricks and wood?

Tigerman: Right. Materializing. What I found was that there were a series of things that I could categorize. Nine of them, in this book. And that was pretty interesting to me. Actually, if I look back at it now, one of these hindsight deals, again... The first chapter is the Mies chapter, neo-Miesian. I told you about this townhouse, that was the first thing that was published. This was a single-

family townhouse which was in *Arts and Architecture*, before I ever met John Entenza. And it was done in 1958 and it was published in August of that year, just before I went back to Yale. I was at Skidmore. These two, the first two—the first was much earlier, in 1953, when I was in the navy. That chapter and the Miesian chapter—look at this work, I mean, my God—Boardwalk, this Loop College project, Pensacola, it's all about interpretations of Mies. Then, at the end of the chapter, is *The Titanic*, that little collage. So I was basically sinking myself. I wanted to get out from under that.

Blum: Well, was this your way of ridding yourself of Mies?

Tigerman: Everyone takes it as my antagonism toward the descendents—no way. The truth is that it was my way of getting rid of myself, of purging myself of those forces, right?

Blum: Well, the letter you wrote is really very amusing.

Tigerman: I know. But it's also very loving.

Blum: Well, it does have a different tone, in fact, than the cartoonish collage.

Tigerman: It says, "That's about it, I guess. Oh, as far as me? Well, you always thought I was kind of silly. At least that much hasn't changed. I do miss you, though. Love, Stanley." You know, I admired him immensely. But it was an amusing letter, yes. Now, then, this De Stijl and Rudolphian brutalist phase is about deconstructing buildings. It was influenced by Paul Rudolph. But look at this stuff—my very first projects, the Habenicht house, Pickwick Village/Pickwick Plaza, they're all sort of push-pull, click-click. They're not centered, they're not tidy.

Blum: Well, didn't writing *Versus* help you classify things for yourself?

Tigerman: Yeah, to type them.

Blum: Why? Why couldn't they just all co-exist?

Tigerman: Well, I suppose they could. But I wanted to try to put them into a language that said what they meant, what I felt they meant. Now, was I right? I don't know. I'm somebody who puts into language what I felt they meant.

Blum: I just found in some of your writings that you often categorized. For instance, you put the projects in order and labeled them. It was like a filing cabinet.

Tigerman: Well, the tradition of architecture is about ordering. I was trying to order them and then I discovered that I couldn't. Now, you can say, "Well, therefore you're investing it with your Jewishness as both an afterthought and as a rationale, in a way." Perhaps that's true. When I found that I could only order it—even in eighty-two, which is a lot of problems—I could only order it, I don't want to say in groups, but in these nine different chapters, which is just because what do I know about all that? Now, I did the later book, the one in '89. The one that Sarah helped me with. There is no ordering, but basically Sarah did it. It's not such an interesting book.

Blum: That was more chronological.

Tigerman: Yeah, it's just a chronological. Sarah, I love her dearly, but it wasn't such a great job.

Blum: In this book, *Versus*, it seems that the underlying statement it makes is that your work is diverse. That's the umbrella that connects it all.

Tigerman: Sure. But if you do some close reading of the words, you find that I'm not using words as a rationale, but trying to find an order. It never comes out, because there is none. So I can say, "Sure, it's surrealist, a surrealist fantasy"

or this and that—whatever it is entitled to be. And the work does, it's been written about by John Hejduk.

Blum: Up until, say, 1975, before the Chicago Seven...

Tigerman: The Biennale, right before the Venice Biennale.

Blum: Right before the Venice Biennale, you had attracted a lot of attention. Your work, up until that time, diverse as it was, had been published widely in Europe as well as the United States.

Tigerman: As well as Asia.

Blum: How did that happen? How did you become the American correspondent for a French publication.

Tigerman: Which was *L'architecture d'aujourd'hui*, "the architecture of today." The fact is, the publishing began right here—not the first one in *Arts and Architecture*. When I started my practice as a partnership with Norm Koglin, he had a friend—I forget his name—a really nice guy. He was an ad agency guy with Tatham and Laird. And I forget his name, which is tragic, because he later committed suicide. He was a wonderful man. We were young architects doing stuff, trying to make our way. Norm has brought in—which I told you before—his cousin, George Habenicht, who did the Habenicht house. A guy I knew, Don Lebold who was an emerging real estate developer, came in with this project, which was Pickwick Village. And so we started doing this stuff. Then I met this ad guy, he was a really great guy. One of his accounts—I met him, because we were drinking buddies. Norman drank a lot when we were out, we were drinking a lot. You are who you hang out with. This guy was a big drunk, the ad guy. But he had an account for a building product—this is actually sort of interesting—named Zonolite. Now, Zonolite is a trade name for something intrinsically called vermiculite, which is an expanded shale

that is puffed into powdered little puffballs that you drop into the cores of masonry. It helps to insulate the masonry—it's a good product. I don't know how it happened—it must have happened over drinks or whatever—but at some point, I persuaded the guy that Zonolite was the most boring product in the world. It is, it's a big nothing product—it goes inside, you never see it, it looks like shit, it's nothing. I said, "Why don't I design and make drawings for you," as best as I could, "of typologically different kinds of projects that are all out of masonry that this product can go into." I thought we'd do it in such a way that it comes out as two-page facing ads in the architectural magazines of the day." He thought it was a great idea. So I did. These are some of those projects. These are imaginary projects—it says right here.

Blum: These were all published.

Tigerman: In the Zonolite advertisements, I was able to organize my thoughts about the formal possibilities which led straightaway to what I call The Formal Generators of Structure. Not from Netsch, but straight from the ads. There were squares, rectangles, pinwheels, okay? That's where it came from. And it's not because I say it, it's true—it's right there in print. Here, "I was able to organize my thoughts about formal possibilities that lay in the design of masonry buildings and to test devices I had been experimenting with earlier at Yale." It's true. So these are all Rudolphian kinds of buildings, which you can look back to Paul Rudolph and say, "Boy, that's a direct connection." They were drawn like that because I learned to draw that way at Yale. Those ads were published starting in 1962. I was thirty-two years old. They became so goddamned well known, I can't tell you.

Blum: Did you become known as a result of it?

Tigerman: Absolutely.

Blum: Was your name on the drawings? Or was it just the product?

Tigerman: Absolutely. Oh, yeah, definitely! I've even got some tear sheets here yet somewhere. "Stanley Tigerman designs a school, a housing project, an institution." Whatever.

Blum: All for Zonolite?

Tigerman: All for this product. But they didn't look like ads, because the Zonolite stuff was about this big—teeny—on the two-sided page. Here's this terrific project, drawn impeccably, right? I designed whatever as best I knew how. And there they were, month after month, year after year. I did a ton of them. And if you ask people, that's where I first became known. Not from the little thing in Entenza's *Arts and Architecture* in 1958 or whenever it was, '62-'63.

Blum: You think you became known through these imaginary projects for Zonolite?

Tigerman: They're imaginary projects. Now, it's not the first time an architect has done that. Architects have been doing that forever, designing imaginary projects because they have no clients and they have no conduit and nothing to show anybody. So you do this stuff which was fabulous, right?,

Blum: Well, your name got published. And not only did you get recognized, but you also got paid.

Tigerman: Marginally. But my name began to be recognized.

Blum: Then did that lead to actual work?

Tigerman: I did this before I did any actual work. So that stuff, which is very interesting, led to that stuff, *The Formal Generators of Structure*. This, *Instant City*, do you know who that was done for?

Blum: Zonolite?

Tigerman: Zonolite. Now, I have to tell you this, Betty, by that time I was no longer in partnership with Norman. This was 1965-'66. Booth and Nagle worked for me and Richard Franklin and Gordon Crabtree—here are their names that helped work on this, right?—and Fazlur Khan was a consultant—it's listed right here.

Blum: They worked on the mega-structure you call Instant City?

Tigerman: The first mega-structure. And then the second mega-structure came, which is this, called Urban Matrix. And then this, which is a Floating Kingdom of Atlantis. And then this, for the Chicago Bears, which was a hotel over the stadium.

Blum: This was a time when mega-structures were very popular.

Tigerman: They were in, that's right. These got into lots and lots of books on mega-structures. The point is that something happened when I did this. Not the ads or *The Formal Generators of Structure*—although that was published in an English magazine called *Leonardo*, which still exists. Let me go at this another way—in 1965 or '66, whenever the hell I worked on it, W.R. Grace and Company, Peter Grace, which is the company that produced Zonolite, was having an annual convention or gathering in Scottsdale or Phoenix or Tucson—somewhere in northern Arizona. I used to come out and present this, right? So I did these drawings and models and all this stuff and like a schmuck I threw the model away, which was really stupid. It was too big and I was moving into a small house. When I got the big 40x40 boards back from the photographer of the project, I knew that I had done something that was different. I knew that. I can't say that about all this other stuff because this was all obviously influenced by Paul Rudolph. This was influenced by no one. You may say Netsch, but you're wrong. This was influenced by no one.

This was the first individual project that I had done. Mind you, the only other projects was stuff like the ads, *Pickwick Village*, the *Habenicht* house, where clearly, the influence is about Rudolph, right? Then I did this and there was no influence. Now, that's not entirely true. I found out later that Gropius—which I don't think I had seen, but what do I know, maybe I subliminally repressed it. This was basically mine. I was thirty-six years old. I remember that when I was at Yale, six or seven years earlier, Bob Herbert—who did the catalog raisonnée on Seurat, was my art history professor. I remember in that art history class that one time somebody asked a question, or maybe he brought it up, "When is it that an artist makes the first statement that's actually beyond influence?" Now, there are exceptions—Ingrès, David, Jacques, Louis David—and so forth, and Lou Kahn and Frank Lloyd Wright. These were people who did it when they were very young, not Lou Kahn, who did it very old, but Frank Lloyd Wright, who did it very, very young—Christ, he was in his twenties. But generally, your first autonomous work, so-called, is between thirty and forty. I was thirty-five in 1965. So I remembered that little tidbit from Bob Herbert.

Blum: So you were typical according to the findings.

Tigerman: Right, I was consistent. I saw that it was unique. And then it got the biggest fucking most immense play in the press—you can't imagine. You cannot begin to imagine! I have never done a project that was so widely published. It was published everywhere, in every newspaper. We keep scrapbooks here—there are volumes of them—of newspapers and magazines, whatever. That stuff was published, I want to say, in 150 different publications all over the world. When I saw that photograph, which is a model photograph, no doubt I knew that this was something unique, okay? It was also something that was, in my view, right or wrong—"good." In other words, it had something in it. Now, the jokey side is that Bob Stern—this was before I went to Yale—years later kept saying things like, "How can you possibly get beyond or get over *Instant City*?" Then, later, he would say, "How are you going to possibly

get over the Daisy House?" So I was crap, right? But I knew Instant City was a major statement. I knew that. So, I've got to tell you, this was a major thing in my life, very. Was it built? No. Did it get built by others? Yes, including I.M. Pei.

Blum: So you were noticed by the press?

Tigerman: Yes, by that time, in the mid-sixties, which was, after all, only three or four years out of Yale.

Blum: After this big play with Zonolite, what followed? Were your built projects as widely published?

Tigerman: Well, yes, because then—mind you, this is a year and a half after I first went to East Pakistan. I went to East Pakistan in 1964 and this was published in '65-'66. So on the one hand I was doing that. On the other hand, I started doing these barns and the church, St. Benedict's Abbey. The first barn doesn't seem to be here, the Vollen barn in Wisconsin. This was then the Christensen barn. I don't know if they were lyrical, but the intention was the machine in the landscape, to paraphrase Leo Marks, right? So, you know, you can say the Hot Dog House, Frog Hollow—this guy used to have swans, and he still does, we're very good friends. It was a surrealistic thing. And on and on. All this soft-corner stuff. And this underground church, You hire a Jewish architect, the church goes underground. It was a crown of thorns. And on and on. But the fact is that I was doing smaller work, because in the end, an architect dreams big, but his first projects, with exceptions, tend to be very small.

Blum: And were they published?

Tigerman: Yes, they still are.

Blum: Did you send notice of your new work to the publications? Or were they at your doorstep?

Tigerman: In the beginning, I sent it to them. Over the years, it segued... It wasn't so many years—by 1970, I didn't have to send anything because they were coming to me and they still do. So, now, on the one hand, you'll hear me say—which I said earlier—how much I loathe marketing. This is marketing. But it's a general marketing, it isn't directed to a client that you hear at a cocktail party is doing a school or a this or whatever. This is just general marketing. It's just broad publishing. Where'd I learn that? Paul Rudolph. He did it like mad.

Blum: Regarding the Chicago Seven, we have spoken with the six other architects and everyone, without exception, has said, "Stanley is a publicist without equal." Where did you learn how to market yourself?

Tigerman: Paul. Paul Rudolph. Because that's what he did. I learned everything from Paul about teaching, about publishing.

Blum: What was an example of what he did to get himself published?

Tigerman: Every single project he ever designed was published like mad, culminating in the Arts and Architecture building at Yale. In one month, all three architecture magazines had that building in its cover, with a massive twenty-plus-page spread. On the cover! That was unheard of even until now, even with the Getty, even with the goddamn Getty Center.

Blum: Rudolph sent this project to the magazines and had contacts there?

Tigerman: Yeah. And me, too. He had contacts at magazines and I did, too.

Blum: How did you become a correspondent for *L'architecture d'aujourd'hui*?

Tigerman: I started working on the Bangladesh projects. Bangladesh is halfway around the world. You can go via Tokyo, as I did with Margaret, Eva, and Lynn. Or you can go Europe. So I did more Europe than Asia. Two out of three, three out of four times, maybe. At that time, but no longer, I loved France. I don't anymore. But I loved it then. I met a woman through Paul Rudolph. It came back because he had been correspondent with *L'architecture d'aujourd'hui* years earlier—I mean twenty years. On my first trip to East Pakistan, I met Paul in Rome in July of 1964, and we came back three or four weeks later. We came back via Paris. We stayed in Paris for four days—he in one hotel, me in another—but we met all the time. We went to L'Opera Comique, you know, whatever. He introduced me to a wonderful Jewish woman, Renée Diamant-Bérger. Madame Diamant-Bérger, now deceased, was the reducteur-en-chef of *L'architecture d'aujourd'hui*. She was the next to the editor, she put the magazine to bed every month. We became good friends and she pulled me under her wing. And André Bloc, who founded it and was still alive, she persuaded him—I don't know who had been the American foreign correspondent—but whoever it was, wasn't there then.

Blum: It was someone from New York. And in the first few years your name was listed with his on the masthead. After a few years, his was no longer listed, but your name was.

Tigerman: Then his name went bye-bye. Renée Diamant-Bérger caused André Bloc to have me first split the job—I was very young. In 1964 I was thirty-four. I mean, that might not be so young, but I was young. And so I became the American correspondent of *L'architecture d'aujourd'hui*. And I started spending a lot of time in Paris on my way back from Bangladesh, generally, three times a year. Always staying very fancy at the Ritz Hotel and so on. It was great, I really enjoyed it. And they started publishing my work like mad. If you go back into the sixties—let's say from 1965 to '70—*L'architecture d'aujourd'hui* published Stanley Tigerman a lot. And then John Entenza, because one of my

friends, a woman from California, Esther McCoy, she put together an article for *Zodiac*, which is probably around here somewhere. If I look, I'll probably find the goddamned thing.

[Tape 4: Side 2]

Tigerman: Later, Olivier Boissière, a French *journaliste*, good man, wrote a book in the seventies called *Trois Portraits de l'Artiste en Architecture*. One was Frank Gehry, one was Jim Wines of SITE, and one was me. But much earlier—this I'll tell you today—this *Zodiac*, which is a quarterly from Milan, this was through Entenza. Esther McCoy was a very good friend of Entenza's, so she wrote, "Young Architects in the United States." But look where this thing starts out—this is 1963, just when the Art and Architecture building was built by Paul, which Henry-Russell Hitchcock wrote about, right? Look at this versus my bachelor's thesis? So you see where a lot of the influence comes, right?

Blum: Would you be surprised not to find Paul Rudolph's influence in your work?

Tigerman: No, no, not at all. Here, this is pretty interesting, I think, "Young Architects in the United States," by Esther McCoy. This was in 1963. So who are they? Evans Woollen, look at him then. You know who he is? From Indiana.

Blum: Yes, I do.

Tigerman: This here is Pickwick Village. Christ, I'd just started practice in 1962. Here, look. Pickwick Village, not even built; Habenicht house, not even built. Okay? Pierre Koenig, who did all those houses for John Entenza. Who's this—Fred Mehoffey, I don't know. Howard Perry, I don't know. David Travers, who I do know. Y.C. Wong, who does the atrium houses. James Durdin, I don't know. Nothing happened with most of these guys. Gunnar Birkerts—there he was then five years older than me. Howard Barnstone,

who later committed suicide in Houston. Very good architect. Unbelievable. Neo-Miesian. Wonderful architect. Pulliam, Zimmerman, and Matthews, here's Bernard Zimmerman. Here, Peter Millard, who taught at Yale, the fire station. That's it.

Blum: So, as a result of having these few important exposures in the press...

Tigerman: Between Entenza and *L'architecture d'aujourd'hui*, and Paul Rudolph, and Christ knows, I started getting published a lot. Very early, I was thirty-three years old—I was two years back from Yale when *Zodiac* came out. That was through Entenza, straight-out. I don't know how many projects he published from the time I got back from Yale in 1961 until he sold the magazine. I was published every third or fourth month. He was obviously interested in my work. He took me under his wing and he recommended me for projects.

Blum: So you think your talent for publicizing yourself and your causes came out of Rudolph and that interested people like Entenza and Esther McCoy in your work?

Tigerman: Yeah. They were interested in my work. So at some point the cultivation, if you want to use that as a word, of editors, of people who wrote about architecture, was no longer needed. By the time I was forty, by 1970, they were coming to me. So it was never a question. So from 1970 until 1998, is after all thirty years, it's not been an issue.

Blum: Well, that's why your bibliography is so voluminous, and in tiny print.

Tigerman: Yes, I've been widely published.

Blum: I know you also have tabulated how many times your name has appeared in print.

Tigerman: There are zillions of this and that.

Blum: Some of the things that I tracked down from your bibliography were not major pieces on you. I mean, you made a little comment or one was made about you and it was listed in your bibliography.

Tigerman: But nonetheless, I've been published about 3,000 times. A touch less, 2,900. Because I'll show you later, Betty, next to my desk, annually—I start it every year—I have a list of projects published and where and what page. Because if you do it one by one, it's nothing, it takes a second. And awards. Buildings.

Blum: Well, your CV is remarkably complete.

Tigerman: God, we have seven national AIA honor awards. They're right there. So I've always kept records of that crap. You know, it's like when I was a kid... One thing that Peter Eisenman and I have always had in common was stats, statistics. When we were kids—he in New York, me in Chicago—we didn't know each other, obviously. He knew more, he was better at this, but I was pretty good. He knows the entire 1939 offensive line of the Chicago Bears. I can only name probably seven of them, as opposed to the eleven, right? Sid Luckman, Bronco Nagursky, whoever they are. So when you do that shit as a kid—it's what boys do, it's a boy thing, right? So when you start publishing or winning awards or giving lectures—Christ, I've lectured hundreds of times—you keep records, you keep them right by your desk. And then you turn them over to an assistant who puts them on the word processor. And you get these scores of pages of year after year of all this crap, which is a nice thing for later generations.

Blum: Is that your genealogy?

Tigerman: No, that's not my genealogy, because my genealogy is in that book, *Versus*, who I worked for, et cetera.

Blum: By 1974, you already had had a ten-year history of changing the vocabulary of your work, and in Chicago, the United States, the world, things were also changing.

Tigerman: Traumatically.

Blum: There were assassinations, there were...

Tigerman: Think of the late sixties. For example, my very first... I mean, everyone has this—it is not unique to me. It's going to sound like, "Boy, he's led a really interesting life." I just kept track of it, that's the only difference. My first teaching job began in the fall, in September of 1963. I was a visiting critic at Cornell. I met John Hejduk, I met Colin Rowe. But Hejduk and I became really good, close friends, okay? We were on a jury—everyone knows this, this is no big thing, Tom Beeby, Stuart Cohen, and others were at Cornell—Hejduk and I were on a jury, the final jury, in November of 1963. That jury occurred the day that Kennedy was assassinated. During the jury, somebody came into the class who had been listening to the radio and said that the president had been assassinated, or that he had been shot and then we found out later that he died. So John and I stopped the jury, of course. I mean, the stupid dean, Burnham Kelly, wanted to continue the jury. I mean, you can't imagine how stupid some people are. Well, we stopped the jury and it was never reconvened. Hejduk and I were walking the quadrangle at Cornell—it's a very long friendship, because the book was never closed and it never went back to the jury and all that. So a lot of things happened. In 1963, Kennedy was killed, in 1964 or thereabouts Martin Luther King was assassinated, then Bobby Kennedy and all that crap. I was already working on the West Side through the Maremont Foundation. I had already begun teaching at Navy Pier, which became the Circle Campus, which then became UIC. So there was a lot of crap going on that began to impact heavily, like hits, on me. So, is it any wonder that there's no overriding single belief that

carries you through? Its skepticism that's a part of your background, let's say religiously. All these huge things that were going on in the late sixties in America alone were wild. They were wild.

Blum: And they reverberated all over, like with the student protests on campuses.

Tigerman: No doubt. And then I get involved. And then in the late sixties, I started getting involved in Bangladesh, which carried through to 1971. So I found myself involved. I mean, in the sixties, I was also opening up these clinics, forensic clinics in black neighborhoods. I told you about these—Fifth City in Lawndale and in Woodlawn. So, I was involved, no doubt. And I was susceptible. I didn't have to be involved. But somehow, it seemed to mean something to be involved. After all, I had been in the navy much earlier, in the Korean War.

Blum: And this was during the Vietnam War.

Tigerman: And this was the Vietnam thing. This was the first war that we didn't win, that we lost. So, how do you maintain sort of a single overriding belief of one thing? So when you write a book—this first book, *Versus*—this in 1982, it's a sign of the times.

Blum: Do you feel that you reflected the kind of fragmentation that was prevalent?

Tigerman: I say it in the book, early on, what was going on in Chicago—I think in the introduction. You know, what went on. This argumentative attitude, I realize stands outside the mainstream zeitgeist theory of architecture. I thought I said it pretty clearly, right? And even then, which is interesting, about morality and ethics, that's what Archeworks is all about. It all came back and home to roost, big time. Look, Betty, none of these thoughts make me heroic, a good guy. It's all bullshit. It's just that I was aware of it. I was conscious of a lot of forces outside, and somehow I allowed them to impact on me, or get

myself involved. I got myself almost killed. A whole number of things. Because I've always believed, without stating it, that the morality of this implies that an architect molds his epoch, rather than reflects it, right? I mean, here, I say, "...since in my own work I'm not at all interested in finding a new, right way of making, or, for that matter, even looking at things." It's about the times, it's not me. I couldn't have written *Versus*... If I had written *Versus* in the eighties—I mean, say the height of the eighties, the knowledge of the eighties, the "me" generation—it couldn't have happened. It was published in 1982, so I was writing it in 1980. That's another interesting thing, by-the-by, how did I happen to write the book? Because, first of all, in 1976—we began in 1975—was the Chicago Seven and that first book about Chicago architecture. How did that come about? I assume that Stuart and Ben and Larry told you—if they didn't, surely Stuart knows—as a resistance to that single overriding goddamned thing that Franz Schulze and Peter Pran wrote about the basic zeitgeist, the Miesian thing. I love Mies. But it was about the descendents. I never loved them, any of them. Any of them. So we evolved to make a way for another move in Chicago. That publishing and doing the show at the Richard Gray Gallery, that first exhibition, was very interesting because it began through that. Then the Chicago Architectural Club, which is 1980... And I started, I was responsible, as a part of the Chicago Seven, for starting the journal, right? That journal was published by Rizzoli. Why Rizzoli? Because I bought a lot of architecture books, both from Marilyn Hasbrouck and at Rizzoli at Water Tower. And the young man that ran the Water Tower shop was named John Brancati. And he said to me at one point, because my work was very well known at that point, he said, "Why don't I do a book on your work?" So I went to Monacelli, who was the CEO of Rizzoli, and he said, in his inimitable... He's still my publisher, even though he was fired, because now he has his own press, Monacelli Press, who's doing the next book on the Kabbalah and a book on Margaret's work in the spring. He's my publisher—I don't stay with a company, I stay with a guy—so when Gianfranco left, he's my man, I was with him. So this first book, he said, "Why don't you do a book?" in the way that he speaks...

Blum: A book on your work?

Tigerman: On my work. So that's how this book came out of that.

Blum: So Monacelli was your contact with Rizzoli?

Tigerman: And he became my publisher.

Blum: Can we go back to 1973, when the "One Hundred Years of Chicago Architecture" opened in Munich? How did you learn about that exhibition?

Tigerman: I don't know. We found out about it when it came back to Chicago, to the MCA, three years later, in 1976.

Blum: In an expanded version.

Tigerman: In an expanded version. We, which means Stuart Cohen, Ben Weese, Larry Booth, and I, got together and wanted to do a book and an exhibition, which became "Chicago Architects," which was done consciously, in contradistinction, to the prevailing wind, the Miesian thing.

Blum: To make what kind of a distinction?

Tigerman: That there are other things. That there wasn't just a monolith, as Franz Schulze and Peter Pran and Carl Condit... All they were writing about Chicago was that it was this monolithic thing. It began with the first Chicago School and it became the second Chicago School.

Blum: Wasn't that out of Giedion?

Tigerman: It's out of Giedion, sure. These are polemicists. Scully was the same kind of polemicist. Scully pretends—talk about dissimulation, dissembling—he pretends that Frank Lloyd Wright's house and studio was followed by Bruce Price's work, who did Tuxedo Park, New Jersey. That's bullshit. Everybody has selective amnesia or selective memory when they're trying to produce one overriding idea. So, in Scully's case it was the shingle style, and in Chicago, the Miesian inheritance of Sullivan and Wright and Gothic and seeking the sky and LeBaron Jenney and all that. So Franz and Peter Pran, who's just a schmuck, are all the same. They were trying to do the same thing. The four of us met on several occasions and we found all kinds of stuff, which we all contributed, which meant, in my case, Keck and Tague and others. Stuart's preconceptions were fulfilled with the shingle style kind of stuff that interests him. Philip Maher came in between Larry and me. The idiosyncratic, Schweikher and all that, came in through Ben. Those were important architects. The Wrigley building and the garden city kind of stuff, which was never covered by Franz and Peter Pran or it was covered so marginally as to simply say it was not covered. If things didn't descend structurally from Wright, Sullivan, Jenney, and so forth, then it didn't exist for them. You think of who they were, where they taught, what their attitudes were, and I understand it. But we were antagonistic to that. We were young men, it was 1976, I was forty-six, Ben was forty-seven.

Blum: You were the elder statesmen.

Tigerman: Well, Ben was the oldest, I was the next. And Stuart was probably seven, eight, or nine years younger. And Larry was probably six years younger. But Ben was the oldest one and I was the next oldest one. And then out of that came the Chicago Seven.

Blum: And then you added Jim Freed.

Tigerman: No, Jim Freed was a part of the original Chicago Seven. There were the four of us and then we added Beeby, Nagle, and Freed.

Blum: When it was only four of you, you produced the "Chicago Architects" show.

Tigerman: Yes, that's right. That was the first one.

Blum: The others were in the show, but they were not part of the organizing body.

Tigerman: Yes. It was the four of us. It opened at Cooper Union in New York.

Blum: Why in New York?

Tigerman: Well, it'll come to you, think about it. First of all, Hejduk was a friend of mine. He was already the dean at Cooper Union. You know how when they open a Broadway show, they always open it up in New Haven. You open it up out of town. So we knew that. We knew we had to gain some credibility before it opened in Chicago. And we did. There was a lot of press in New York about the show at the Cooper Union. Then we brought it to the Time-Life building because we couldn't get a museum venue.

Blum: Well, the Art Institute didn't have an architecture department at the time.

Tigerman: In any case, we couldn't. We couldn't get it even at the Graham Foundation because Entenza had left and then it was Carter Manny. It went from Entenza to Carter. Remember, Entenza had had a stroke in 1976 or so and in 1977 we took him to La Jolla. I think that's in an earlier tape. So Carter was the man. He was the director of the Graham. So we couldn't put it anywhere. So we put it in the lobby. We talked to Harry and he had serious influence with IBM and he had done this terrific building and we put it in the lobby of the Time-Life building. Then it continued to get press, but in Chicago. But the press coverage began when it was in New York, for sure.

Blum: The two shows, when they played in Chicago, you've talked about them as theater. They were in two places at the same time, presenting different ideas to the same constituency, appealing to the same audience.

Tigerman: A different constituency. Ours was the pluralist one that fleshed out the whole, that didn't have a polemic and had an honest-to-God truth. And the other one had a polemic; it had an agenda, to carry on the Chicago School, one and two, traditions. For sure.

Blum: When the press picked it up, they talked about it as the war of ideas. Ada Louise Huxtable wrote about the "fight in Chicago." Nory Miller talked about it as the "war." Is that the way you saw it?

Tigerman: Yep. We did.

Blum: Was it to open up the field? Or was it also to make a place for yourselves? Because you weren't designing those Miesian high-rise buildings.

Tigerman: Although I had done the first one. Boardwalk came before.

Blum: Did you wonder why the Boardwalk wasn't in the "One Hundred Years" show?

Tigerman: Well, you'll have to ask Franz Schulze and Peter Pran. We weren't part of the canon. Except for Jim [Freed], who was then the dean at IIT, none of us were Miesians by training. And Ingo was despised by them, at IIT.

Blum: Well, he had a building in their show.

Tigerman: Of course, he was trained there. This show was about people trained by Mies and then leading back the hundred years of structure, form, or whatever they

call it. He was one of theirs. Now, when he became dean, whether you know it or not—if you only could have heard the rhetoric by people like John Vinci, who hated him because he was bringing color into the curriculum. This was all published; it's all out there. He brought people like Hejduk and Colin Rowe and others to lecture to IIT—un-fucking-heard of! Unheard of, Betty! So, Ingo was one of theirs, but tainted.

Blum: Well, he has said the people at IIT expected certain things of him and he had hoped to do some other things and it didn't quite work.

Tigerman: Well, it didn't quite work in part because of Hermine. She hated being in Chicago. She was a New Yorker, a self-endowed video artist, not so great, but she had a bigger play in New York. She expected to be Queen Shit when she came to Chicago in art and it didn't happen. She hated it. She bad-mouthed this place all the time. Margaret will tell you, we were at parties at their house, smoking grass. She was a problem.

Blum: Well, I understand she was one of the reasons he left.

Tigerman: Right. She finally left. She preceded him. She just couldn't stand it. She expected to have a reception here as if this was Des Moines.

Blum: Well, your exhibition was received with great interest. Nory Miller attached herself onto you guys and she really gave you a lot of coverage.

Tigerman: Yes, true. God rest her soul. True. Lots of people did. Shall I break out the scrapbooks and show you all the stuff that was published, and all the people that wrote? Nory wrote just a bit more than anybody else.

Blum: I was given to understand that Nory Miller was something like the den mother to the group.

Tigerman: Not really. I would say that if she was den mother, it was only a bit more than probably about five others. A lot of people wrote multiple articles on that show.

Blum: What was the consensus of what they wrote, in your opinion?

Tigerman: Well, I think your use of the language—to say that there was a lot of interest in the show—was fair. Chicago and other parts of the world as well—but in Chicago for sure—was perceived as a single overriding view, which Condit has to take the heat for, and Giedion before him. Those are the people that persuaded everyone that Chicago had one overriding image. The fact is, it did. There's no question that Sullivan, Wright, Jenney, Holabird, and then Mies were the overriding characters. What we put on the table was what I would call "minor artists." In the end, they were minor. But there were enough of them. I mean, you would never say that Tague and probably even Keck were major artists or else you would see books on them. Nobody was a fool about this. But when you pick up all of them and find so many that were not included in Franz and Peter's book, then you can say "repression." They repressed or they suppressed all of these less important figures. There's no question they were less important.

Blum: Well, they were pursuing their own thesis.

Tigerman: Yeah. And Mies—talk about a publicist—my goodness. Who was published more than Mies? Corbu? They were major publicists. So they persuaded everybody that they were great architects. And you know what? They were, at the end of the day. I mean, you'd never accuse Philip Maher of being a great architect, but he's not uninteresting. He's a minor artist. Or Goldberg or Netsch or Weese, are they in the category with Sullivan and Mies? No. But are they dreck? No. They're very good architects, they're interesting. So, when you put all these guys together, can you imagine that Netsch and Goldberg and Weese are published in "One Hundred Years of Architecture,"

like so, like nothing? That's crazy. We knew all that. Ours was "revisionist history," no doubt.

Blum: You primarily had a strong connection with architects in the East. Stuart had a connection with people in the university, mostly Cornell. But the architects in the East had done a lot of work publicizing themselves—the "Five Architects" show and catalog.

Tigerman: Right, they had a very important show.

Blum: And you were tuned into that.

Tigerman: Right. So we had the apogee of that—that's what you're alluding to. It came about at the Graham Foundation, which was a huge event. It was called "The Whites,"—which is Meier, Eisenman, Hejduk, Gwathmey, and Graves—"the Grays"—which is Giurgola, Vreeland, Stern, the sort of shingle style descendents—"the Silvers",-which is the California grouping of Craig Hodgetts, Gene Kupper, Pelli, Lumsden—"and the Chicago Seven." There was a huge monster rally at the Graham Foundation, with guys hanging off the rafters. The fire department actually came. It was packed, because here they all were. Yes, I mainly brought them to Chicago.

Blum: You made it happen—but that wasn't what I was alluding to.

Tigerman: That was the culmination of it.

Blum: Were you taking the Five as a model for the Chicago Seven agenda?

Tigerman: It's more complex than that. It's easy. You sound like a Miesian, for Christ's sake. It's easy to say, almost as a "j'accuse," Well, these young pups, whose talent is debatable anyway—all seven of them or all eleven, with Cindy Weese and Ken Schroeder—are these really talented people? Marginally. But

you can say, "Well, who are they individually? Why the hell was that put together? What about me? What about this one or that one?" Sure, I'd say that's a part of it, trying to make a name for yourself in a time that was purely a Miesian time. You have no idea of the power and authority of Skidmore, Owings and Merrill in those years, none. It was wild. Sure, part of it was to elbow a place into what was happening in Chicago. Part of it was revisionist history, which had nothing to do with self-promotion, because we felt that all these other guys were getting screwed. Who ever heard about Tague? Out of the question. Who ever heard of Winston Elting? I mean, I can name an endless number of not great but very good architects. So you flush them all out and you say the entirety is a representation of Chicago. That was fair, that was a fair thing. Part of it was self-publicizing. I can hear the same comments from the likes of George Danforth about people like the New York Five, the Whites, or the Grays. But what the fuck did he ever do, George Danforth, to qualify him to be the dean for decades as a caretaker, where nothing ever happened? Duh! Think about it. So, I'm saying that, yes, we were trying to say that Chicago represents more than a repression, more than—what is the language used in religion?—the "normative thought," the "centroid." You snip off the edges—this is what Catholicism does, it gets rid of the edges, it focuses only on normative thought. They get rid of all this other stuff. That's what Franz did—he got rid of all this crap. He said it wasn't important at all, he didn't publish it at all. How come Philip Maher, how come all those guys, an army of architects, not one of their fucking names showed up in that show?

Blum: Well, it was pretty clear that what their agenda was.

Tigerman: What they were presenting was the entirety of Chicago, that's what was being presented. That's what Condit did, that's what Giedion did, that's what prompted all of us. Now, were we purely noble in doing it? No. We wanted a piece of the action, for sure. Were we also so self-important and self-involved that it was really "me, me, me," or "we, we, we"? No. They had actually

suppressed a lot of information—and it was suppression, that's what historians do. We know it.

Blum: Is that another way of saying selection?

Tigerman: Selection. That's nicer, a nice euphemism. I will call it suppression. But the other guys didn't get published, let's leave it at that. That's fair.

Blum: Until you, Stuart, Ben, and Larry came along...

Tigerman: We came along and we caused it to happen. I would submit, albeit a revisionist history, it was an important historical phenomenon, no doubt. It was not that we had a place. After all, in fairness, Betty, maybe the others did, but I didn't need a place—I had been published like mad in 1974 and '76. So I will say that it was important to do. From my side it was a very noble and good act. I didn't need the publicity. It didn't really help me, because I kept getting published no matter what.

Blum: Well, you were published a lot, but you were published as an individual and to bring about the kind of change that you were hoping for, the kind of broadening, could you have done that yourself, without the other six?

Tigerman: No, I could not have. You know, to cause Chicago to be perceived in a multilateral way, there's no question that one person can't... Why do you think that Archeworks had two founders? Because if there's one, it's bad for the Socrates-Plato thing, right? I wasn't interested in being given hemlock, neither then nor now. I'm not ready quite yet. Maybe later. I couldn't have started Archeworks, because there are two of us—one's an architect and one's an interior designer. You can't really criticize more than one. And when the Chicago Seven was formed, here was a whole lot of people whose only connection was to put together revisionist history, because we had nothing, zero, formally, that connected us. That's interesting. And we were often

against, over and against the Miesians—not Mies, but the descendents. Mies was dead already, in 1969. Here were a bunch of guys whose work was all the same, and, by the way, derivative, not of their own. So here we all were, and we were all different. So we became somewhat believable. How can seven guys...? Well, the first was four guys—Ben, Larry, Stuart, and I—and we had absolutely nothing in common, then or now. I don't even speak to Stuart, as you know or you may know. I have no use for him; I have no interest in him. We'll get into that later. Ben and I broke our relationship... We had a very close relationship. We talk, but it's marginal. Larry and I are close, because he was my employee and I love him. He's a great guy. We had nothing in common, but when we all came together to produce "Chicago Architects" it was a great moment. There was a mission and out of that mission, if you want to take that chronologically... When the show was done at Cooper and then at Time-Life, we realized that nobody is entirely stupid about this, that here was an opportunity and so we expanded on it to add the other three. Jim was here and the other Jim—Nagle—was here, and Beeby was here. We put together the Chicago Seven and we had that first show and then that second show.

Blum: The first show was the "Chicago Seven" and the next was at Richard Gray Gallery. The second show was "The Exquisite Corpse."

Tigerman: Which was upstairs in the same building.

Blum: But that was a separate show, at a different date.

Tigerman: Separate show, different date. Later. Subsequent catalog for each show. You've ever seen the catalogs? They're great. They're here.

Blum: I've never seen the catalog for "The Exquisite Corpse."

Tigerman: Oh, yeah, it's great. Actually, the Richard Gray show, I've been meaning to get a hold of him because Beeby did these absolutely exquisite drawings. I mean exquisite. Here they are in the catalog, see? You know, I have actually a rather major collection of architectural drawings, of which I have something like five Beeby drawings. They're beautiful. They're spectacular. There is a woman in town and before I married Margaret, I took her to my high school prom. Her name was Susan Glassman and she was Saul Bellow's third wife. Years after that, she and I dated some and her son, whose name was Dan Bellow, hated Margaret because he wanted me to marry his mom. We made an arrangement at that show. I bought this one, she bought that one. Each of us bought one of Beeby's drawings. There's a front and rear elevation of this utterly lyrical, fabulous thing. We made a deal, we cut a deal—it's a very sweet story—that whoever died first would inherit the other one's drawing. So, this kid Dan, because Suzy died—I had gotten her a job at Cooper Union when she left Chicago—she was there and she lived, I think, on West End Avenue. About a year ago she died. And the kid called me up about three months ago and said, "I remember this arrangement you made with my mom, so I'd like to ship off the drawing." Actually, I need to tell Beeby. So I have the other drawing now. It's very sweet. I've got to tell you, Betty, I love stories like that. I just do.

Blum: A happy ending?

Tigerman: Not a happy ending, but these kind of poignant things.

Blum: Were you the conduit by which the Chicago Seven got published?

Tigerman: In 1976, was when the book was published... I had been published in tons of books, pages and pages and pages. So my taking advantage of having access to publishing as a product of "Chicago Architects" is not germane. What I did do...

- Blum: Well, did you bring some expertise to the Chicago Seven and the...
- Tigerman: What happened was that the four of us were able, because we were four, to do this thing and gain some legitimacy for the movement. No doubt. I don't think that even in their case they were interested in capitalizing and publishing. Yes, we got notoriety for actually some four or five years. Then after the Chicago Architectural Club we did the "Late Entries to the Chicago Tribune Tower Competition." Stuart authored the first book, which was "Chicago Architects" and this one was by Stuart Cohen and Stanley Tigerman. The first name is the one that goes in the Library of Congress. But the second one, "Late Entries to the Chicago Tribune Tower Competition," was by Stanley Tigerman and Stuart Cohen. After we founded the Chicago Architectural Club—it was founded in 1980—within three years, by 1982 or '83, I had lost interest. I wasn't interested, because it is meant to be for the young and I was already fifty-two or fifty-three and it wasn't interesting to me. Then they all started to quit, which means Booth, Beeby... A few of them hung on, I suppose Schroeder and Stuart and Ben. But it wasn't interesting, because it's meant to be for the young.
- Blum: You've gone very quickly over some of these things. Could we go back to the first catalog, "Chicago Architects"? In the essay that Stuart he appealed for opening a dialog, which apparently was something that the Chicago architectural community didn't do easily, or maybe at all.
- Tigerman: No, it didn't.
- Blum: Following this show, these symposiums did take place. There were symposia; there were panels...
- Tigerman: These were basically one-time things. I mean, there were several of them, but with different people.

Blum: Well, he was calling for a long-term benefit to...

Tigerman: It never transpired, because the Miesians, the descendents—perfectly good architects, perfectly good guys, and in some cases, utterly brilliant, like Jacques Brownson and Gene Summers—these are not verbal people and the bulk of them don't even have a perceivable IQ. So what was there to dialog? There has to be somebody... A dialog means there's somebody on the other side, right? They didn't have that. So it didn't really happen.

Blum: Well, there were the symposia at the MCA, a lecture forum at IIT that followed the two shows... Was there a long-range plan?

Tigerman: No.

[Tape 5: Side 1]

Blum: If you did not have a long-range plan—you and your other four people—how did the four of you decide to include the next three—Jim [Freed], James [Nagle], and Tom [Beeby]—and have another exhibition?

Tigerman: Because we realized the response, while not universally approving, certainly, which wasn't the intention anyway—we weren't going to displace Mies, that was not in the cards and we knew that. But what we were able to do was to flesh out the entirety of the history of Chicago architecture. And some of us continue to do it. That genealogy was my way of continuing to do it.

Blum: Has this been a long-standing interest of yours?

Tigerman: Long-standing. And people like Susan Benjamin in Highland Park, and Pauline Saliga and others have worked on that stuff and are credited in the catalog. I had been working on that for years before John put together that second show [Chicago Architecture and Design, 1923-1993]. I mean, I want to

say for six or seven years I hired people to work in this office. That's where all the profit went over the years—doing shit like that.

Blum: Do you consider that was your contribution?

Tigerman: Of course, I was definitely into that. We did that, I was really interested in that. I've always been a student of history. How did things come about? Who worked for whom? Under what circumstances? If you like, who slept with whom, symbolically? I'm interested in that because it impacts on influence.

Blum: Help me reconstruct the progression of the Chicago Seven. How did four become seven?

Tigerman: It came about because we saw that the four had had an impact. *Chicago Architects* was impactful, no doubt. I will say that it really began with Stuart and I, not with Larry or Ben. Stuart and I were the fulcrum and the force behind *Chicago Architects*. We saw that the show and the book had an impact. We sold a shitload of the books—the Swallow Press, what is that?

Blum: What was the Swallow Press?

Tigerman: Who even knows? And who cares? It was a nothing of a press. But they published the book. It was interesting.

Blum: Was it a dummy corporation?

Tigerman: No, not at all. Actually, there is even some humor in it. I think around—this is jumping ahead but I would otherwise forget to tell you. There is some humor and there is some bitterness, there were a lot of things. In 1980, '81, '82, '83—somewhere in there—I got a grant from the Graham Foundation—which has always been extremely generous to me and now to Archeworks—to do a show called "Nine Architects," three from the East Coast, three from

Chicago, and three from the West Coast. I don't know, I think it was Beeby, Helmut and I from Chicago; and it was Cesar Pelli, who was not yet at Yale, and George Ranalli, there were a few people from the East Coast; and Frank Gehry and whoever from the West Coast. Have you ever seen this catalog?

Blum: No, I haven't.

Tigerman: It was very interesting. A guy named Morris Lesser, a critic whom you never heard of, did a terrific critique of the show.

Blum: Where was the show?

Tigerman: It was a traveling show. It went all over the place.

Blum: Was it in Chicago?

Tigerman: Yeah, I think at the Graham Foundation. So, one time—whenever it was, I don't remember now—Pelli invited me to teach at Yale. He invited me twice when he was teaching. I don't think it was the first time, because that was 1975 or '76, I guess. Somewhere in the 1980s, I think. So we're sitting over a beer in this German restaurant in New Haven... Pelli was one of the guys in the show. He was a very sweet man, very innocent, at some level. So he's saying to me, "I've never heard"—in his Argentine accent—"of this Morris Lesser. Who is Morris Lesser?"

Blum: This was your critic?

Tigerman: Yes. So, I said, "More is less-er." It was me, okay?

Blum: That was your pseudonym?

Tigerman: Yes! Absolutely! It was great. He laughed. He loved it. He absolutely loved it. So then it got out who it was who had written the critique, because it was a very tongue-in-cheek kind of critique.

Blum: Then this must have happened at a much later date. You know, you've been called the linchpin, the head guy, when it came to events of the Chicago Seven. How did these other three people come into the picture to make the four of you the Chicago Seven.

Tigerman: Let me tell you how they came into the picture, it's very clear. Stuart was a terrific scholar—Cohen. He wrote the book. Well, Jim Nagle added precious little intellectually, because it's not his thing. Jim Freed didn't add much, because he was just a terrific architect, so he added that.

Blum: He was also the dean at IIT.

Tigerman: He was also dean at IIT, but it was more than that—it was not because he was dean.

Blum: That he was the dean and with your group seems ironic.

Tigerman: We were aware that Ingo—we always referred to him as Ingo—was the dean at IIT, but he was in it because he had been educated in Chicago at Hyde Park High School and at IIT. Then he went to New York to work for both Philip and Mies on the Seagram building. But he was here and he was the real thing—he was Chicago. So, in our view—certainly in my view and, I'm sure, in everyone else's view—Freed was a terrific architect, a terrific architect. And he still is. He is a fabulous, first-class architect, who is ending his life up tragically. It's awful. I love him, I really do. Then, Beeby, who is without question an intellect of size—he's a very smart guy. But even then, the stuff we did subsequently, like the "Late Entries to the Chicago Tribune Tower Competition," and the founding of the Chicago Architecture Club—all

of which comes about as the product of certain things, which I'll be happy to share with you—that was all of us. I was probably more organizational but that doesn't mean that I either could have done it alone or that it was solely or largely mine. It really was a collaboration. We had a ton of dinners, which I'm sure many of them told you about. There's a great story, as a sidebar—the guy, Sal Parrinello, was living with Herb Greenwald's son's former wife, Lynn, who is Susan Manilow's sister. He opened a restaurant on Deming, north of Fullerton, west of Clark, in a little sort of cul-de-sac thing. Very nice. Lynn was the maître'd and he was the chef. It was a great restaurant and it was called Salvatore's. The Chicago Seven met there pretty goddamn frequently—once every other month, maybe, for some years, anyway. Those dinners had a great collegiality connected with them.

Blum: This was when you were seven?

Tigerman: We were seven and we were eleven, both. And out of that came the Chicago Architectural Club. It came out of those dinners. And out of that came the "Late Entries" show. But all those things—the "Late Entries," all the shows, all the stuff—while it was all of us, I suppose, it was largely Stuart and me, I would say.

Blum: How did the idea for the exhibition at Richard Gray Gallery come about? Why did it take the form of individual houses, unbuildable or unbuilt?

Tigerman: We tried to present a conceptual basis. Mind you, Mies had a great concept, no doubt. But the descendents had none. None. They added nothing, no thing, to Mies. Zero. And the one guy who did, Ingo, was persona non grata in many ways and they ultimately forced him out. And they ultimately forced him back to New York. He was, from their side, wrongfully inappropriate, no doubt.

Blum: As the dean?

Tigerman: As the dean. I mean, they were wrong. Of all the descendent deans at IIT, Ingo was the breath of fresh air. He was great. I must say that Ingo and I—I will even go so far as to say that *The Titanic*, while not Ingo's idea, was very influenced by him. He influenced me to do that. We were drinking one night and he was at my office and he basically talked me into doing it. It was my idea, for sure, but he talked me into doing it. I had chickened out and he said, "No, you have to do it." It was Ingo, it was great. We were really good friends.

Blum: Stanley, I know that many people have taken you to task for that, because it was just sort of a nasty thing to do. Did that trouble you?

Tigerman: Absolutely not. And it was definitely not nasty! It was great. My pleasure. The combined I.Q. of the people that have taken me to task remains in two digits. I mean, who are they? But Ingo gave me the wherewithal, the *cajones*, the strength to do it. It was Jim Freed, he was great.

Blum: So there was more to the interaction of the seven of you, the four of you, than meets the eye?

Tigerman: Yes. I mean, even to this day, I will say that Beeby and Helmut Jahn—outside of Eva Maddox and Margaret McCurry—are my only friends in architecture in Chicago, in a deep way, in a truly deep way. Yes, I love Jim and Larry and Ron Krueck and others, but Beeby, particularly, and then Helmut, somewhat secondarily because he's never here much and he speaks elliptically as you must know by now. It's not so easy to have a conversation on any subject except Helmut Jahn's most recent work. Where Beeby, intellectually is really a brilliant guy. I mean, I'm very fond of him, to this day. And his office is right there on the other side of this brick wall, just right next door. So, some of us have maintained... For years I've played tennis with Jim, I've gone skiing with Larry, I still do, and so forth. But the only deep relationship is

with Tom, and then Helmut. Now, do I like Ron Krueck? I love him, I think he's one of the best architects in the United States.

Blum: Why was he not made one of the Chicago Seven or Eleven?

Tigerman: Because he wasn't at that time any force whatsoever, otherwise he would have been in a heartbeat.

Blum: Were people selected because they were a force?

Tigerman: Oh, Betty, I don't know why we added the eleven. We certainly wanted to add Helmut. Certainly Jerry Horn is a person of immense quality, immense. Cindy [Weese] and [Ken] Schroeder, much, much, much, much less so. Why were they added? I don't know. I mean, it was not up to me, it was up to the group or a conversation. Well, seven and eleven, it was like dice. Were we going to make it the Chicago Nine? Right. I don't think so. It was catchy.

Blum: And it was deliberate, of course, that you were the Chicago Seven, patterned after the political seven.

Tigerman: The original Chicago Seven. One of whom, Rubin, was a very good friend of mine. Absolutely, no doubt.

Blum: How did they get their name?

Tigerman: There were seven of them. It was simply from the press, when they came to trial under that stupid Jewish judge, Julius Hoffman. He wanted to "silence" them. Talk about suppression. You know, the press named them. And then, years later—that was in 1968, '69, '70, and then our show was in 1975. Well, it was five years later because the first show, *Chicago Architects*, opened up at Cooper Union in New York. It opened in Chicago in 1976.

- Blum: In the Richard Gray show, where there is an essay in the catalog by Dennis Adrian. How did Dennis Adrian, who's primarily an art critic, not an architecture critic, come to write the essay?
- Tigerman: We asked him. I don't know, it may have been Richard Gray influencing me. I knew Dennis.
- Blum: But why Dennis and not someone like Nory Miller or someone who was into architecture.
- Tigerman: Nory was very young and she was also biased. She loved us and she went to Europe with Stuart, which you probably know by now—they traveled together. She was an extremely close friend of mine. She was biased. Dennis, we were trying to get an even-handed review. Dennis, who was not, as you say, an architecture critic... Obviously, we could not have Franz. Who else was out there? No one. So we asked Dennis and he wrote a great piece.
- Blum: Well, he wrote an article slanting the work of the Chicago Seven in an art context—you were not builders in the construction sense, you were artists in the designing sense. Did you think of yourselves in that way?
- Tigerman: I think we tried to position ourselves in that way. None of us, even the oldest among us, Ben and I, had built a lot. I think that Larry and Jim built more than any of us. Beeby hadn't built a lot.
- Blum: There was also a statement that each of you made about your projects. Yours was Little House in the Clouds.
- Tigerman: Which influenced a lot of my work.

Blum: Was there an effort at this time also to present yourselves not only outside of the museum vocabulary but to present yourselves as thinkers with ideas and not only as builders with a hammer and nails?

Tigerman: Yeah. Little doubt, kiddo.

Blum: Why?

Tigerman: Because it was something that we felt wasn't transpiring with the descendents of Mies, who, once again, basically had little clue about conceptualization. I'm looking through *Versus* here at Little House in the Clouds, the surrealist thing—notice that it's cleaved? "Postmodernism as a Jewish Movement," was the statement that goes with it. I said even then, "one half of the house returns to nature while the other half becomes man's home." It's about cleaving—boom, boom. So, by 1976 it was pretty clear that I was into that, okay? Out of that came an unbuilt project, obviously influenced by that.

Blum: Unbuilt?

Tigerman: For the Baha'i faith—the archives building in Wilmette, which would have been built one day. The reason it never got built was that there was still litigation with the State of Illinois for riparian rights for Lake Michigan. So look at all these cleaved buildings after Little House in the Clouds. There's the Baha'i thing, there's the D.O.M. project—the model for which sits right out there—outside of Cologne in Bruel. I mean, it's all about fragmentation, these fragments of that house in Barrington. And there's this one, which is the Symbolic Museum, from 1981 in Guernica in Spain. There's this stuff, which were all in again, the Thonet showroom, where Beeby, Ron Krueck, and others—notice how this is again broken into two? It was a major influence.

Blum: It was in the flow of a lot of other projects in your development.

Tigerman: Definitely, definitely.

Blum: Later that year was the show at the Walter Kelly Gallery for which you did a townhouse. How did this theme for side-by-side townhouses come about?

Tigerman: Well, it all came to pass... Didn't any of these guys tell you?

Blum: Yes, but how do you remember it?

Tigerman: There is a thing that began with André Breton. You tell me that none of them told you about the *cadavre exquis*?

Blum: Yes, yes, of course.

Tigerman: It's a game that people at a party play, as late as today. I will draw the head, fold it over so you see only two lines, and pass it on and you'll draw the body down to the navel or midsection and you leave two lines and some other will draw it to the hips and some other will draw the legs and some other the feet. Then you open it up and it's monstrous—it's a fun game. It's called the *cadavre exquis*—the exquisite corpse. So what we thought of doing was to—unbeknownst to each other, but established by the rules—the townhouse would be so high by so wide and each of the eight of us—Helmut was there—eight of us did eight townhouses unbeknownst to each other.

Blum: Measuring the same frontage?

Tigerman: Same frontage, same height, same more or less. And we lined them up, like you see in the photograph, as a show. Lo and behold, the department of urban renewal, where we had some influence, had a series of lots on Sedgwick, starting at the north on Wisconsin, that they sold to individual people who hired different architects: Booth and I were among them and I

think that Schroeder was one. And we built eight others like these. They exist on Sedgwick. Well, in any case, we actually built it, which is interesting.

Blum: How many years later did that happen?

Tigerman: I don't know, in the early '80s sometime.

Blum: How close was your unbuilt townhouse design to the townhouse you built?

Tigerman: You know, different. The unbuilt one is truly surreal. No doubt. Look at the people, cut out.

Blum: Where did Magritte come from?

Tigerman: Magritte comes out of André Breton. Magritte did a lot of that. There was a surrealistic movement in Chicago.

Blum: Is that the first time that the figure with the derby enters your vocabulary? You've used him it in many cartoons.

Tigerman: No, John Hejduk. You know, the architect, the head of Cooper Union.

Blum: He used the image?

Tigerman: John Hejduk's work is surrealist, consciously. Hejduk was a big influence on me, period. So, you can look at it in different ways.

Blum: That one is Tom's. I think that they, too, are arranged alphabetically.

Tigerman: So Helmut's must be this one, two before me. So this is Freed's, this is Helmut's, this is mine... And Freed's is the one before this one. Mine is the

least literal, because the series of cleaves—think of all the cleaving that goes on.

Blum: Well, that's more than you've done before. You've got four or five portions. The figure is either half or larger, depending on the stairs he's on.

Tigerman: The residual figure is not listed. I loved this. But the townhouse that I built looks like a paddle wheel on the Mississippi. The one that was built, the ones that were built, luckily, I got the end one, so you are able to see it this way. That guy no longer owns it, he was a guy named Howard Kastel.

Blum: Did you design it for him? Or did you design it and he just bought it?

Tigerman: Yeah, but the people who worked out there, Larry Booth had one next to me and maybe he had one further down the block. We didn't show each other our work, it was just like our townhouse show.

Blum: So when did you first see each other's built townhouse?

Tigerman: When it got built, when it started going up.

Blum: And in the show?

Tigerman: Same. When they opened the exhibition. It was great. It was wild. I mean, you look at these things...

Blum: Well, these townhouses have been used over and over again as an example of the Chicago Seven work.

Tigerman: See, the first show was the detached house in nature, the machine in the garden as it were. These are attached and they're urban. The others were rural and lyrical in nature, particularly Beeby's, which was brilliant.

Blum: Do you still have your model?

Tigerman: No, I think I threw it away. I moved at one point from Illinois Center to 920 N. Michigan—what is now the Bloomingdale's building—with that old fabulous apartment and Jacques, the wonderful restaurant on the ground floor. In any case, I had the Instant City model and when I moved I threw them out. They were too big, they were falling apart. It was a mistake. It's too bad, because I loved the project. I love it now, I loved it then. It was fabulous. And whatever little things there were that would be habitable were behind. It was Stairways to Paradise. So I really, truly loved that project.

Blum: The next exhibition at the Graham Foundation, which is when the Chicago Seven became Eleven. It was the townhouses again.

Tigerman: And we then added these other people—Cindy and Schroeder and Jerry Horn.

Blum: How did an idea to expand come about? And to hold it as an open competition?

Tigerman: I don't remember how we did it. I mean, the Chicago Eleven, by that time, were in the front. And then we added these other people, which I forgot about, which was Debbie Doyle, Bob Fugman, Jim Goettsch, Steven Gross, Anders Nereim, Joe Poli, Peter Pran...

Blum: Weren't they the runners-up?

Tigerman: Yeah, they had a competition. We picked in the blind.

Blum: How did this idea come about?

Tigerman: I don't remember. I truly don't. But we wanted to expand it again even beyond the Chicago Seven. This was a jury. So we picked these guys and then that started the formation. See, here's all the people who entered it, right?

Blum: Well, I thought they were the architects who were given an honorable mention.

Tigerman: Yes. And out of that came the Chicago Architectural Club.

Blum: Were you aware, or was anyone aware, of the fact that the Chicago Architectural Club in 1885 had run a townhouse competition?

Tigerman: Of course, absolutely.

Blum: Was that the inspiration for yours?

Tigerman: I guess more seminally involved, because I wrote the thing after Carter. I guess I had some part in the idea, but I forget. I just haven't thought about all this in so long.

Blum: It's my impression that you look back on this time in your life as not being very important.

Tigerman: Right. The whole damn thing, which I've told you separately, about my reluctance even to do this interview about the Chicago Seven. I'm not interested in it anymore. Not at all.

Blum: Is it because you have a short attention span or because you think it was meaningless?

Tigerman: It wasn't meaningless, no doubt. It wasn't meaningless! I sort of am not there anymore. I'm not close to the bulk of them anymore. Nothing is forever. Time goes on. Does that mean it was unimportant? No. It was important. The Chicago Architectural Club [continues] today.

Blum: Do you have an interest in the Chicago Architectural Club?

Tigerman: No, I told you, I quit. I quit very early on. I'm not interested in them—they're some good ones and some bad ones, just like in the original. It's a very good thing, because it's another aspect of Chicago architectural culture. It made history, but you don't want to hang on. I'm not a coupon-clipper. I'm not interested.

Blum: But it certainly did provide a forum for many people, to exchange, which hadn't existed before.

Tigerman: And continues to exist today and they continue to do things today. Here, look at this: "Work has been published more than 2900 times." I'll give you this. "Exhibited more than 275." Awards...

Blum: You're reading from the first page of your CV.

Tigerman: The short version. Awards—I know it's here, because it wouldn't be like me not to have it here... "111 design awards..." I think it's now something like 115.

Blum: Does the Graham Foundation deserve any mention for helping the Chicago Seven achieve their goals?

Tigerman: Absolutely. Absolutely! And all of us, separately and collectively. God almighty! Do you know how many grants I've gotten from the Graham Foundation? Probably that's not there. I don't know, maybe fifteen? And

Archeworks has gotten three or four. The Graham Foundation gave Archeworks its initial grant, its seminal grant, of \$25,000, not the usual \$10,000, because of Beeby and Rick Solomon. No doubt! And now Ben Weese. The Graham Foundation was always helpful under Entenza, under Carter, and now under Rick. There was terrific involvement and it had a big impact and it ultimately kept getting bigger and bigger and more pluralistic and more pluralistic until it became too pluralistic and that's when I left. It wasn't interesting to me. There were too many quite ordinary architects, because you can't sustain it. There's not 125 architects worth a shit in Chicago. It's not in the cards.

Blum: You think you began with an elite group and when it passed that point, you lost interest?

Tigerman: Well, at some point. Because it was about dues and their journal, which I began, and that carried it to UIC.

Blum: Why the journal?

Tigerman: Again, it's about history. We were making history. I knew that even with the Chicago Architectural Club. Monacelli and Rizzoli published it all. And then we did it at the University of Illinois at Chicago, *Threshold*. Even before I was the director, when Beeby was the director, I started that journal. I like documenting what transpired. It's certainly not about me. I am a booster. In another life I would have been head of the Chamber of Commerce. I love Chicago, truly. I wanted—and I suppose I still do—to make Chicago have a mark. It's not me, my mark, not at all. Chicago needs to have a mark in history.

Blum: In architectural history?

Tigerman: Yeah. Well, in history, but then architectural history, because exclusive of the part that I or my projects played, and apart from this same resistance to the same people like Franz Schulze and Peter Pran pretending or dissembling and saying that there's one view. That is what united us in the beginning and that was the best time, when we did the show "Chicago Architects." It was just the four of us and that was the best.

Blum: That was when your interest was the highest?

Tigerman: Absolutely. It kept going down as we kept getting bigger. Now, when it was the Chicago Seven, those three additional guys were great. When we got to the eleven, two of those guys...

Blum: Is that when it became too diluted for you?

Tigerman: Yeah. Two of them were terrific and two of them were not as terrific. Obviously Jerry Horn and Helmut... Now, who talked Helmut into joining the Chicago Seven? He didn't want to. I talked him into it over a drink one day at lunch. I said, "You've got to do it."

Blum: Why did he not want to join?

Tigerman: Because he was pretending that "No, I am my own man," and whatever bullshit. It was bullshit. So, Helmut benefited from the Chicago Seven. We all benefited from the Chicago Seven.

Blum: In what way?

Tigerman: The coalescence at those dinners at Salvatore's.

Blum: Do you mean by just cementing your friendship?

Tigerman: Not friendships, because they weren't sustained. Cementing, coalescing diverse views about architecture, which never coalesced into an overriding thing, for sure. All eleven were extremely different, including Cindy and Ben from each other—and, if you like now, Margaret and I. We have very little in common. It's part of the same thing. It's just coalescing views. Bringing people together. However noble it sounds, it's for the greater good. So, I believe in that.

Blum: When did the Chicago Seven win their fight?

Tigerman: They never won it.

Blum: What do you mean they never won it?

Tigerman: I mean, it's still an unresolved issue, which is as it should be. The museums still are authoritative, make no mistake. My God, certainly! But now there is a much more pluralistic... It goes back to when I started in architecture and I flunked out of MIT and I was working for Keck. I was talking to Kitty Weese about it the other night in Aspen. Then there was Mies van der Rohe, as a practice; there was Harry Weese, who was a really good architect; there was Edward Dart, who was a really good architect; and there was George Fred Keck, who was a really good architect. And you know what? That's all there was. These were all little firms.

Blum: Would you have included Bud Goldberg?

Tigerman: No, absolutely not. And Goldberg was a big firm. These were little firms. I was over at Harry Weese's at the time when he was in 612 N. Michigan Avenue, a few floors above Keck. He had three people, Keck had five people and Ed Dart had two people. And then there was Mies, who had exactly the same number of people each year, which was twenty. That's it. There was

nothing else. It was all dreck. There certainly were no good little architects. Now there are a ton of architects and they're very good.

Blum: In smaller firms?

Tigerman: Smaller firms. And some bigger firms now are good.

Blum: Do you think the activity of the Chicago Seven had a hand in changing that?

Tigerman: Yes, absolutely. I do believe in that. So when it got too big, at the same time it encouraged young people, which was its point, that was my view. Others may not share that, but that was my view of what the Chicago Seven should be, which is a place for the young to muscle-flex, work out, for others to see.

Blum: Is that the way it is today?

Tigerman: Yeah, there are exhibitions. Do you ever go to any of them?

Blum: Occasionally. At the Graham Foundation.

Tigerman: No, at the various galleries. They have real exhibitions. Some do very good work, some. And certainly as good as the first Chicago Seven, no doubt. It's good work and there's a lot of good guys out there. So I've always loved the young. When the Chicago Seven was young, I loved it. I've always taught that it's about the young. Archeworks is about the young. And in this office—except for Margaret and me and Melany—they're all very young. I love the young. And as I get older, they're no less interesting.

Blum: Why do you prefer them?

Tigerman: They keep me young. They're filled with energy. They're filled with risks. As people get older, they're much less willing to take risks, they have less

energy. That includes organizations and individuals. Chicago Architectural Club began 1980, that's almost twenty years ago. As these things go, that's a long time.

Blum: You know, the idea that you're expressing was the focus of a symposium in 1987. There was a symposium at the Art Institute called "7+11."

Tigerman: And Michael Sorkin was the moderator.

Blum: I think the big question that the symposium posed was, What comes next? The people of the Chicago Seven—maybe it's because they were ten years removed or for whatever reason—didn't offer much of a suggestion. All they said was that they were ready to pass the baton.

Tigerman: Right. That's right. I believe that. That's the way I've always felt until this very second, this very minute. This is again about not having an overriding single view. And now, I'm not interested. Margaret and I have a will. Part of the will reads that when I die, she may not keep the name "Tigerman/McCurry." It's to be called "Margaret McCurry" or she can close it, I don't care. It's not going to be like "Mies van der Rohe and Associates" for a ton of years. When I'm gone, I believe in succession. I believe in transference. I believe in passing the baton. Beeby knows this. I talk to him about it all the time and I have for twenty years.

Blum: Well, he still keeps Jim Hammond's name.

Tigerman: I know, he doesn't believe in that. It's just an honest difference of opinion. I believe that when you're dead, you're gone. Close it up. Done. I believe in that very strongly. Then Margaret can make her own way. Margaret is going to be doing very well. Christ Almighty, she's going to have a book on her work published. Actually, Archeworks, which is what I do want to talk about, it my concept of the future. I would never want to lay it on others.

[Tape 5: Side 2]

Blum: Teaching has been a big segment of your career. In 1964 you started to teach at the University of Illinois. Did you teach before then?

Tigerman: In 1963. There were two jobs before the University of Illinois. One was at Cornell in the fall of 1963 and the other was at Washington University in the spring of 1964. Yes, because I've been a visiting critic over the years at a huge number of schools—Harvard, Yale, Iowa State, God knows. The Engineering College in Dacca, Bangladesh. But, obviously, the long-term job on-and-off was the University of Illinois at Chicago.

Blum: When you say that you taught studios, was that a one-time lecture?

Tigerman: Not a lecture, I was a visiting critic for a semester. Running back and forth. At Iowa State it was two days a week. At Harvard it was two days. It's basically two days a week. So you fly in and fly out.

Blum: Did this system give you enough satisfying contact with the students?

Tigerman: It's like writing. It helps to clarify what your beliefs are.

Blum: But what about the students? You're not there all the time for them to say, "I've got a problem. Can you help?"

Tigerman: Even if you're permanent faculty, you're not there all the time. You're there three days a week, that's it. Design critics, design studio professors are there three afternoons a week. That's it. So, that's between two and three days a week.

Blum: That's not a lot of time. So the students are pretty much on their own.

Tigerman: I know that. Which is how it's supposed to be. They need the time.

Blum: So what did you give them that they could mull over and work though until you came back?

Tigerman: Well, I can't answer it that way, Betty. You give them a problem. They work. At Yale, when I was a student, we saw Paul Rudolph one day a week. And that was more than enough.

Blum: Did he have back-up staff?

Tigerman: Yes, he did. He had back-up staff. He'd see you another day—one day. So that was two days a week. At Yale now, it's three days a week—Tuesday, Wednesday and Thursday—to make it convenient for the New Yorkers so that they don't have to go plodding back and forth. So you give them a problem and you tell the students what the expectations are for the next week, what you expect to see in terms of drawings and models. That's plenty. More than enough. So, what the students get from me or anyone is that you're either impassioned about what you're saying or not. When you give lectures at the same school, you either show that your work is consonant with your ideas or it's not. And they see that.

Blum: What were you able to present to them in 1963?

Tigerman: To communicate my passion about architecture, from 1963 to 1998. In Archeworks, it's the same. I believe in what I do. So that makes for a good teacher. I am a good teacher. So, even guys that don't like me will admit to that.

Blum: That's true.

Tigerman: I believe in what I do and I can present a consistent case, there's consonance, congruity. The students tend to believe you. There are plenty of teachers who say one thing and build another, or worse, say one thing and then don't build at all, don't write. Others don't subject themselves to scrutiny and don't become vulnerable. When you work, you're vulnerable to criticism. When you write, you're vulnerable to criticism. If you don't do that, you're safe. You don't stand for anything. So the students can't really tell. Now, pure academics will argue that because a pure academic who doesn't build, at the very least, writes books or writes papers.

Blum: Well, don't they have to maintain academic standing?

Tigerman: No, once they get tenure, a lot of people really go to hell. You must know that. If you don't, let me be the first to tell you. Because tenure is kind of an evil thing. It's a key to the men's room. It's a chance to be lazy and you don't have to do anything anymore because you're assured a salary. If you don't molest students, if you're not a sniper, if you don't do anything against the law... It's basically a life sinecure. Many people—shall I name them here in Chicago when we get to that?—I mean, there's a lot of people who really don't do anything.

Blum: And you're suggesting that the reason they do nothing is because they have tenure.

Tigerman: And/or they're not capable of doing anything. In other words, time has passed them by. When they went to get tenure, they had to present a case. And they did something, everyone does. Every person gets tenure because they have a case, there's no question about it—in addition to their good teaching and service to the university. But after they get tenure, many people... The Mr. Chipses of the university, you know what I'm saying? Guys who have been there forever and... You know what, let me go about this in another way. If you're an architecture critic, a professor of design,

among the things that you do are juries where kids stand up and present their work. It's not so easy to be critical because a student is actually very uncomfortable in those circumstances in the beginning—then you become inured to it, for sure—and you have to tell them straight. If you don't tell them straight what's going on, they think that there's no problem, that everything is okay. To continue year after year to be ruthlessly honest is really hard. And most people, only a few, don't weaken and become soft. You want to curry the students' favor—who the fuck wants to be hated? It's extremely hard. Everybody in the beginning when they start teaching is rigorous, even cruel, and they're tough. But as the years go by, it's very hard to maintain that. So you start to weaken, you start to become soft. In the meantime, you're not practicing really because you have tenure. It's not a great income, but it's better than a sharp stick in the eye. It will keep you alive, okay?

Blum: Well, you didn't have tenure when you began in 1964, at the University of Illinois.

Tigerman: But how long did it take me to get tenure? Three years.

Blum: Was that considered fast track?

Tigerman: Very fast.

Blum: How did you come to teach at the University of Illinois?

Tigerman: Len Currie. Do you remember him? He was the dean. He was at Navy Pier. And many of the same guys are still teaching: Ed Deam, Tom Jeager.

Blum: Did Currie asked you to teach?

Tigerman: Yeah, he did, because my work was published a lot.

Blum: Some of your colleagues have talked about how creative you have been in the classroom with some projects that you have presented to students. They really admired that.

Tigerman: You try. And whether or not you succeed at these things... It's like building. Stuart Cohen once said—and he's absolutely right—that writing a book is as hard as and very similar to doing a building. When you begin—he may not have said it this way—but my understanding was that when you begin you begin with broad brush strokes, which is to say that for a builder, a writer, a teacher. When you really focus in, you can't be making huge changes. In any case, the rigor by which you approach something—building or writing... Not to overstate the case of how fabulous architecture is, it's like anything else. If you make shoes really well—and that's hard—and to make every pair well every time, that's not easy. You can get sloppy. Journalists get sloppy—they do—as opposed to critics and historians, because they've got to crank it out in a minute. They've got to crank it out once a week. Nory Miller got sloppy.

Blum: Was that in any way connected to reporting the Chicago Seven or reporting you personally?

Tigerman: No, just in reporting. Because it happens. There's a lot of people who write for newspapers and magazines where the demand is to get it done. It's like being an editor. You really have to get it out. You have to meet deadlines and they're there and they're regular. Writing a book is not that way. You don't have to get it done on such-and-such a date so you get sloppy. And I would say that teachers get sloppy, in my view. But again, all this comes from Paul Rudolph, because he was such a terrific influence in my life.

Blum: Peter Eisenman said, "I use students as foghorns to correct my course."

Tigerman: That's a very smart statement.

- Blum: That's what he got out of being in the classroom with young people.
- Tigerman: Well, it's complicated because that's a little selfish and self-serving. Peter Eisenman is a terrific teacher, but he's being honest there that he's using, as in usury, his students. He does. He says that.
- Blum: But is it only a one-way street? Doesn't he give them a lot, as in your example?
- Tigerman: There's no question. I have also used students. When I did *The Architecture of Exile*, the book on the bible, I wrote it in 1984 and Beeby was the director at UIC and I was running the graduate school. That was in 1984, before I became director. I took a visiting critic position two days a week at Iowa State and so I had students. I gave a problem which was Solomon's temple or Ezekiel's temple in anticipation of a messianic age. The bulk of students were from Iowa State, although I gave the course again at the University of Illinois at Chicago, and frankly—this is not dumping on UIC—the kids at Iowa State were better. Why? I have no idea, because I wouldn't say that Iowa State is a better school than UIC, at all. But they were better—they just did a better job or I was more persuasive. I was writing the final draft of the book when the studio wasn't in session and when it was in session I gave these reconstructions. So, yes, I have used students in that way.
- Blum: But if you give credit to the students, it was a two-way street.
- Tigerman: Sort of. But I got more out of it than they did, at one level.
- Blum: Did you ever get something that wasn't a material benefit? Did you learn anything from them?

Tigerman: When you teach? Always. There's no question about it, if you listen to what they're telling you. Because students are not believers, they're very critical, they're skeptics. Yes, you learn a lot from those guys.

Blum: Thinking about the formal layout of a classroom as I remember it, the teacher was at one end and all the students face the teacher. Your office's studio is arranged in the same way. Do you think of yourself as the teacher here with all your students around?

Tigerman: Yes, I do. It also is a performing art.

Blum: You're on stage and they're your audience?

Tigerman: Right. I've always seen it that way. You can see from the way the office is laid out. Teaching is a good thing. Let me give you a couple of cases, a couple of examples. If you build and you don't teach with any regularity at all, as many architects do, you become incredibly arrogant. You become your own worst believer. You have no critics, there are no critics in this office, my own office—very few, because I'm paying the salary. So it's not fair, you know what I'm saying? If you teach, students criticize you, they question. You say, "This is what I think is the right thing." And they'll say, "Why?" They're like little kids. Take Bruce Graham, who didn't spend much time teaching at all. Very haughty, nobody criticized him, so he thought what he was doing is right. Turns out, he's a very good architect. But his lack of teaching showed in his work.

Blum: He taught studios.

Tigerman: Almost not at all. Where? Can you name more than two? He's given lectures, but he has not taught for a semester. Maybe once or twice, but that's all.

Blum: I think he was teaching at Penn.

Tigerman: He did a little bit at Penn. I brought him to UIC. I can give you a lot of cases of guys who didn't teach. But take Bruce. Well, he built, but he built it uncritically. There was no pedagogical depth in the work. There was no resonance that comes out of teaching. Every single person who is a really good architect that's alive to day or at least in recent memory, taught continuously—Stern, who's on the faculty at Columbia; Eisenman, who's on the faculty at Cooper Union and he's been a visiting critic in thousands of places. Frank Gehry's been a visiting critic at Harvard at Yale so many times I can't even begin to tell you. Michael Graves is on the faculty at Princeton. Gwathmey is almost a professional visiting critic, he teaches everywhere. Beeby has continuously taught. Helmut hasn't and it shows in the work. So that's the one side of it. It's a problem. I think you have to build and teach.

Blum: Can you think of an instance in your own experience where you were teaching and you were building and one was reflecting or refining the other?

Tigerman: It may be hard to pull up a case, except for attitude, philosophy, belief systems, and consonance between one and the other. Sure, I don't think I would have ever written had I not taught. For sure.

Blum: When did you begin to write?

Tigerman: Very early. Before I ever even had a practice. Before I went to graduate school.

Blum: When you were teaching, the first time you taught, from 1964 to 1971, were you teaching undergraduates?

Tigerman: Yeah, there was no graduate program. In fact, I began teaching first-year visual fundamentals and stuff like that. It was great.

Blum: And you have been widely quoted to say that Hejduk and Rudolph were your models in that way and your teaching was patterned after theirs.

Tigerman: Well, it wasn't really patterned, but they had a huge influence. Their rigor both intellectually and then, I want to say their ruthlessness to make sure that the quality was there. Because it was about quality. They were interested in quality. They were interested in students turning out quality work. To get kids to turn out really good work is not obvious, it's not easy. So then take the other side of people who teach but don't build. Do you know who Ed Deam is at UIC? He's an example. He is a partner in OWP&P for reasons that escape me because he doesn't build. He only built one building. Lou Rocah, another one, had a practice, probably built four buildings, maybe five.

Blum: He was trained at IIT.

Tigerman: Right, after Berkeley. If you don't build on a regular basis and you teach—unless you are a writer, unless you write books—you have nothing to talk about. You're not believable. Lloyd Gadau do you know the name, at UIC?

Blum: No. Does he write?

Tigerman: No. Does he build? No. He teaches. And what does he teach? No one knows. I mean, he teaches design. But what does he stand for? No one knows. Because, basically, if you teach and don't build, you're invulnerable, as they say.

Blum: I've heard it said that your teaching is on trial each time you open your mouth.

Tigerman: It may be on trial, but you have nothing to back it up. Nothing built, nothing written, never awards, never published. So, who are you at a really serious

level? No awards for teaching? Do you get where I'm coming from? There's an army of tenured people.

Blum: And you think that architects, to be believable, should teach and build?

Tigerman: Or better to teach and write. If they purport to teach, you have to do something in the public realm. You have to do something. If you write and you're writing inanities, you're criticized. If you build and you build in an inane fashion—if you're Epstein or whatever—you're criticized. But at least Epstein builds, so he's criticized because it's ordinary work. If you don't build, you're beyond criticism.

Blum: You left teaching at UIC in 1971 with a big statement. Why?

Tigerman: What happened, you mean?

Blum: Yes, if you want to talk about what happened, what motivated you to part company with something that you talk about as being very satisfying to you.

Tigerman: Right. When I started at UIC, Len Currie was the dean. He brought on a chairman, whom you may or may not have heard of, named Don Hanson. You can be critical of anyone or anyone can be critical of me, so you can be critical of Len or Don. Don was charismatic, he really was. He got into trouble later in his life, but he was charismatic. I love him, he was just a really great guy. We had a nice relationship even before Don came and I think I got tenured as an associate professor and within four years of my having begun. I was a full professor tenured. So it was a life sinecure.

Blum: Well, you must have been very special to have risen so quickly.

Tigerman: Well, I was a good teacher. I don't know how special I was. For whatever reasons, they chose to give me tenure and then make me a full professor. By

1971 we had moved to the campus, as you know it now. There is a faculty member on campus who still teaches named Tom Jaeger. He's in practice in Park Ridge or somewhere and he does churches. He's an okay architect, not a great architect, not a terrible architect. He had been a follower of a man who taught in the art department at UIC. He had certain belief systems that I didn't agree with. Tom was then the chairman. He became either the acting or the department chairman in, let's say, 1970. In my view, he took the school into the toilet, no question.

Blum: How did he accomplish that?

Tigerman: Oh, it was quite an accomplishment. He was about mediocrity. He didn't hire properly. His values were not the values of the day. He was an ordinary teacher. Now, you can ask any of the Chicago Seven, like Stuart, who is on the faculty.

Blum: Was Tom Beeby there at the time?

Tigerman: That early? Oh, no. I'm not even sure he started at IIT. Beeby was still a very young man in 1971. He was here in 1965 or 1966 from Yale. He came to me for a job and I sent him to Murphy. I don't think he had joined Hammond and Roesch—it was Hammond and Roesch then. Peter Roesch was at IIT. At any case, Jaeger was very ordinary and I couldn't take it, basically. I blew up at a faculty meeting and I told him to take my tenure and position and shove it up their ass. And I walked out. For nine years, I just walked out.

Blum: What was the school like when you came?

Tigerman: It was ordinary. It was not a good school, not a great school.

Blum: And when you left in 1971?

Tigerman: Ordinary. Still ordinary, in my view. For a school to be good, in my view, you have to have good faculty and you have to have a good head. It's that's simple. George Danforth versus Mies, you get the drift?

Blum: So you left in a huff in 1971 and left your tenure behind?

Tigerman: I just walked out. Gave it up, quit. Done.

Blum: But in 1980...?

Tigerman: In 1980, Ed Deam asked me if I would consider to come back as director of what they were going to call the Option One program, which was a post-professional degree. In other words, a second architecture degree, a master's degree, but you had to have a five-year bachelor's of architecture.

Blum: Was it equivalent to a master's program?

Tigerman: Well, there were two master's programs in architecture. This is the basic two-year master's program for people who have a five-year professional degree, a B.Arch. There's another M.Arch program, which is a three-year program that UIC was starting as well, which was a program that gives a degree after an undergraduate four-year degree in another discipline. You've never been in architecture, it's like going to law school, it's been around a long time. This was in 1979 and Beeby was being appointed as director. So Beeby and I began at the same time. But I was asked—I'm not even sure that I knew that Tom was going to be there, or maybe I did and I just don't remember—I told Deam absolutely clearly that because I didn't like the faculty I didn't want anything to do with them. I said I'll do this on the condition that it's completely autonomous, that I have nothing to do with the faculty—they don't show up on juries.

Blum: Were the people who troubled you in 1971 still on the faculty in 1980?

Tigerman: Yeah, for sure. Many of them are still around. Some of them are retired. But I can name them—one was Hinman Keely, an alcoholic, now deceased. One was Jaeger, one was Rocah, one was Gadau. They were teaching both in 1971 and 1980.

Blum: And you didn't see eye-to-eye with any of them?

Tigerman: It's not seeing eye-to-eye with them, it's that they were really ordinary architects. They hadn't done much of anything with their lives and that was being transmitted to the students. The school didn't win any awards, it was not a great place.

Blum: What's the measure of a great school, in your opinion?

Tigerman: Good students.

Blum: How do you measure that?

Tigerman: Oh, did you ever hear of a student after they graduate? Ten years out? Fifteen years out? If you haven't, what the fuck was the point? I mean, if you even know that the students have made something of themselves at least something accrues back to the school. Or they don't. If they don't, what did the school do? How many students do you know from Kansas State, Montana State? I can name a shitload of famous architects for you and if none of them came out of those schools, what do those schools do? Do they provide grist for the drafting studios or for computer technicians? What have they done with themselves? For example, I can even be critical of Hejduk. How many people under John Hejduk—he's taught there almost thirty years—build buildings?

Blum: What do they do?

Tigerman: Teach. At least they're good teachers. But who comes out of San Luis Obispo, Cal Poly?

Blum: Perhaps for some people, that's enough.

Tigerman: Yeah, he was a friend of mine in the Seabees, but who was he? Did he ever write or build? No. So you say to yourself, "Oh, well." Just because he was a friend of mine in the navy doesn't mean that he produced anything, he's just a friend of mine in the navy. So UIC had not produced and continued to not produce really good people. At IIT, I can argue the case that, sure, IIT has produced a lot of good architects. Who's going to argue that? And Harvard, Princeton, Columbia? Of course. USC, SciArc, UCLA, Berkeley? Of course. University of Miami at Florida? But Oklahoma State? How many people? Texas A&M? How many people? You don't know those names and you never will. Nobody ever comes up.

Blum: Did you have any hope that when you went to the University of Illinois—either the first or the second time—that you would produce someone great?

Tigerman: The first time, oh, yeah. Both.

Blum: To bring some attention to the university?

Tigerman: Of course.

Blum: And did you do that?

Tigerman: The first time, no.

Blum: And the second time, when you taught Option One?

Tigerman: Yes, absolutely.

Blum: Will you describe the program?

Tigerman: I did the entire program. It was a design studio. It was a theory course, that I also taught, which was one course more than anybody else at the university. If you teach studio, that's it. So I was teaching studio, running the program, teaching the theory course, and the electives—they had to take courses in philosophy, theology, comp lit—so I governed the entire program. That was the deal. And then Beeby came and now we had, for the first time, a quality director. Who's going to criticize Beeby? Not me. He's a damn good teacher. And he was a very good director. A little political for my taste, doesn't make decisions, study in perpetual foreplay, all that... But as a teacher, pedagogically, a highly visible IQ. Wonderful teacher. Wonderful, wonderful writer. Wonderful builder. Maybe I don't like what he does, but you know what? It's his right to do it and he's a good architect. So Beeby was there and I was there.

Blum: Stuart was there also at that time, wasn't he?

Tigerman: Yes, Stuart was there. Stuart was there since he came back from New York. He worked for Richard Meier and he went to Cornell. No question about it, Stuart and I don't get along. It's chemical, although there is another issue as well, because I think he's intellectually dishonest, which I've said to him. So this is not behind his back.

Blum: What you're saying now, I can't place it in time or space. But you had worked very closely with him for three or four years.

Tigerman: Oh, longer than that. I would say from 1975 when we began the work on "Chicago Architects" to the beginning of the Chicago Architectural Club, which was 1980, and then "Late Entries to the Chicago Tribune Tower

Competition," which is already after 1980. He did something that was... His personality grates on me, it begins there. I can't stand him. It begins there. We always referred to him as "the rodent"—not just me, everybody in the Chicago Seven. He was known as "the rodent." That was his nickname, to his face as well as behind his back. How does Margaret define it? She's so good at this but she's not here now—she calls him a grackle, he has this kind of twitch. He did something in 1980 that was really problematic, with respect to me. He's a quality architect and he's a good teacher, if limited, because it's within the palette that he was trained in by Colin Rowe. It's within that palette, but there're a lot of people that came out of Colin Rowe who also have those limitations. But Stuart's one of the better teachers who came out under Colin Rowe. He's also a very good architect. Retro, but so is Margaret. But then he did something... We had done *Chicago Architects*, we had done the whole Chicago Seven thing, then we started the Architectural Club and did the catalogs: *Late Entries*, which was predominantly mine, and *Chicago Architects*, which was predominately his. Let me get this absolutely correct. When we did *Chicago Architects*, the first book, he was the author of the book and I wrote the introduction. When we did *Late Entries*, I was the author of the book and wrote the main essay and he wrote the introduction—it was just simply reversed. All of it was fine and his scholarship is very good—I have no argument about any of it. But something else will come out of this as well. The "Late Entries" show, among other places that it went, went to the Walker Art Center. There was a lecture that was jointly delivered by Stuart and I. So we prepared all the slides. And the lecture was to break down very neatly into two areas, one of which was the first Tribune Tower competition. Stuart, more the historian than I, for sure, was to have talked about that, and so he was first, because history always comes first, for sure. Since I had pulled together the bulk of the people in the show, I was to have talked about their work, which was after, because many of their projects were based on the first competition. Stuart proceeded to get up and talk about both, leaving me nothing to say. I never forgave him, Betty. I never forgave him.

Blum: I suppose you couldn't interrupt him and say, "Hey, it's my turn."

Tigerman: Oh, no, you don't do that publicly. You don't do that. I called him on it afterwards. I never forgave him. I thought it was an intellectually dishonest, fucking behavioral thing that was, frankly, shocking. Because I was left, basically, speechless. I did the best I could, but there was really nothing to say. I thought that was incredible.

Blum: So you were angry with Stuart.

Tigerman: And remain. And will for life. Never change. I am unforgiving, there's no question about it. That was unforgivable. And he can't deny it, that's why I want it on the record in this fucking treatise, because it's true. Something transpired as a result of that, which actually has some Shakespearean comic relief, but it will tell you a little bit about all of this, and certainly me as well. I have never mixed up or carried over my likes, dislikes, or loathsome feelings about people into the subject of quality. I'll give you an example. Right now, it happened two days ago, I'm setting up and I'd rather the person remain anonymous for now, this happened the other night. I'm at a dinner the other night with a certain person and I'm working with John Zukowsky on this show, on this 2004—last blockbuster show. One was history, one was contemporary, and this will be about the future—wither goest? In other words, "where is Chicago going?" which you'll probably ask at the end of all this, anyway. So it's about the future. John and I made some mistakes in the last show and we got some people, some of whom were very good, like Steve Wierzbowski and Ron Krueck. Some of whom were not so good, who shall remain nameless, to give them a certain area to work in. So John and I are trying very hard not to make those mistakes in this show. This is 1998. The show is 2004, that's six years. We have to make the decisions by 2002. Time creeps up on you because you have to get grants, you have to organize it, it's not instant anything. When we did the other show from the Tribune Tower competition to the present, we got some people in too early.

Blum: Do you mean they were too young?

Tigerman: They were good when we thought about them, but it didn't continue and their work weakened. But they had already been asked. So I had dinner with a person the other night and I said to this person that if their work continued as it is now, I would put them in the show. Now, let's go back to Stuart. So, when I was director at UIC, among the many things that transpired was that Stuart was brought up for full professorship. He may have gotten it by now, I don't know. He was associate professor with tenure. He was up for full professor. And there are regulations that govern these things, as I'm sure you are aware. And it had to go through me and this and that. This was when I was director of UIC in that later period. Those eight years from 1985 to 1993. When I was director, Stuart came up for full professorship. I supported him vigorously. Why? Because I think he's a good teacher, quality person, good architect. This has nothing to do with my liking him. He is all of the above. So, he didn't get it. During that time, he didn't get it. He came to see me one day in my office. And he was furious, of course, because he didn't get it. He accused me of not supporting him. I said, "Stuart, nothing could be farther from the truth"—and I had it all in writing—"and these were the words I used about you. I supported you absolutely because you deserve to be a full professor. If these mediocre people here are full professors, or even associate professors, or are even here at all, certainly you should get full professorship." But then I said to him, and to prove the case that I supported him, I said, "I supported you in spite of the fact that I can't stand you." Now, nobody had ever told him that in his life and he was shocked. I told him why, about this business on the "Late Entries" thing. I said, "I don't like you. I never have. I never will. I have nothing in common with you. And, frankly, I loathe you. However, does that have any impact on you being a good teacher, a good architect, and deserving of full professorship? Absolutely not. So I did support you." He walked out of there stunned, because nobody had ever said that to him before. What you see, Betty, is what you get.

Blum: That's what you said in the first tape we recorded.

Tigerman: I am who I appear to be, for sure. I don't have to like a guy to recognize if, in my view, the guy's a quality guy. And I'll say it. It's like that Bob Bruegmann story, which I mentioned earlier.

Blum: What did you do with the curriculum with the Option One program?

Tigerman: Well, I told you. The theory course, which was like an apprenticeship—the students were mine, straight-out, for a year. There was no other faculty involved. They came to study with me, period. They had no other contact, basically, with other faculty. Now, that's somewhat of an exaggeration. I certainly had Macsai do a little bit with me in that program, which was a mistake because he's another bullshitter who doesn't have a whole hell of a lot to contribute. I brought him in anyway, because he was a friend, anyway—then, not now. What I want to say is that the theory course was creative. The theory course everybody remembers, the young architects who are out there now—Eric Davis, Ed Keegan, who's a writer, as you know, Freddy Wilson, and Melany, who's right here, was a part of that. Melany still hates me because I never gave her an A. I was the only B she ever got in design, but under pressure.

Blum: She's forgiving, too because she works for you.

Tigerman: We love each other.

[Tape 6: Side 1]

Blum: Tom Beeby, who was the director then, said that you were a big attraction to attract students to the University of Illinois that it had never attracted before. What did you do that was so captivating?

Tigerman: No, it was because I was well known. Because in the beginning, how would they know what I would do?

Blum: What if you were well known but a rotten teacher?

Tigerman: But I wasn't a rotten teacher, I was a good teacher. They didn't know what specifically I could do, but they came to know what I was doing. They came to know—it takes a few years and then the word gets out what the program is. What was different about it was the theory course, number one. Let me go about this another way. Do you know the *Journal of Architectural Education*, the *JAE*? As I became director of the Option One program at UIC, I was interviewed and there was a long article in one of the issues early on. They only come out once or twice a year, so it's not going to be hard to find. It was a long interview and it'll tell you the changes I was going to do or had already brought. I don't really remember quite how it was done and the circumstances of my coming there, which was 1980. In those five years running that program, I was interested in giving theory a place in architecture. I was tired, let's say, of the Tom Jaeger unthinking white-shoe, polyester suits kind of guys talking about building alone—obviously that's a huge part of architecture and, I will admit, a huge part of education. But by then I had begun to antagonize about Paul Rudolph, who had turned his back on history and theory at Yale, when he was the head. I felt that there was much to be learned by then, and so I came there to run a highly theoretically charged program.

Blum: And they knew that when you came?

Tigerman: No, you have to remember something: I came there in an absolutely haughty way. This was before Beeby, it wasn't told to Beeby. I think it was told to Michael Gelick or Ed Deam or whoever constituted the people who were trying to get me to do this, to run the Option One program. I said, "This is the way I'm going to do it. If you don't like it, shove it up your ass. I'm not interested in debating the issues. This is what I would do were I to come back." They were so eager to have me back that they said yes, okay?

Blum: They gave you a blank check?

Tigerman: They gave me a blank check. But I told them what I was going to do. This will come up again in the 1985 circumstances of my beginning as director. But, in any case, at that time what I said was—and I may not have said it quite this way—that theory is becoming a major part of architectural education and UIC has none. I said, what we'll do is we'll do a design thing that's theoretically charged. In other words, the designs that they would do would be theoretically charged, A, and B, there would be an actual theory course, which was a brutal course, where two kids would get up on a subject and debate each other. There was a winner and there was a loser, straight-out, voted by the class. The winner got an A and the loser flunked, right?

Blum: The loser got nothing for effort? Is that a good educational approach?

Tigerman: It was great. It was the kind that was given to me. It works very well.

Blum: It sounds unforgiving.

Tigerman: It was very harsh. But nothing was ever harsh at UIC, it was a laissez-faire place, okay? This was harsh, for sure. The kids loved it, the way that I loved Yale.

Blum: The winners loved it.

Tigerman: No, the losers tried harder the next time.

Blum: If they stayed, if they survived.

Tigerman: No, they stayed. Very few flunked out, but it impacted on their grade, dramatically. Not voted on by me, by their peers.

Blum: You set up a conflict and you thought that through conflict you would improve their performance?

Tigerman: Yes, right. It was really interesting. I did the same thing at the Chicago Architectural Club. Hasn't anybody told you? There were a series of presentations. It was the same thing, it was a debate forum.

Blum: Among the members?

Tigerman: Yes, where guys would present their work. I didn't always win. Beeby beat me once, for sure!

Blum: Oh, you remember that!

Tigerman: I remember also winning. I beat Darcy Bonner. It was varied among the membership, it was great. So now number two was this theory course. Number three, I basically gave them a list of fifteen courses at the university from which they could pick an elective, period. I started the journal *Threshold*.

Blum: Why did you begin a journal?

Tigerman: Because I wanted the university to be perceived among schools as theoretically-engaged. So I went to Monacelli and he published it, year after year. That was run by my students.

Blum: Weren't you, in a way, competing with your friends in the East, with their journals and their prestige?

Tigerman: Somewhere between no and maybe. Don't you think that anything can happen here without influence from the past? What I was interested in was UIC having a voice. If I was going to be identified with the goddamned place, it was going to have a voice. That carried on from the time I started in Option One all the way through. And UIC did, over those thirteen years—five years of Option One and eight years as director—develop a real reputation and there's no question about that.

Blum: Is *Threshold* still published?

Tigerman: No. And the *Architectural Club Journal* doesn't exist, either. We had the will to do those things, but it's very hard to inherit those things. Nobody can inherit those things.

Blum: James Marston Fitch wrote an article and it was "Written Building, Painted Word," in which he said that there was too much talk about architecture and not enough substance.

Tigerman: That was his view. At the time that I was wanting to do this, there was too much building. You must be aware by now that there is a real schism between practitioners and teachers of architecture. There's a huge schism, huge. They both mock each other, okay? But at least the theoretical types have a place at the table to argue, whether the practitioners like them or don't like them, for the first time, theoretical types have a place. In some measure, I helped find that place, until it became too much.

Blum: Chicago has always struggled with its anti-intellectual image.

Tigerman: Chicago never struggled with it at all. Chicago is an anti-intellectual place. There was no struggle.

Blum: Did you hope to change that perception?

Tigerman: Yes. So kids come here now from Harvard, Yale, and Princeton. They no longer stay on the East Coast or go to the West Coast. They come here, because now there's something for them. You have the Graham Foundation lectures, you have the stuff at the Art Institute.

Blum: Even the AIA runs...

Tigerman: Exactly. Even the AIA. Ugh! You have a very strong young architects community. You have real critics. Ed Keegan's a good writer. And Blair Kamin at the *Tribune*, at least a good writer at the time of this interview. So those journals, the *Architectural Club Journal* and *Threshold*. Monacelli was very accommodating, because journals were selling from different schools.

Blum: Well, he sure did you a favor by publishing everything that you were connected with.

Tigerman: Here, I'm looking and this issue is about America and here's a drawing by Beeby.

Blum: Isn't that the issue in which Ambrose Richardson wrote a history of SOM? I thought that was the one.

Tigerman: Yes, and what he doesn't point out is that he almost committed suicide at SOM at 37 South Wabash, driven to it by Bruce Graham, by Bill Hartmann. Ask him—well, he's no longer alive, is he? He actually said that.

Blum: It seems that SOM had a very competitive atmosphere. It wasn't just at UIC.

Tigerman: No, I know that. But there were also a lot of wonderful articles... Phil Bess, who went on to become the expert on baseball stadiums... Stuart. Gary Ainge, who used to work for me and now works for Tom Beeby, and Rick Solomon... All these guys... Steve Hurtt, who was then at Notre Dame...

Blum: Stanley, is this competitive attitude between architects at the university also between architects in their practice?

Tigerman: Oh, sure. There still is.

Blum: Within Chicago? Or Chicago against, say, New York or the West Coast?

Tigerman: No, that was made clear through the vehicle of the Chicago Seven versus the Silvers, the Grays, and the Whites.

Blum: So that was evidence of their competitiveness?

Tigerman: Right. But my point in this is I was trying with *Chicago Architectural Journal*, with these two journals...

Blum: 1981 was the first *Chicago Architectural Club* issue. So both journals began about the same time.

Tigerman: About the same time. This first issue, which is 1982, so I guess the *Chicago Architectural Journal* came first, right? By this time, I'm already the director. And various editors, including, I think, Sid Robinson, various people ultimately became editors. So these were done not always but largely by students.

Blum: This was a journal of the graduate school?

Tigerman: Yeah, of Option One. These are all my students. Let me just see who's not... Bob Krone was Option One. Ralph Johnson was out. Randy Fielding was Option One. These were Option One students.

Blum: So it was their journal as much as yours?

Tigerman: Yeah, it was done to be their journal. So you ask, "What did you do?" I gave a lot of notoriety and visibility to the Option One students, is what I did.

Blum: I have heard that you also brought in big-name speakers, people who had never taught at UIC.

Tigerman: Right. Eric Moss, Peter Eisenman, Bob Stern, Bruce Graham. They had never been, right? I only brought in stars, that's all I did. I brought in stars.

Blum: Did students really learn enough from the stars? Was there any substance to what they were teaching, or was it just the fact that this was a Hollywood scene?

Tigerman: You know Betty, you're really being snide. Well, I mean, it's been Hollywood and still is at Harvard, Yale, Princeton, and Columbia.

Blum: What about UIC?

Tigerman: Yes, UIC became that. The Option One kids got exposure and, ultimately, jobs from these people. That's how you develop relationships. That's always worked. So I actually was trying to get the place to be the hot-shit place. What's wrong with that? It sounds like a good idea. It's actually fairly easy to do. Can I tell you, when I became the director in 1985, I said to myself, I'm going to treat this place like a great place. And if I treat it like a great place, it will be a great place. And then it became a great place, so it's not a big, brilliant deep-seated thing. So Option One set it up.

Blum: You brought about change in Option One, which was 1980 to '85. And in 1985, in spite of your connection to UIC, you wanted to be the dean at Yale.

Tigerman: I wanted to be the dean at Yale, that's right. Beeby and I...

Blum: And Tom was also in the running.

Tigerman: There were three of us. Beeby, Gwathmey and I were up for that. Did you know that Gwathmey was a part of that?

Blum: No, I did not.

Tigerman: Well, you want to get the whole story, always. In 1984, before the selection, when Charlie and Tom and I were up for dean...

Blum: Were you finalists or were you invited candidates?

Tigerman: Absolutely, you don't seek these things. You don't seek them—it's not done. We were not finalists, we were the three candidates. There wasn't a longer list, there were three candidates. Just before that, Yale notified three architects—different ones, not the same—that they, Yale, were going to have a special convocation. A first, where they would award what you might call "best of breed"—they were going to honor three alums from each of the arts schools: music, drama, art—painting, sculpture, graphics, and architecture. So the three people—it was people like Ivan Chermayeff in graphics, and in architecture it was Norman Foster, Charlie Gwathmey, and me. There was a huge convocation in 1984—I think it was, because I have the goddamned thing around here somewhere...

Blum: Do you think that was the prelude to your invitation to apply for the position of dean?

Tigerman: No, no. We were already invited and by the time that the convocation existed, the winner for the deanship was picked, which was Beeby, of course. So, sure, I would have loved to be the dean at Yale. By the way, it's come up again now.

Blum: The deanship?

Tigerman: Yeah, and would I be interested? And the answer is absolutely not. Been there, done that. I do Archeworks now, period. It's something that's so unique and different, which is where my head is at and my heart is at. I'm not interested.

Blum: I can tell throughout all these tapes that Archeworks has worked its way into your remarks in various places. Well, may we address that completely by itself later, please?

Tigerman: All right. So, there was this huge convocation and Beeby was already dean. I mean, it wasn't in-house because he began in 1985, but in 1984 or whenever it was, he was there, along with Bart Giamatti, who was then the president of Yale, to present the three of us with awards. It was very collegial. During the course of the interview—I should ask Charlie, I don't know what he said—during the course of the interview, the faculty interviewed us and the students interviewed us and the president interviewed us. During my interview, and I'm absolutely certain he asked the other two the same question—Giamatti was a charming man whom I really liked—he asked me. I've told this story to Beeby, who just laughs at it. He said, "Now, Stanley, if I were to ask you one word by which you can characterize your most inner being. In other words, who are you, really? What would be that word?" And I thought for about a thirty-second of a second, and I said, "Action." I said to Beeby afterwards, I said to Beeby, "I'll bet that when he asked you that same question, that you sat there for a full minute and then you said,

'Contemplation.'" And then he laughed, because I'm sure that that's right. Giamatti didn't want another Paul Rudolph, a hired gun who came in with guns blazing. He wanted things the way they were, and he got things the way they were, because Tom is nothing if not a study in perpetual foreplay. In fact, it's very funny, because Beeby and I are very close friends.

Blum: Well, I hope you're close, because if you're not, you may not be after this.

Tigerman: No, I've said much tougher things on TV about Beeby's library. Who nominated you as the architects' union-shop steward? Please. You have to be straight, mostly, with your friends. If you want to stroke people, then you can't be believed, in my view. I'm not interested in making people happy. I'm interested in telling the truth, as I see it—my truth. I mean, Beeby's fabulous. I mean, Christ, he's the best friend I have in architecture in Chicago. He's terrific, there's no question about that. But you've got to say it straight. When Beeby went to Yale, when he was about to leave, and after I was appointed his successor as director at UIC, he said to me, "Now, the way it works"—and I'm rubbing my hands together, like he does—"is that you should treat these positions as if you're a new member of the college of cardinals, where your obligation for the first five years is to say and do nothing but observe." Of course, I didn't do that. But he did that at Yale, and he had done that at UIC. So I've said to Beeby, the reason I cleaned everybody's clock and kicked a lot of ass at UIC is because he never got rid of people. They'd stay and he knew that they were shit but he just let it go and tried working around the edge, which he did very successfully, because he's very smart—working around the edges of what existed to make it better, which he had done when he was director. Beeby and I remained great friends while he was director at UIC, but I basically had nothing to do with him because I was doing Option One autonomously. And I did it autonomously. He may have sat in on a jury now and then, but no impact. The deal was that I would do it autonomously.

Blum: Now you seem to have some distance about Tom getting the job at Yale and you stepping in to his former position at UIC. How did you feel at the time?

Tigerman: I was very disappointed about the Yale thing. So was Charlie. That was something that each of us wanted to do, probably more than Tom.

Blum: Knowing who you were, knowing what you had already done in your Option One class, what did you think was expected of you as the director when you took over in 1985 at UIC? You were already a known quantity.

Tigerman: I would say so. I would say that as tough as I was, and am now, about the tenured faculty, the old guys, at UIC—there were still old guys when I came in—they voted on it.

Blum: Voted to appoint you?

Tigerman: Yes. Now, they were very courageous, because I told them exactly what I would do. There were three candidates—I think that Mike Gelick was one, I was one, and some guy from the outside. I told them what I would do. I told them I wouldn't tolerate mediocrity any longer. Whatever transpired, it was going to be theoretical, I wasn't going to pander to anybody, and they needed to know it. And then they voted—probably a split vote, I don't even know what the vote was—they voted to bring me on as director. I thought that was very courageous, because they knew goddamned well that I was a loose cannon, a hip-shooter, whatever words you want to use to describe somebody like me. I then did what I said I would do.

Blum: You did it for eight years.

Tigerman: Eight years. That's a long time, in those kinds of positions.

Blum: Was there much difference between the job of a director of a program or a director of a school?

Tigerman: Oh, yeah, it took much more time, even though it took a lot of time being the director of Option One, when I taught full-time, I taught the extra theory course, and I ran the program, I picked the students, and I ran it, and I brought in the stars, and published *Threshold*. I treated it very seriously. So, when the director thing was only more, because I also decided to teach full-time when I was director, which nobody does. I thought it was important to be a paradigm, to be a model. Rather than just tell people what to do, you have to show them by example. The point is that I believed that you have to show by example. You can't just run a place, as so many do, and not teach. You have to run it, that's not a big deal.

Blum: So what was so controversial about what you did that they asked you to leave in 1993, after eight years?

Tigerman: Yeah, well, I was ruthless. Let me give you an expression of what ruthless is—but I told them, I warned them that I would be, and I was, so no surprise. I think maybe they thought that I wouldn't be. They hoped, or that maybe it wouldn't impact them, rub off on them. But it was. I'll give you one example of what I consider ruthless behavior to keep the place on a track. My desk here, you see, is cluttered. My desk at UIC was absolutely clean. There was nothing on the desk but a sheet of paper—I had a round table—typewritten, facing toward the person who was sitting there, not me. The paper was a list of the faculty, which I thought was cute.

Blum: A little intimidating, but...

Tigerman: Well, let me tell you what was on it. It had all of their names, their age, when they were hired, their rank—professor, instructor, whatever—when they got

tenured, and the date when they would become sixty-five. And there was a yellow marker through those that were no longer there. It was great.

Blum: That's not a funny joke.

Tigerman: That's because you're humorless. It was great. I thought it was just fucking wonderful. It became something of a joke. I mean, everybody knew. What transpired was I got rid of them, but they're mostly back now, because, you know, ultimately, times change.

Blum: Do you mean that you got rid of them and they returned to teach after you left?

Tigerman: Yeah. But I got rid of them.

Blum: What does that say? That you were the problem?

Tigerman: No, I mean, come on, Betty. For Christ's sake, try and think once qualitatively. I wasn't the problem. They left because they were the problem. They were weak teachers, they were shitty. When I left, Schroeder was not exactly Mr. Strength, right? He succumbed to the faculty who brought their various partners back, like Jaeger brought Bob Nicola back. Bob Nicola's a terrible teacher—he'd been a student of mine in Option One. He brought Nicola back and he did nothing. Schroeder brought him back. Why would Schroeder bring him back? Schroeder's weak; Schroeder's an accommodator. Schroeder's never done anything that represents signs of great strength. He's weak. He brought these guys back. He didn't do it. The faculty wanted them back, their various partners and associates. People that I know very well, like Jack Naughton, who was a terrible teacher. Listen, I made a lot of judgments. Margaret's not so thrilled with it. I brought her, Greg Landahl, and Eva Maddox on separately to teach interiors. Do you know who was the best interiors teacher? Eva. Was Margaret great? No. She talked down to students.

Greg just pranced around. So I was interested in the best people. I don't give a shit about friendships or even marriage. I simply wanted the best people. Now, if that's a flaw, I accept it.

Blum: You were ruthless.

Tigerman: I was ruthless. I accept that. And the product of the ruthlessness is that, of course, if you live by the sword, you die by the sword. What difference does it make? My point is it became a school of reputation. It didn't have a reputation before. If you want to be nice and not have a reputation, be my goddamned guest. If you want a good school, that's how you do it. I don't know another way. There may be other ways, but I don't think so. Mies, do you think that Mies was a great guy? Was there ever another architect who taught at IIT at all, ever, under Mies who wasn't trained by Mies? No. That was his system. Mine was to bring in—I knew I had a limited amount of time—to bring in the very best. That's number one. Number two is that I brought in an army of people who now represent, in the United States, the leading edge of theory. That's known. Catherine Ingraham, Mark Rackatansky, Doug Garofalo, Bob Somol, Eva Maddox, Gregg Linn, there were ten of them. I had a show near the end called "Ten Untenured Faculty." It was a great show at Gallery 400. So the school developed a reputation and I continued to bring in Eisenman, Gehry, all the stars of the day. Are they there now? No, not as much, although I'll say straightaway I think that the current director, Katarina Ruedi is fabulous. She's terrific. Not only don't I have a problem with her, I think she's really good. So I was determined to make the place have a reputation, particularly in the theoretical bent. So that was important to me. I accomplished that.

Blum: Why did you leave under a cloud?

Tigerman: Why do you have so many negative preconceptions about me? No cloud. It was very simple how I left. One day—I give the faculty full marks, I have no

problem with what happened, particularly because if it didn't happen, I would never have done Archeworks, which is, for me, far more important. It would have never happened. Eva and I had begun talking about Archeworks. The whole damn thing was wrapped up in 1992, in the fall. This show, the "Ten Untenured Faculty"—a great show, a really great show, and vestigially, a piece of which is going to show up in the 2004 show at The Art Institute in terms of the design of the show, the layout, which I've talked to John and Martha about. That fall, her office—Eva's and mine... I mean, I've known Eva longer than Margaret. I've known her for twenty-six years, for Christ's sake. I've followed her career, sometimes mentored, whatever. So, she's there teaching and her office and ours were engaged, as we were once before, as joint venture colleagues or partners on a project in Muskegon, Michigan, the largest part of which never transpired. Mostly because the architects that brought us on from up there were sort of slimy. Anyway, it didn't transpire. Whatever. When we were up there one time, one of the people, the city fathers—actually, a fairly young guy named Scott Devon—liked what we were talking about and said, "You know, you ought to start a kind of Bauhaus." He meant up there, because this was in 1992 and because of the recession of '89 and '90 the furniture industries in Muskegon, Grand Rapids, Zeeland were in a huge depression, which impacted far beyond the furniture industry. Eva and I knew when we drove back to Chicago that we'd heard something important. So putting Archeworks aside, I'll now go back to UIC.

Blum: If it was 1992, then you were still at UIC.

Tigerman: Yes, I wasn't done until 1993 graduation. But in '92, we were starting to talk about Archeworks. And so I started shifting the studio that I was teaching slightly toward social cause. At that time, Dick Whitaker, the dean, was retiring and there was a search for a new dean. I forget who the other candidates were, but ultimately Bebe Baird became the dean. Now Judith Kirshner has become the dean because Bebe Baird was not reappointed. So,

when she came in—I liked her, make no mistake—I told her that I was not exactly what I would call the tenured faculty's biggest fan club, which, of course, she found out in any case. They went to her and complained bitterly about my ruthless behavior. Was it ruthless? Absolutely. Were they right? Yes. They found a new person, the chink in the dam, and they exploited it. They get full marks for doing it.

Blum: Are you're talking about Bebe Baird?

Tigerman: The faculty. The faculty found that there was a new person in charge and that my complaining to them, they could have a shot at getting rid of me. I would have done the same, no question. Truly, to this day, I have no problem with it. I had no problem with it then. So she set up a meeting with me in the winter of 1992. She said, "You really don't have the support of the tenured faculty. The junior faculty all love you, one hundred percent"—which outnumbered the tenured faculty—"but the tenured faculty is the tenured faculty and they really want to you go. So I'm going to ask you to resign." I thought a minute and I said, "Bebe, I can't do that. You're going to have to fire me because I brought in these younger people and if I resigned under fire, among the fallout of such an act would be my turning my back on them. Whereas, if you fired me, it's something I have no control of, which I don't mind. If you want to do that, fine." So she did. At that point, a number of the junior faculty—actually, a majority of the junior faculty—got together and attempted to overturn that by putting together a list of the most famous architects on the planet—historians and theoreticians—Ken Frampton, Wolf Prix of Coop Himmelblau, whoever. Frank Gehry came and lectured, Peter Eisenman came and lectured. Basically trashing the faculty for even thinking of doing such a thing.

Blum: You mean they were supporting you?

Tigerman: Supporting me. Bebe Baird attended all that. She met with a lot of people—Tom Beeby supported me. She met with Eva Maddox. She met with everybody. But she stuck to her guns, for which she had every right. So now, I'm fired. I'm no longer the director. So what do I do? I think, like most of these nerds, you can stay. When you're no longer the director, you can stay. I'm a full professor. And they all do, no matter what people think of them, they all stay. And I was being paid quite a lot of money. I thought, that's not so thrilling, because who wants to be a full professor with people you can't stand and who can't stand you, right? So I resigned my tenured position for a second time, but this time doing it as part of a contract for retirement with pension at arm's length through a labor lawyer with the university, because I was not interested in doing it any other way. So I now have this terrific pension, a serious pension. So, I thought, this is the time we do Archeworks. So and I sat down, brought Beverly Russell as the communications director. Bob Somol is still teaching there. Doug Garofalo is still teaching there and Doug Garofalo still teaches at Archeworks. And they've had a hard time, first, with Schroeder and then with Bebe Baird because they still teach at Archeworks. These people didn't like the fact that I started another school.

Blum: Well, you weren't in competition with them.

Tigerman: Not exactly. But you get my drift. They didn't want out of the ashes of my being fired as director that I would turn right around and...

Blum: Rise as a phoenix?

Tigerman: Exactly. Now, I have talked more on this tape in the last five minutes about UIC than I've thought about it since I left, which also pisses them off. They mean nothing in my life. They meant nothing when I was there—I'm talking about the tenured faculty—and they mean nothing now. They are nothing, so I treated them as nothing. But now that I'm at Archeworks, I have nothing to do with them. So I don't even think of them. I'm telling you more about my

relationship. So, was I ruthless? Yeah. Did I get fired for it? Yeah. The answer, "So fucking what?"

Blum: Were they justified?

Tigerman: In their feelings, they were justified.

Blum: Do you have any regrets?

Tigerman: Absolutely none, because I made it into a terrific school. Absolutely none. That was the whole point. If I wanted to make friends, I could have run for governor, okay? You understand where I'm coming from? I'm saying that metaphorically. If you think about UIC, it became a really well reputed school. The applications increased—no longer because of Stanley Tigerman but because of the program and because of the shitpot full of young, really hotshit people, all of whom are gone, except for Doug, who got tenure. Every single one is gone. I mean, it's wild. Lily Zand, who was fabulous, teaches at UCLA or SciArc right now, or wherever the hell she is on the West Coast. They were really good. I'm telling you this now that when I was there, it was a hot place. Everybody knew it.

Blum: So, out of the ashes arose Archeworks. How did that take shape between you and Eva?

Tigerman: The ability to do it was based on a decision of mine. I didn't have to resign my position. But, you know, why do you want to be with people who can't stand you?

Blum: But why did Archeworks take the form and shape that it did?

Tigerman: Eva and I—it goes back to that thing in Muskegon, Michigan, when I was still employed at UIC. We knew that—putting UIC aside—we knew that that just

gave me the chance to do it because I was fired. I wouldn't have done it if I hadn't been fired. Well, of course I deserved the income, make no mistake...

Blum: So you had a good cushion with the pension?

Tigerman: Yes, but I had a cushion for the first time in my life, okay? It wasn't much, but it was substantial. It still is, it's for life. It's good. I like it. What it did was gall the shit out of them to think that it's money out of their pocket that started Archeworks.

Blum: Do you figure that they're financing Archeworks, in a way?

Tigerman: Of course they are, because it's out of the budget. I love it, I love it. Betty, one of the things that you've never liked about me—and it should be on this tape—is that there are certain prerogatives of the aging process that I think you don't agree with. Singly among them is the ability to hold grudges, which I believe in. You don't.

Blum: Perhaps that's not a product of age.

Tigerman: Yes, it is. I've been training for it for years.

Blum: I believe that.

Tigerman: But, in any case, I love the fact that they're paying for Archeworks. That's another level of quality and they no longer represent that level, at some real level. So, that's amazing.

Blum: Was there something that you were doing or that the UIC program was doing that was based in social concern, that you were inspired by and did better than they did?

Tigerman: No, I took nothing from them. But they'd always had—not in the school of architecture—but in the school of planning that's called something that I forget now. It was not at all in my mind when we started Archeworks, because it was not connected to the school of architecture. There were people—Roberta Feldman singly among them, whose whole career has been wrapped up in the behavioral aspects of architecture. She now is coalescing with the school of architecture now, after Archeworks, with this unit that the school of planning always had—it's called the Voorhees Center. But we had no connection with it before my time. It was in no one's head.

Blum: So Archeworks was independent of anything that you were doing?

Tigerman: Absolutely. There was no influence that connected it with the university, no. But there's been so much in my own life, before that, about social cause. Christ Almighty, from Bangladesh to Woodlawn Gardens to forensic clinics to libraries for the blind, Boy Scout camps for the handicapped. I mean, please. So, what happened was that when I decided that I was going to resign my position, that summer, after the graduation of 1993, we got together with Somol and Garofalo and we put out, that fall, a poster announcing the new school. We got ourselves a major benefactor. Judy Neisser hosted a cocktail party at the Arts Club.

[Tape 6: Side 2]

Tigerman: She hosted a cocktail party at the Arts Club, where I made a slide presentation about what we had in mind. We put together a board of directors and a lawyer. We became a 501c(3)—we applied for and got that. We talked to a developer who came forth—we didn't ask for that at all—but a developer stepped up, Shelly Baskin and a guy named Jerry Fiat, who gave us a basement space at 18th and Indiana. It is kitty-corner from Glessner House that would be given to us for free—they said at the time that it was for life. They'd built out the space for free. Chicagoans stepped up like crazy in

terms of generosity. Helmut Jahn not only wrote us—and still does, significant checks—but he gave us a shitpot full of drafting room furniture, conference room furniture, because he had moved his office before then and he had all this old stuff. So he was very generous. Skidmore was very generous, and so was Ron Krueck. They all gave us stuff. People started giving us money. We found a grants writer and we started applying for grants. And the Graham Foundation—the first one—gave us \$25,000, that, for a new organization, was very large. It was based on Eva's and my reputation that we would do this. We put together a catalog that we sent it to all the design and architecture schools and the next academic year—from September of 1993 to January of 1994—I taught my last studio ever. I will never teach again at a conventional institution. It was at Yale where I did the dry run for Archeworks, basically. Eva came out and Somol came out and Garofalo came out. And it resulted in a thing that yet exists at Yale called the Urban Design Workshop, run by one of my Yale students, Mike Haverland, from Denver.

Blum: How did the technique differ in that kind of studio—you said it was a trial run for Archeworks—from a standard studio?

Tigerman: Well, number one, two of the kids—they broke up into a series of projects—two of the kids actually built something called the Connecticut AIDS Rehabilitation Program—it's called CARP. While I was there that fall two of the kids and I visited the director of that program, which produced halfway houses for people who were HIV-positive. This was before the drug cocktail and you could get out of that problem—where you either get full-blown AIDS and die or you are rehabilitated medically and chemically and you are back in society. Those kids designed and built out for real in one of their houses a fabulous project for an AIDS victim—and HIV victim—to make life easier. And I had already been doing studios like that at UIC, but they actually built it. More than projects, however, something happened that was different. You are looking for unique situations. At the end of the fall, this kid, Mike Haverland, and a girl named Anne-something and another one

who's in Chicago and is a practicing architect organized an event that has changed everything at Yale. At the end of the semester, in December or whenever it was—we had the jury and Eva and Bob and Doug came. That was on a Friday and on Saturday morning these kids and the school organized a workshop in the morning to bring together students from the rest of Yale who had been independently involved in social causes but nobody had ever talked to anyone. The nice thing about the architecture school at Yale is that there is an alumni house and bar for graduate students and on the second floor is a very big room. There's something at Yale called Dwight Hall, which is for the undergrads who are involved in such things. But there's the medical school and the forestry school and architecture school, et cetera. And so they had a workshop where there was one person from each of the schools at the table and it was moderated by Eva, Doug, Bob, and me. And they talked to each other for the first time and started coordinating programs. Number two, in the afternoon there was a huge event in the architecture school atrium with Rick Levin, the president; Linda Lorimer, the provost; De Stefano, the mayor of New Haven, (who had gone to Yale); and a bunch of aldermen and town-and-gown folks. Yale, until that time, had not been so forthcoming to the social problems in New Haven, which are huge. They started talking to each other. That came about and those are unique circumstances, not the product of those kids, but those are unique circumstances. From my view it was a terrific thing—I have slides of all that. It was a wonderful thing. So the program still exists at Yale.

Blum: So is this the kind of interaction that you tested at Yale and then used at Archeworks?

Tigerman: Yeah. Absolutely.

Blum: Can you describe the kind of student—architecture or design students—who applies to Archeworks?

Tigerman: That's jumping ahead. I'm just trying to be chronological. So we had that transpired. And, of course, I was continuing with my practice, right? And then the calendar year ended—1993—and '94 began and in the spring... It takes time to organize these things and we put together the furniture and we built it out and we got the catalogs and we selected our first class. We put together our first class, which was eight kids.

Blum: Where did these eight students come from?

Tigerman: I'm about to tell you. I want to get it accurate. So the eight kids came from—this is the graduating class of 1995.

Blum: Is it a one-year program?

Tigerman: One year. The student body that first year was an interior designer, an industrial designer, a graphic designer, and architect from the West Indies, another architect still at UIC, a political scientist who was thinking about architecture, another interior designer, and a young woman from RISD who was an architecture student. So there were two still in school. And so we began, right?

Blum: How did you attract these people?

Tigerman: Through the catalog, through word-of-mouth. Through whatever. We brought that first year a lecture series that was very unique. All of our lecturers are not the usual suspects. They're not. So we had Mary Dempsey from the Chicago Public Library; Bliss Browne from Imagine Chicago—she was then on our board for a time; Terry Dougal, a terrific design consultant; the industrial designer Ben Feather, from England; Ed Friedrichs, one of the senior partners from Gensler; Peter Freund, a physicist from the University of Chicago; Tom Hatch, a major educator from Harvard; Lucia Howard, an architect and planner; Barbara Knecht from New York, who's a social

advocate for the homeless; another industrial designer; another interior designer; and an architect. So it was a big lecture series. We put that together and we started. It was one year.

Blum: So after students have graduated—or they've spent the one year—what do they get?

Tigerman: They get a diploma.

Blum: And can they go back to their own program if they're still in school or are they ready to go out and get a job?

Tigerman: They go back to their work. Or occasionally things happen, like the second year, there was a woman who chose to stay a year and a half, named Carol Anselmini. She had been a store planner for Crate and Barrel in Houston and she'd heard about Archeworks and she persuaded Gordon Segal, the head of Crate and Barrel, to transfer her up here so she could go to Archeworks. She stayed the extra semester, so it was a year and a half. It's a one-year post-professional program, rooted in social cause and the problems of the day, period. It's trying to put together design for those most in need of it. It's a little bit like the Bauhaus.

Blum: The Bauhaus certainly could be considered a forerunner.

Tigerman: And it's an alternative in terms of education. Really, there's no tenure—because we were talking about the problems of tenure—there's no pre-requisites, no accreditation.

Blum: Would you like accreditation?

Tigerman: Nope. Absolutely not. There's nothing to accredit. It's about breaking down barriers. Who would accredit us? The ACSA? No, the answer is that it's not about accreditation. It's an alternative educational model.

Blum: Would you ever hope to have Archeworks work in conjunction with another university as a one-year program?

Tigerman: Nope. Absolutely not. Definitely no. Now, there have been attempts. When Gene Summers was at IIT, the president of IIT, Lew Collens, and I and Gene had a series of lunches. They were interested in Archeworks being part of IIT as a one-year program. We didn't have any interest. Tom Beeby, because of his friendship with John Duff, who was the chief librarian when Beeby did the public library and is now the head of Columbia College, and one of my ex-students, Jocelyn Oats, an African-American woman who runs their interior architecture program—they were interested, for sure, to ally themselves with us. Nope. Now, Roosevelt College has shown some interest. The School of the Art Institute has shown some interest. We may do a program and we may do something with them. But where we're really interested is the University of Chicago, where nothing exists. That we would do.

Blum: That seems like a very new and different concept for the University of Chicago to take on.

Tigerman: That's right, because that's not a part of what they do. But they do have something in the business school at the University of Chicago where if you have a business and you want to work with graduate students to do a business plan or strategic plan, they do that and you pay them quite a lot of money. They do have a hands-on program, like Harvard. Everything changes. Hutchins is dead. Times are different. [As of 2002-2003 Archeworks is collaborating with the New Venture Lab with the University of Chicago.]

Blum: For the products that are developed at Archeworks, if they go into production, who owns the copyright, the patent?

Tigerman: We do a quid pro quo with the manufacturer. They give us royalties and we give them the product and the rights to do it. It becomes theirs. The royalties are to fund scholarships for people in need of such things. For instance, we did a head-pointer for people with cerebral palsy and the kids that did it that year—one of whom is in my office—sold it to Preston-Sammons, a big manufacturer of products for the disabled. We get royalties that are held separately in an escrow account, not to be used for operating costs. So if a family can't afford it... we don't gain anything with it, we can't because we're a 501(c)(3). We could set up a sub-corporation.

Blum: Can you explain what a 501(c)(3) is?

Tigerman: A public charitable trust, according to the IRS.

Blum: Are you tax-deductible?

Tigerman: Yes, otherwise we couldn't receive contributions. Nobody can give us money unless we're tax-deductible. So, we're thought of as a school. We charge tuition, we pay our faculty. Eva and I are pro-bono and we have two full-time staff: the administrator, Andreason Brown, and his assistant. We have operating costs like ComEd and everybody else but we don't pay taxes. And we are negotiating now with the judiciary about real estate taxes and we don't pay sales tax. But we have to file with the IRS every year, of course, like any 501(c)(3). [As of 2002, real estate taxes have been successfully negotiated.]

Blum: How do you and Eva divide your responsibilities? You have a practice to manage, she has a practice to manage.

Tigerman: I'm the director and she's the projects and programs director.

Blum: So she hires faculty?

Tigerman: Well, no that's not faculty. Programs are the programs at Archeworks, which are the projects. She's in charge of bringing in the projects, organizing it with the students, how it's done and so forth. In reality, we both do everything. But that is her role. My role is director, which is the rest.

Blum: Who raises money?

Tigerman: We do. We have a fund-raising or development consultant, and there's the board of trustees, which is actually a pretty big board at fourteen people, and it's growing. So, yes, there's all that that goes on, no doubt.

Blum: Do you ever envision a time when the tuition will pay for the operation?

Tigerman: Never. It's not possible. No tuition at any school ever does.

Blum: So you'll always need benefactors.

Tigerman: We'll always need benefactors. We have, as I think you know, benefactors who give us money. We do a big black-tie benefit every other year where drawings by stars are auctioned off by me. We usually make \$100,000 at that, which turns into \$50,000 a year. It's a very small budget. Our budget is under \$300,000 at year, because we're paid basically nothing. We now have the building, right?

Blum: You have a new facility. What is capacity for enrollment?

Tigerman: Just as it was before—24. Up until now, we've never had more than... There's been about forty students over the four years. There was eight the first year, eleven the second year, nine the third year, and eleven the fourth year.

Blum: So you're running at about half capacity?

Tigerman: About half, yeah. This fall it's going to be about eighteen. A big jump. And the quality of the students is really good—much better than up until now. But it's about breaking down barriers—it's about interior designers and architects and industrial designers and graphic designers and others—creative writers, engineers, art historians... We have one student from the Art Institute this fall, a young woman named Maren Nelson who was working for Ian Wardropper. They work together on a team, so there's never a team of all architects. We do it by lottery. All this is about breaking down barriers, it's a different kind of educational system. What do the kids get out of it? What they get out of it is fulfilling their interest in social causes. This is a unique time. It's like the late-1960s. Things are collapsing in our society. Rome is burning, in a simplistic way. So they get to network and get exposed to people, get jobs, do things that they never would have been exposed to... I started to tell you that one of the women—the one from Crate and Barrel in Houston—well, she came up here, went to Archeworks, stayed a year and a half, went back to Crate and Barrel for two minutes—as I went back to Skidmore for two minutes after I went to Yale. Archeworks has skewed the trajectory of her career where she now is in the engineering department at the Rehabilitation Institute at Northwestern Hospital. She was on the head-pointer team. Our idea is to change people's lives. So her career trajectory was changed by being at Archeworks.

Blum: And is this your hope for all students?

Tigerman: Yes, it says in the catalog that our desire is... The people who come to Archeworks are conduits to the worlds. We want them to change. They can go back into the same career, but they have a new perception.

Blum: It sounds curious to me to take a long view to see that you're running a school today that's a hands-on kind of experience for students, for you. And at UIC...

Tigerman: At UIC I was always more interested in theory, you mean?

Blum: Yes, at UIC you were interested in bringing an intellectual focus and not the hands-on experience. And Archeworks offers only a hands-on experience.

Tigerman: No, who said it was *only* a hands-on experience? Those are your words.

Blum: Well, is there theory too?

Tigerman: Yes, absolutely. We're trying to evolve a new theoretical position out of social cause. Absolutely. This is not just hands-on.

Blum: By writing and reading or doing?

Tigerman: By writing. We're doing it in a way that never was done before. Do you understand what I mean by that?

Blum: Yes, I do.

Tigerman: The theory, we're doing a book that was funded by the Graham Foundation, which is the first in a series of books on Archeworks, which is on the essential values of morality and ethics that comes out of social cause. Yes, in other words, I'm trying to evolve not out of literary criticism that then turned into deconstruction, but out of social cause.

Blum: So you're trying to bring those things together?

Tigerman: I'm trying to do both, right. Because, frankly, this counter-productive attitude where theoreticians and academics dump on practitioners in architecture and practitioners dump on academics doesn't go anywhere. It's counter-productive. Now, it's interesting because before we began, when I was talking to Lew Collens at IIT, one of the people I talked to was Patrick Whitney, who is head of the Institute of Design. Patrick said—he's a very smart Brit, but obviously antagonistic to architecture—he said, "Why are you trying to save architecture?" I thought that was an interesting statement. In other words, "Why don't you let the academics and the practitioners just beat up on each other and the whole thing goes down. So architecture is changing, it is. Social cause on the one hand, technique on the other hand—the computer and so forth—it's changing dramatically, dramatically. There have been conferences—Eva and I did two at the Graham Foundation last year. They're in their catalog that describes their grants. They were on alternative education and alternative practice, alternative publications, alternative exhibitions. We did a two-weekend affair. Because the way that things are isn't particularly working, so Archeworks is no paradigm for anything but it's one example of an alternative that could be done. It doesn't mean that it's right. Since alternative this, that, and the other are on people's minds. For example, not so many years ago, if you were an architect in industry, designers looked down on you. If you were an architect in government, designers looked down on you. You must know that and if you don't, let me be the first to tell you. Now, architects in industry are not looked down upon. Architects in government are not looked down upon. Times have changed. All of those itty-bitty things aggregate to a position where you say, "Boy, there's a different thing going on out there." So, I'm not willing to let architecture go down, as opposed to Patrick Whitney's question-slash-suggestion. I'm not interested in that. I'm not so interested in abusing and ripping apart. I'm interested in putting things back together, thus the name of my new book about the Kabbalah, *Failed Attempts at Healing an Irreparable Wound*.

Blum: Is that a product of maturing?

Tigerman: No. Well, in part, sure. But I haven't mellowed out so much that I'm conciliatory toward people that don't add much to the mix. I remain the same. I have no feelings of conciliation about that—that will never change. People do something in society or they don't. I'm much more sympathetic toward those people that do, that actually do something for people. So Eva and I, separately... She, too, has had a huge amount of social cause work in her practice. And I've had, as you know.

Blum: You've had a history of social cause work going back quite a way.

Tigerman: She has, too.

Blum: Has Archeworks brought your interest in social cause, your architecture, and your teaching together?

Tigerman: That's exciting for me. Shit, I'm going to be sixty-eight next month and it's great to be moving into my dotage, as it were, and actually starting something new. Eisenman said something—Peter and I no longer speak, we've had a falling out but that, too, will pass. But he said not so long ago when we were still speaking, he said, "You shouldn't be doing this at your age because you're not energetic enough," meaning to start something new. Well, he's wrong. Actually, it's interesting, Peter and I say this partially in jest and partially because it's true. Peter is a master intellect, formalist, theoretician of our age, in my view. He's the man. When he found out about Archeworks, he said something very pejorative, which I can't put on tape. He said it was the dumbest idea in the world and then he said this other thing. Therefore I knew that we were on the right track.

Blum: Why? Because he didn't like it?

Tigerman: If he didn't like it, it's the right thing because he's so antagonistic toward people and so positive toward ideas. He's separated from people, it's very interesting. The school is great. To me it's the most important thing I've ever done, by far, because it's about giving back. So it goes back to my mother, who wanted to be rich.

Blum: I don't see the connection.

Tigerman: Let me tell you the connection. Eva and I get paid about \$2.85 an hour at Archeworks. So it's like being so rich that I can afford not to get paid very much at Archeworks. I love that.

Blum: Do you thank the University of Illinois for that?

Tigerman: Oh, yes, of course I do. I'm forever in their debt. More importantly than the pension is that without being fired as director, I would never have had the opportunity to do this, I wouldn't. Think about it. How? How can you run a school of architecture at the University of Illinois and run a practice and do Archeworks? I don't think so. Not even I can do that. So, it wouldn't have happened, I swear to God—not in my view.

Blum: Well, may we please step back to 1980?

Tigerman: You're so determined about this goddamned Chicago Seven and I don't have a lot of interest in it.

Blum: I know you don't now, but you did at one time. Won't you share your memories with us?

Tigerman: Only if it's seen in the context of pretending to be interested, okay? What do you want to know?

Blum: In 1980, in May, you and Stuart cooked up an activity...

Tigerman: The Chicago Architectural Club?

Blum: No, the Chicago Architectural Club had been already formed. The "Late Entries to the Chicago Tribune Tower Competition." All the Chicago Seven were involved in it in one way or another. This exhibition appeared at the MCA and Rhona Hoffman was involved. How did this idea develop?

Tigerman: It came out of those dinners at Salvatore's, if my memory serves. I've known Rhona all my life and so she could help organize the art side of curating. Stuart, who is an admitted—admitted by me—intellectual and historian could help. We already had a background on Chicago architecture and architects. Again, this is irrespective of liking each other or not. But we were there and we knew we could do this. And it was a fun thing to do. It was a re-look, it was ironic. The first Tribune Tower competition, whether you know this or not, is really interesting because all the European architects did modern presentations—this was 1923—and all the Americans, 100 percent, did neo-classical or neo-Gothic, one or the other. So we talked about that, I'd guess.

Blum: Do you mean you talked about it in planning sessions or in your essays for the book?

Tigerman: Well, I'm just talking about it now, whether I said it in my essay or not. So the "Late Entries" 1980 was the postmodernist time and it seemed ironic and funny and interesting to say, "Let's do another one." Also we noticed that the first book on the Chicago Tribune Tower competition, which is a classic, was not only out of print, but it had run out in terms of time on copyright. So we could republish it, reproduce it. So we did it in two volumes, a set. The first volume was the first competition and the second volume was "Late Entries." I was at the American Academy in Rome in 1980 and I talked to absolutely

everybody that was there—Bill Turnbull, Andrea Brown, Thomas Gordon Smith—into doing an entry, so there were a lot of very interesting people. It just seemed like an interesting thing to re-look to see if there was something we could learn. The Chicago Seven was not involved. We may have asked people from the Chicago Seven to do it, and they did, and there were others, but this was Stuart and Rhona and I.

Blum: Well, the story that I've read is that Ben and Rhona had the idea and Stuart and you came in very quickly to organize.

Tigerman: That's biggest bunch of bullshit in the world. It was Stuart and me, straight-out. Ask Stuart.

Blum: Well, you were the organizers.

Tigerman: It was our idea. I don't know where Ben ever had... I mean, if Stuart says that it was Ben and Rhona, then I'll accept it. But if Stuart says that it isn't, they they're full of shit, as my memory serves.

Blum: The entries were invited. Were recent American and European publications used to develop your guest list?

Tigerman: I don't know. I'm not sure about that. We just came up with names. I don't know how we evolved it. We knew who everyone was. There were very few who volunteered to do it, although there were some—three or four or five.

Blum: If the invitational list was put together by you and Stuart and whoever else might have been involved, how were people selected? Why were some people excluded deliberately? There were architects who were big enough to have been included, but were not.

Tigerman: Who was excluded?

Blum: Well, I.M. Pei was not included.

Tigerman: Yeah, well, he's not a conceptual person and he was over the hill even then. He's never represented himself as conceptual.

Blum: What about Bud Goldberg?

Tigerman: He was never thought of as conceptual. The older generation, if there were exclusions, you've got to understand two things. Number one: the older generation never did jackshit for the younger generation—Netsch, Goldberg, Weese...

Blum: Netsch was in your show.

Tigerman: Then he was one. I have the book in the other room. I don't know. If we did suppress some... We may have, I honestly don't remember. Now, that sounds a lot like Bill Clinton, but I genuinely don't remember.

Blum: Well, let me just take it one step further. The conclusion of what you, Stuart and the others wrote was that postmodernism was the reigning vocabulary of the day.

Tigerman: At that time.

Blum: Correct, based on the submissions. But the submissions were skewed to produce this conclusion, were they not?

Tigerman: Well, they were the architects of note of the time. Goldberg was not an architect of note.

Blum: Well, Eisenman was not included, Venturi was not included...

Tigerman: They may have turned it down. I can't say that they were not included initially.

Blum: Philip Johnson was not included.

Tigerman: I don't think we included the older generation except maybe Netsch.

Blum: Well, Bruce Graham was not.

Tigerman: Well, he's another one who doesn't have a conceptual bone in his body. Why would we include him? Conceptual. You may disagree, but you're not an architect, at the end of the day.

Blum: But he was an architect of note.

Tigerman: But this was not about prominence. The only big architects, Charles Moore was one, most of these were little guys, like Todd Williams, George Ranalli, Stuart, and my friend in the Netherlands, Hans Tupker. These were not major names. These were architects as artists, which we were interested in, not postmodern architects who had done things. The guy who did Jay Chiat's ad agency in New York, whatever the hell his name was. These were conceptual architects, absolutely, both here and abroad. Ando did one. Ando was not a postmodernist.

Blum: So how did anyone come to that conclusion?

Tigerman: We made up a list of what we thought were conceptual architects.

Blum: Was being conceptual one of the guidelines of being invited?

Tigerman: You know, Tom Beeby did a beautiful entry, the American flag thing. Christ, he was the kind of person that we thought would be really responsive. I don't remember whether it was seventy or ninety or whatever the list was, but it was a goddamned interesting list. But it's asking a guy to do a lot, a huge drawing that went around the world—the show was in La Jolla, it went everywhere. By the way, we weren't the only ones to invite entries. Shows and books are always exclusive. We weren't. You invite people, for Christ's sake. Zukowsky's never done a show that wasn't invitational. He puts together a list of what he thinks will serve the end, the purpose, and invite them and they accept or they don't. So we weren't any different. Why look to us?

Blum: So it really wasn't truly an open competition? That's the way it is described in print.

Tigerman: That this was intended as an open competition? The second one, the "Late Entries"?

Blum: Yes.

Tigerman: I don't know about open. I don't know where Stuart gets that. We put together a list, so how do you put together a list and make it open? There were some people who wanted to do it. I mean, it wasn't enunciated that they wanted to do it. We didn't put an ad in *Architectural Record* that said we were going to do this and send your shit in. We didn't do that. So if it was open, that's how it was open. So Stuart's full of shit. We didn't do that, so how could it be open? It was open to those who knew that it was going to transpire and were they interested. We would have certainly allowed them to do it, no question. But we did put together a list. It was a very interesting mix. It was modern architects, postmodern architects, historicists.

Blum: Now, you wrote an essay that is organized like *Versus* and for your own work you categorized the submissions. You came up with seven, eight, or nine categories into which you plugged each entry.

Tigerman: Well, I guess. If you say so. I don't remember. Have you got it with you?

Blum: Well, I have your essay. Look at the last two pages.

Tigerman: Yes, I see. Yes, there is a category. It's good.

Blum: You categorized... Is this another filing cabinet?

Tigerman: Of course, these were not postmodernist, necessarily, "alienating grids"...

Blum: Yes, I think you did come to the conclusion in your essay that it was postmodern and then you had the categories.

Tigerman: Because I have a tendency of categorizing, ordering.

Blum: It seems that all of the Chicago Seven was in this exhibition...Do you think of this was an independent effort and not an activity of the Chicago Seven?

Tigerman: It wasn't. There were others in the exhibition who weren't members of the Chicago Seven but who were members of the Chicago Architectural Club. I think that Debbie Doyle did one. There were lots of people who did it. You see, the reason I don't remember is that it's not just that it's almost twenty years ago, but it's not interesting to me now. Should one be interested in everything that one does even if it doesn't resonate?

Blum: Why was the skyscraper form so maligned and at this time came back in to favor?

Tigerman: Why the skyscraper was maligned was that it is an anti-human, non-person-oriented building type. The reason we brought it back as in "Late Entries" is because we knew that and many of the entries played havoc with the tall building, for sure. So, it was probably in our mind, too. It's just not important to me now. I have recall for what I want to remember. It's called selective-memory, okay? I don't remember things equally.

Blum: In 1976 and again in 1980, you were invited to submit to the Venice Biennale.

Tigerman: Not submit... It was an invitation to exhibit! There's another case. The 1976 exhibition for me was by far the more important one, by far.

Blum: Why?

Tigerman: It was my first. It was a big thing. It's a great honor to be invited. It was more interesting because it was more pluralistic. The 1980 was straightaway postmodernist and people were excluded. The first one was Eisenman.

Blum: Do you mean he selected people?

Tigerman: He and I, and I forget whom from Europe. What was interesting about the first one was that there were eleven American architects and eleven Europeans. It was very interesting. And the eleven Americans were classically-inclined and modernistically-inclined, and surrealistically-inclined. They were very different types. The most interesting thing about that biennale was that the eleven Europeans and the eleven Americans were given the same amount of space in the Saltworks at the Judaica, across the bay from St. Mark's. The Europeans did it like Europe, they created eleven little funny cubicles, almost like those at a passport control. It was like Luxembourg, Belgium, France, all these little...

[Tape 7: Side 1]

Tigerman: I have to tell you, I thought it was wonderful the difference between Europe and America. The European spaces were dense and the American spaces were sparse. The Europeans turned their backs on each other, the Americans were cheek-by-jowl with each other. It was fabulous. You could see the two different cultures. By the time we got to 1980, it was straightaway postmodernist.

Blum: European and American?

Tigerman: European and American, all together. It just wasn't as good.

Blum: The exhibition was titled "The Presence of the Past."

Tigerman: I know, and therefore that sets it up.

Blum: I noticed in your submission that you submitted a lot of your projects that had been built already.

Tigerman: And some that hadn't been done yet.

Blum: There was a select group of architects, twenty, who were chosen to do a façade of a street front, of which you were one.

Tigerman: I know, a facciata. Of which I was one.

Blum: That was sort of special, to be selected out of the rest of the architects, as one of twenty.

Blum: Yeah. There were hundreds in the show. But the twenty on the street...

Tigerman: But then there was a secondary group...

Blum: Was that as exciting to you?

Tigerman: No, because already I was losing interest. I mean, all of this stuff like that, my career is marked by a continuous loss of interest. I wasn't interested in that, even at the time. I mean, I was actually at the American Academy in Rome and I actually did the design for the facciata, the façade, at the American Academy, using the libraries, the Bibiena brothers in the 17th or 16th century who did all those fabulous theatre designs.

Blum: Your entry looked very theatrical.

Tigerman: Yeah, it was a theater. In the first one, it didn't have an agenda. The second one had a polemic. We were going to bring postmodernism onto the scene—that was the polemic. Between Charlie Jencks and whoever else did it, that was...

Blum: There were two Italians.

Tigerman: Yeah, Paulo Portoghesi. Their agenda was to do that, right? Whereas the first one was very open. I appreciated that more. So the second one, where it had an agenda, was not as personally fascinating.

Blum: How did you feel about the new Chicago architecture exhibition that first appeared in Verona?

Tigerman: I thought it was great.

Blum: Why Verona? How did it happen in Verona?

Tigerman: I don't know. I didn't pick it. I thought it was great because it was open.

- Blum: You submitted designs like the Arby's, the library, Animal Crackers... It was a mixed bag.
- Tigerman: Because what I do is a mixed bag.
- Blum: Jencks said about your work in the Verona show that "the ghost of Mies still lurks" in your work.
- Tigerman: It always will. It doesn't have to look like Mies. Jencks is a very smart guy. Mies had such an impact on me, probably more than any other architect, by far. It will always lurk. I mean, look at what I just showed you yesterday, this pair of mid-rise buildings that I'm doing and while they may step up, the façade is straight-out Miesian.
- Blum: Then why were you so confrontational about Miesian modernism?
- Tigerman: Not to Mies, to his descendents.
- Blum: It seemed that you were getting rid of that influence in your life with the photo-collage of the sinking of Crown Hall.
- Tigerman: I wasn't getting rid of Mies, you misread it. It's getting rid of the Miesians, the followers. Because they added nothing to Mies. I agonized about them my whole life because I can't stand architects not contributing something. They contributed nothing, in my view.
- Blum: Do you have a strong Protestant ethic?
- Tigerman: I do. No, I do. There's no question about it. That's why I have a Jack-the-Giant-Killer sort of streak in me, for sure. You have to understand that I grew up in the city where the descendents of Mies—not Mies—held sway like crazy for thirty years, for the first thirty years of my life as an architect, from

the 1940s, even, let alone the '50s, '60s, '70s. It was all Mies, 100 percent. Mies himself, no problem. Mies was brilliant. Can I tell you, there was an incident that will give you some insight into this. You know, Mies was fired in 1958 from IIT. Whenever he showed up at any public event, I was there. I just loved hearing him. So one time he came to IIT and I knew about it. He was presenting, I want to say, the Bacardi building in Mexico, which is sort of like the twentieth-century art gallery in Berlin, but the columns, which were buttresses, were turned at forty-five degrees. This was a big space-frame. Very beautiful. Mies's sense of proportion was exquisite. Everybody—Myron Goldsmith, all of them—saw him only in a constructivist vein. But the man had such an aesthetic sense, I can't tell you. Myron didn't, he had an engineering sense so that his buildings and bridges never had that quality of Mies's. Ever. Mies had, even though it was about technique, he had an aesthetic sensibility, big-time, so the buildings that he did are very beautiful. What the followers do is never beautiful. David Haid's house in Evanston is a clunk. It's beautifully detailed, but it's a clunk. The fascia on the house is way too big—he didn't have a clue. So, Mies comes to IIT to present the Bacardi thing and there's drawings or a model and some kid, some IIT graduate student, whatever... You know, Mies talked slowly, if at all, and seldom. Mies is there in his wheelchair and he's pointing out the... And some kid raises his hand and asks Mies why he turned the columns forty-five degrees. It may not sound much to you, but it was a major move for Mies to have done that—massive. And Mies thought about it and, as I recall—but maybe I'm embellishing—Mies smiled a bit and said, "Because I like it." They didn't know how to deal with that, because if there was no rationale—you know what I'm saying? His saying, "I like it," for me, just interpretively, shows the artist in him. He wasn't going to share that it was because such-and-such technical or structural... It was a massive shift for Mies to do that. The kid was flabbergasted, as was the then-faculty at IIT.

Blum: Is that a quality that appealed to you?

Tigerman: Absolutely, I loved it. It was also ironic that Mies was unwilling, purportedly, to explain away why he did something. He just said, "I like it." But in saying that, he revealed himself as an artist. He revealed himself as a person who makes choices. Ultimately, architects make choices and they can't always be explained. We leave that to the Vince Scullys of the world who then can make their own careers by finding things, as you're doing here. You're saying, "Well, you said this then..."

Blum: I'm just trying to find some consistency.

Tigerman: Why are you so determined to find consistency? Some of those things I would defend today and some of those things I would express surprise at having said, like any person would do. Some of the things I have less interest in, some of the things I have more interest in. I'm sure that everything I said, when I said it, I was impassioned about it. I'm sure of it. But I haven't been able to sustain all of those passions. I haven't had the wherewithal, the tenacity, the belief, so when I say that I shouldn't have been an architect...

Blum: What do you think you should have been?

Tigerman: I should have been what my grandfather was. I should have been a rabbinic scholar.

Blum: But then you wouldn't have that nice pension from the University of Illinois.

Tigerman: Betty, I've got to tell you, your criticism is tiresome. The University of Illinois is very late in the day, very late in the day. It has nothing to do with it. We're talking about five years ago, for Christ's sake. You may think it's consequential, you may not believe that in my practice from the very beginning I never sought clients. You just heard me talk on the phone to a client in a very direct way. I didn't need a pension from the University of Illinois. That pension doesn't pay my taxes, doesn't come near to it. I would

have done Archeworks after having resigned my tenure anyway, there's no question about it. All those years I practiced without any support, without any university money from teaching—from 1971 until 1980 I didn't have any support. Still, I did what I felt needed to be done. The pension makes it easier, but if you don't have it, you ought to do it anyway.

Blum: "Late Entries" was 1980 and in 1983 the Chicago Architectural Club had a competition called "TOPS." Was that a spin-off from the...?

Tigerman: I think it was just inventing new things to do, yeah. We all did it.

Blum: And this was again using the skyscraper. Was it just for fun?

Tigerman: Yeah. Do you know what mine was? I promised Pauline when she was at the Art Institute before Martha that I'd give it to the Art Institute. And then I decided not to.

Blum: What was it?

Tigerman: It was the Federal Center done... Oh, you have the catalog. Is it in there?

Blum: No. I thought that you did not submit to this competition.

Tigerman: Are all of them in there?

Blum: I thought so. Please show me. The front part is the competition and the back part is devoted to the work of members.

Tigerman: Well, maybe I didn't do "TOPS." Maybe it was something else I did it for. I did some ironic piece about the Federal Center and Catholicism. It was a very anti-clerical piece.

- Blum: Why was there no entry from you in "TOPS?"
- Tigerman: Well, I thought there was. But if there wasn't, then it was about passing the baton. It was to younger people. I'm fifty-three years old at that point. No, I'm saying something.
- Blum: You're measuring it against yourself and I'm looking at the date, 1983, and measuring it against the inception of the Chicago Seven and the change they fostered.
- Tigerman: The Chicago Architectural Club came about in approximately 1980. I don't know when I resigned from the club, but I want to say it was probably 1984 or '85. It didn't interest me any longer.
- Blum: You are, frankly, in a general way, credited with the formation of this club.
- Tigerman: Yeah, but that doesn't mean I have to continue to be a member. If you get something off the ground, that's great, but you don't have to be there forever, as, by the way, I won't be at Archeworks forever. I've tried to institutionalize it, Eva and I, so that it can move on its own. I have no intention of being there forever. Why would I do that? My whole life is marked by change. I'm not interested in staying the course. It's not my pattern.
- Blum: In the following year, there was an exhibition in Frankfurt that Heinrich Klotz put together. In it, he showed the Chicago Seven as a group with the townhouses that all of you had designed for the Graham Foundation exhibition. Was that a way to self-validate the Chicago Seven, by using their work as an historical example?
- Tigerman: I wasn't using anybody. It was Klotz that did it. You have to ask Klotz, I don't know. You know, a show begins and then people pick up on it. But I think that to ask one of the people in the show is it about self-validation—I don't

think that any of the Chicago Seven were interested or not interested. I mean, it was another venue and Heinrich did it.

Blum: In the catalog, he said that the Chicago townhouse competition was an example of a "successful attempt to change the mainstream of architecture in Chicago. Do you agree with that?

Tigerman: I have to tell you something. You know what's funny about this whole thing? I don't care about that. You know what's interesting about this interview? It's like a comment or a question, like if an historian... There are historians and there are architects. There are people that make things and, as my mother said, if they can't, they teach. She could have said that they become historians. Everything you ask me sounds as if because such-and-such said it, there must be some truth in it.

Blum: But that's what we'd like to know, is there? We'd like to hear your take on it.

Tigerman: Sometimes there is, sometimes there is not. I remember Lou Kahn and Vince Scully and Scully was trying to make a hero out of Kahn. Kahn hated Scully, he despised him. He had no interest in what Scully said about him. Scully was trying to build him up. What Scully was doing was building himself up, everyone knows that. That's why his reputation within architectural historical circles is not so great. He attempted to influence contemporaneity, you know that, with Kahn and Venturi and whomever. It turns out that I'm very fond of Heinrich Klotz. Heinrich, a terrific man, but because he said it, it doesn't mean that it was so.

Blum: That's why I asked for your comment.

Tigerman: I don't know whether it was so and I don't much care about it. Did it influence the city? I don't think it influenced the city. It was interesting, because, as I told you, there was that townhouse project of different stuff that

was built. That's interesting. Even after it was built, did it change the city? No. Cities don't change.

Blum: Did any of the activities of the Chicago Seven make a difference?

Tigerman: I think with students, with the young, with the next generation. Always. But cities aren't influenced by such frivolous things, by transitory things. Cities change because of much deeper, more resonant things. Was it an interesting competition, the *cadavre exquis*? Absolutely. At the time, it was fabulous. I loved many of them. I surely loved the one that I did. I do. I haven't looked at it for years and looking at it again, it was nice to do. Did it influence even me? No, yet alone a city.

Blum: It was just fun?

Tigerman: No, it wasn't just fun. It was a serious set of ideas about things but it didn't really influence anything. You know what influences? If you take Mies van der Rohe, that's an influence. Corbu isn't even an influence anymore. But that's my opinion. Mies did influence the city. Look at all the neo-Miesian buildings. For good or bad. Yes, he had a huge impact. I don't expect to have any impact at all.

Blum: Were you serious when you got together with other architects in Charlottesville and again in Chicago when you discussed some of your current projects?

Tigerman: I set the one up in Chicago. Yes, those are important things. Most importantly is not what's said, or doing it, but the chance to dialog. I am representative of a generation unlike the one that preceded me. I want to underscore that. It gave nothing to the next generation, but for Philip [Johnson]. None of them gave a goddamned thing—Netsch, Goldberg, Weese, to talk about local guys.

If you want to go national, I.M. Pei never did jackshit for the generation after him, nothing.

Blum: Was it because there wasn't a forum to do it in?

Tigerman: Whatever it was you can say to defend them, I'm not even interested in defending them. I mean, I don't care. We decided to do that, to pass the baton. *I* decided to do that in life, because I believe in that. It would have been nicer for my generation to have been the beneficiary of help from the generation preceding it. When it didn't transpire, I chose to do it. So, I do it. I know that. The generation behind me knows that. I am giving in that way. It may not be in other ways, but I am giving in that way. So, thus an Archeworks comes about. It resonated with me when Eva and I talked about breaking down barriers between disciplines. Architects never respect... They hate... They bad-mouth interior decorators and interior designers with venom, to this very instant. So, it was interesting to start a school with an interior designer. If nothing else, it showed my respect for her. That was not a bad thing. So breaking down barriers between fields is important. Breaking down barriers between the academy and practice, where they all hate each other, was important. So, even back then, passing the baton and doing all that, those are important things to do.

Blum: The Chicago Tapes conference, which you organized, was patterned after the Charlottesville Tapes. Why at Hull House?

Tigerman: I did not organize the Charlottesville conference. I did organize the Chicago one. That was also useful to the university, to give it presence.

Blum: Why?

Tigerman: Think why. Why would it help?

Blum: To bring important stars, to bring Hollywood to UIC?

Tigerman: Beyond your sarcasm about Hollywood... Yes. To UIC. Hollywood to Halsted Street. Of course. That's a terrific thing to do. That was great to do for Chicago and for the university. I was the director, I was brand-new.

Blum: I didn't have the impression that the conference was passing the baton. I thought that was a conversation among equals.

Tigerman: Yes. Passing the baton is about the Chicago Architectural Club, setting up the next generation, no doubt.

Blum: And the Chicago Tapes were to your benefit and to everyone else's benefit.

Tigerman: And the university's benefit. And the field's, generally.

Blum: Well, now, the Chicago Tapes conference took place in 1986. You were brand-new as the director.

Tigerman: Right. It was very helpful to the university to be perceived by the star quality-types as a place worthy of doing such a thing. You know, the first one, the Charlottesville Tapes conference, was another thing—Peter organized it. There were no women in the first one, in Charlottesville. In Chicago, there were. Peter hated it—that there were women included. He said it. He'll hate this being recorded, but that's his problem. He did say it. He didn't want women involved, no matter who the women were. But I insisted, because I was organizing it.

Blum: Why was the format was almost identical to that of the Charlottesville Tapes?

Tigerman: Because I thought it was the second in a series of what I thought would continue.

Blum: And it was sort of cloaked in theater, with players and the setting, the play.

Tigerman: Well, it was established as the first one, and so this was the second one. And so there never was a third one, but at least there were two.

Blum: And Rizzoli again published the transcript.

Tigerman: Yes, Rizzoli, in the body of Gianfranco Monacelli, was a huge support system to architecture, not just to me or Eisenman or whoever, and to this very minute. Rem Koolhaas, that *S, M,, L, XL* book, Monacelli continues apace to support architecture. So we, architects, have always supported him. You can get books by Ron Krueck and what's-his-name is doing—Valerio. It's great. Ralph Johnson. It's the next generation.

Blum: Ralph Johnson?

Tigerman: Ralph Johnson worked for me, which you may or may not know. Ralph's substantially younger. Proof in the pudding is that he's married to Jim Nagle's daughter. You get my drift. He is the next generation. So we've always supported, or tried to. I believe in that. I believe in continuity and I believe in support. The Chicago Tapes conference wasn't about passing the baton, but it was about breaking barriers, with people talking to each other. So, all those kinds of things, just to hear myself talk about it in this way, in this format, is a suggestion that there is a certain consonance of stuff like that that people know about me. I do things like that.

Blum: Yesterday you showed me your office and all the projects that are on the boards. Is there a project today that most accurately identifies where you think you're at in your practice?

Tigerman: Well, Archeworks has to come into it, because you might have asked the question, "Are there projects today that begin to coalesce many of these other seemingly disparate interests of yours?"

Blum: Well, let's take that as two questions. If you're constantly moving, where are you at this moment?

Tigerman: It's about social cause, of course.

Blum: Is there a project on your table that represents that?

Tigerman: And I must say about children. I've always loved doing projects with children. Two camps: Camp Algonquin, the kid that made that drawing. And Camp Hoover, the Boy Scout camp for the disabled. All the Anti-Cruelty Society—that was done for kids, to influence their parents to get a dog or a cat. All of my stuff, like the thing at the Art Institute for the children's gallery, which I loved. I worked with a focus group of twelve kids who sat around this table with me for thirty sessions.

Blum: And today?

Tigerman: Well, there are three projects today. There is one under construction, one that's fairly new in the office and one that hasn't even begun but will begin shortly. You heard me make those reservations to go to San Juan, Puerto Rico. The San Juan one is for the children and family gallery in the art museum in San Juan. The second one is starting is the Chicago Children's Advocacy Center, where children who are sexually or physically abused come in for case disposition, therapy, remediation, and so forth.

Blum: So is it offices that you are doing for them?

Tigerman: No, it's a clinic, it's offices, it's emergency overnight. It's counseling, it's bringing a kid back to normality. So that's a great project.

Blum: What do you do to prepare yourself for something like that?

Tigerman: Listen.

Blum: To whom?

Tigerman: Kids—which I have yet to start, I will do that. To parents, to the state's attorney.

Blum: Is this a place where they pass through not stay?

Tigerman: Right. But it's very poignant to do it non-institutionally, make them feel at home. The other one I'm doing is under construction—that's the Ounce of Prevention Fund. You saw the model, this thing in Robert Taylor Homes at 51st and State. It's a day care center, to keep the kids from being shot at by drive-by shooters and gang-bangers and keep them free from drug dealers and so forth. Those are three projects that are terrific, in my view.

Blum: Do you have any problem when you think that you're important, you're well known, but you've never had a major commission from the city?

Tigerman: No. Absolutely not. Margaret gets pissed off that I'm not recognized as such that I get a major building. I think that all these buildings that I've done have been major buildings. They may not be large buildings, but I'm not interested necessarily in large buildings. I'm interested in working with people who want me, period. If those projects are little buildings, so much the better. The smaller the building, the more you can invest in it. The greater resonance, the greater the depth of the projects. You or others who read this may not believe it's the truth, but it's the absolute truth. I have no problem with that at all.

Why don't I have a problem with it? Well, I am an architect, but I am many other things. I'm also a teacher, I'm also an educator, which is different than being a teacher. I'm also a writer. I'm a polemicist. The greatest success I think I've had is keeping this practice small.

Blum: Has there been pressure to make it bigger?

Tigerman: Of course. We turn down clients. I don't want...

Blum: For what reason would you turn down a client?

Tigerman: Because I don't like them, maybe. I'm not obligated to work for everybody who walks in that door. I actually turn them down. And on the occasion that I make a mistake, then I cause them to fire me. I do that from time to time.

Blum: What do you mean?

Tigerman: Well, I realize I've made a mistake, that I've accepted a client I shouldn't have. Instead of firing the client, I cause them to fire me.

Blum: Do you become so disagreeable that they can't live with you, so they are forced to dismiss you?

Tigerman: Right. Which is better than firing the client—nicer, in my view. Not so nice to fire a client. I don't do that. I don't fire employees. They retreat out. I don't like firing people. I'm ruthless, but I very rarely have ever even flunked a student out. But I'm ruthless with them, yes. I'm interested in their becoming very good. They may leave on their own, finally. Employees here may leave, fine. Clients may leave, fine. But I don't like firing people, it's not nice.

Blum: Have you always been a supporter of the AIA?

Tigerman: No, I'm not a supporter at all, as we speak. It's all about—which we really haven't talked about much at all—morality and ethics. We will at the end, because you're going to say, "Where is everything going?" because everybody ends that way. And you will, too. Trust me. I can tell you where it needs to go. Where it goes is another matter.

Blum: But tell me when you parted ways with the AIA. In the 1960s, you were on their committees.

Tigerman: Jesus-fucking-Christ, this is the end of the nineties. This is thirty-five years later, okay? We're talking about a young man I hardly even remember. Right? When the AIA stopped its interest in morality and ethics... It has an ethical clause. When it became a support of marketing, in the 1980s, I lost interest. The AIA today is about marketing.

Blum: Are you a member?

Tigerman: Yes, I'm a member. It's the only game in town.

Blum: So why are you a member if you disagree with their policies?

Tigerman: Didn't you ever hear about the not-so-loyal opposition from within, trying to change it?

Blum: Are you active in the AIA, to try to change it?

Tigerman: Not particularly. But the Committee on Design, which I once chaired, in 1976—which Margaret was much more recently the chair of—I give lectures to AIA events all the time. I'm very tough in the AIA—more important from within. It would be easy if I quit the AIA.

Blum: You're a member but not a believer?

Tigerman: No, I'm not a believer. When they start supporting morality and ethics, then they've got me.

Blum: Did they do something? Was there an incident?

Tigerman: No. It's about marketing. You know, most offices now have marketing people. I hate it. And small offices, including people like Paul Florian, who otherwise I'm very fond of, market. I hate marketing. The whole concept of diminishment of architecture, to me, is shocking, frankly.

Blum: You don't like to think of architecture as a business. You think of it as a profession?

Tigerman: Look at the way I dress, Betty. Look at the way I behave, my reputation. Do I sound like a marketing type? Do I behave like one?

Blum: Well, you're marketing a different image than that of a typical architect.

Tigerman: Well, then look at it that way. I mean, I'm not a cookie-cutter architect. I'm just not. I'm difficult. I'm contentious. Marketing types are not difficult. If you're going to market, you'd better get used to putting your head up and down, okay? You'd better be agreeable. Because if you do what I do, it doesn't do well. What I stand for is my work, my teaching, my former students, my writing. Go fuck yourself, because that's all I can do. I'm not interested in being a namby-pamby, a nice guy. I am a nice guy in lots of ways, but I'm not interested in it in order to get work, to present myself in that way. Okay?

Blum: What did it mean to you to become a fellow in 1973?

Tigerman: It was fabulous. No doubt about it. I did very well, no question. Larry and Jim never even went to their respective conventions when they were made fellows. No, I'm not snotty in that way. And does it mean something to have gotten all these AIA awards? Yes. Do I look for the respect of my peers? Yes. Of course. Why would anyone not say yes to that? And the AIA honoring me? Of course. But if that means I can no longer criticize the AIA, you're crazy. I criticize them to their face. I criticized the former executive vice-president of the AIA in Washington to his face, in a very tough way, against marketing and pro-ethics. And you know what? There are occasionally presidents, like Raj Bar-Kumar, the former president, who understood entirely and were very supportive of me. Or the last guy, Ron Altoon. There are some good guys that show up as presidents of the AIA. Or my friend Sara Topelson de Grinberg, the president of the Union Internationale des Architectes—the UIA. She's a Jewish-Mexican woman—that's a trio—who's a Cornell alum. She's a very good friend of mine, very dear friend. She has a place in Aspen and I see her all the time. She's a good woman, she's very interested in morality and ethics. If you're not interested in those issues, you will raise my ire, make no mistake. Because without morality and ethics, which means marketing, which means business, you've diminished the field that I've spent my whole goddamned life in and you'd better watch out. I will come after you, publicly.

Blum: I suppose there are people who would say that you have marketed yourself, but in other ways.

Tigerman: Of course, by publishing. But that's not what I mean by marketing and what you're doing is giving marketing a sex-change. You're saying, "Well, because you publish, you market." That's bullshit. When you go after a job, when you hire a marketing director, that's marketing, When you want work. I didn't say I want work by publishing, I'm sharing my work, for Christ's sake. Is that marketing? If a job comes out of it, great! But I don't go after jobs. I don't try and get jobs at all. Zero. So, I'll give you an example. This job I've got right

now, with the Public Building Commission. Ben Lewis is the head of the Public Building Commission. He's a very nice man. And he and Paul Beitler commissioned me once upon a time to do a Montessori school. It never happened, but I got to know him and I like him a lot. I got a call the other day from him, not more than two weeks ago, not even. And he says, "How come you don't like me anymore?" I said, "What are you talking about? Of course I like you." "But you never try and get a job with the Public Building Commission." And I said, "Ben, I don't do that." So he said, "Well, I have to correct that. We're going to give you a job." Well, now, am I going to turn the fucking job down? But do I go out and get a job? No, absolutely not. Absolutely not. I am not a marketing person. You can say all you want that publishing is marketing. It's sharing your ideas with the profession, with the general public and if somebody shows up after that, fine. Margaret is fabulous. Margaret doesn't do shit. She just puts her head down and draws. She has more work than God and she doesn't try to get any work at all. In her case, it's very easy to give her work, because she's nice, she's supportive of the client, she's a very good architect, she's thorough. She is perfect because she doesn't do any of it. She hates it. Margaret's idea of business is to cheat on her timecard downward because she feels that she's slow. She is slow and though she puts her time on her timecard, she feels that her clients don't deserve to be billed that much. So she writes it downward. That's Margaret's idea of business. What kind of business is that? So I'm married to the perfect woman in that sense. We may have other differences, but in that sense, I really admire her big-time, big-time, because she doesn't diminish architecture. In my case, it's not as easy. This other crap diminishes architecture. So the Skidmore, Owings, and Merrills, I will always be against them. They market, they go out and hustle work. They rustle it up. Bruce was a master at it. I saw him in his office one day, in one of our friendlier moments—I was in his office about something—he said, "Watch this." He called up someone—I forget the guy's name in Connecticut, whom he caused to go bankrupt. I hasten to add—he called up this guy and he said, "Let's do this hotel in Barcelona. There's a great chance to do such-and-such." This guy

was the developer—the developer didn't evolve the idea, Bruce evolved the idea. Now, on the one hand, I thought it was great, because Bruce was exploiting power, which the architect always pretends that he or she doesn't have. But on the other hand, he was marketing like mad. He was causing the job to happen. He could cause jobs to happen. He actually caused that to happen! Do I admire that? Yes. Would I do it? Not at the end of a twenty-foot stick. Nothing could persuade me. What a horrible notion, first of all, that you have to spend time doing that shit when you're trying to evolve theories, ideas, designs, writings. I don't have the time. I don't want to do it. I only do what I want to do, which comes from being spoiled as a kid.

Blum: That's a privileged position.

Tigerman: As a kid, I got to do what I wanted to do. I still do. I don't meet with insurance men. I don't meet with any of the crap side of architecture. Salesmen—I don't touch that at all. It's a waste of time, I'm not interested in those things. So, I'm a very happy guy, in actual fact. And you can do that in architecture. So, architecture has been great to me. It's set up a situation in which I can act out my spoiled fantasies from childhood.

Blum: Well, you acted out these ideas with the Chicago Seven. It continued for a few years while it held your interest. And, it seems that the Chicago Seven sort of dissolved into the Chicago Architectural Club.

Tigerman: And it got bigger, and bigger, and bigger. I mean, there were 125 people in the club.

Blum: Do you think that the changes that came about, the avenues that opened up for dialog, do you think that that all would have happened without the Chicago Seven?

Tigerman: Nope. Chicago Seven was very important in its day. And the first four, in their day: Stuart, Larry, Ben, and me.

Blum: Do you mean the first exhibition?

Tigerman: Yeah. It was a gathering of four architects—that was the most important and vibrant time. The next one went down a little bit in interest with the Chicago Seven. When it became eleven, it went down rather substantially even more.

Blum: For you?

Tigerman: For me. When it became the Chicago Architectural Club, it went down quite a lot. And then when everybody in the world became a member, I just dropped out. As it grew and then became the Chicago Architectural Club and when it was dues-based and anyone could be a member, then it was like the AIA. Are all of them good? No. The quality reduced continuously dramatically. Wierzbowski, that jerk, stopped publishing the *Chicago Architectural Club Journal*. Was that a good idea? No. They had the Graham Foundation, where they originally began—we originally began. Then they moved to some other stupid thing.

Blum: You were no longer a member at the time?

Tigerman: No. It was done by people of much lesser quality, in my view. Now, that's haughty, arrogant, and so forth, of course. But I just do what I want to do. When it reduced its quality substantially, hey. Larry Booth and Jim Nagle were partners. Do you know how they broke their partnership? You won't like it, but it's the same discussion. Larry thought that he was a better architect than Jim. He said to Jim, "I don't want to be a partner of your anymore."

[Tape 7: Side 2]

Tigerman: I went to a shrink for five years and one of the few things I learned from this jerk was to look at reality as what it is—not what you want it to be, but what it is. Larry was ruthless in doing that with Jim. That was not a particularly human act, but it is reality. That's how they broke their partnership. He crushed Jim. And Jim was very hurt. It was not a particularly nice thing. But it was the truth. So I will say that Larry is a better architect, maybe marginally. And in his mind, he's better. And so he broke that partnership. That's not so great, that's not so easy a thing. But it's what he did. When the Chicago Architectural Club was being run by Debbie Doyle—Debbie Doyle!—you think that I'm going to be...? It's like at the University of Illinois, when Tom Jeager became chairman, do you think that I'm going to be a party to that? No way. So I quit the university, I quit the Chicago Architectural Club. I quit. I quit a lot of things.

Blum: Is that what you call passing the baton?

Tigerman: Thank you for your consistency... I thought you'd forgotten how to be sarcastic. Well, passing the baton is different. Passing the baton is actually trying to help the next generation. I've done it in my teaching, I've done it with others through the vehicle of the Chicago Seven and the Chicago Architectural Club. Then, when the others come of age, it's their right and it's their obligation to take over. It's not mine to hang on. Now, the Chicago Architectural Club, I never went back, because I never go back, you can't go back to anything. You can't reinvent a time that was, it's now consigned to history. So I never went back to the Architectural Club, for example. They wanted to do a presentation at Archeworks—they wanted Eva and I to do an evening at Archeworks. Did I do it? Absolutely. Absolutely. But generally, people don't go back. Paul Rudolph never went back to Yale after they turned against him. I've never gone back to the University of Illinois at Chicago and I never will. Not in the cards. Not for a lecture. You know what I did? It's great—when Donna Robertson, who's a friend of mine, became dean

at IIT, she said, "You have to come and give a lecture." I said, "Donna,"—I said it to Katarina Ruedi, too—I said, "I want you to give lectures at Archeworks, there's no doubt. I will help you"—I said this to both of them, separately—"in any way I can, because I feel compelled to do that. But I will never come to either of your institutions. Don't ask." So before Donna came, I think Ben Nicholson asked me to give a lecture at IIT, and I did, because it's Ben. And there was a huge audience. And I said, "I will never come here again. This is my last lecture at IIT. I'm done with it. I only go to places I want to go. Period." So, that continues. Passing the baton, that's another matter. I believed in it then and I believe in it now, or else I wouldn't have done Archeworks.

Blum: Do you think that Chicago architecture improved after the Chicago Seven activities?

Tigerman: Can I tell you something? I think that Blair Kamin—and I've told this to him—is totally wrong when he condemned Chicago architecture today. I think that Chicago architecture is terrific today. Better today than then, because there are all these terrific young architects.

Blum: Do you mean better than before the Chicago Seven activities or after?

Tigerman: Better than anything you want to mention, including back in the time of Mies. I think that Chicago is terrific today. I think it's the best today it's ever been because there's a shitpot full of young terrific architects, absolutely first-rate in offices and in practice. Do you want me to name them? I mean, there's an army. Doug Garofalo is an example, just one. There's a terrific number of very dedicated, extremely intelligent—more intelligent than ever before...

Blum: So you think that architecture has a very optimistic outlook?

Tigerman: I think that people like the members of the Chicago Seven at that time, people like Mies, specifically, then and now, others, I think that those are important people only insofar as they tried to encourage the young, to try to persuade the young to encourage their next generation, for which I won't be around. I think that the whole game of history is passing the baton and I think that those that don't do it need to be discouraged. So I believe—and where is architecture going to go, what's going to transpire out of all this? I believe in morality and ethics, period. That's why I should have become a Talmudic scholar or a philosopher or something. So I'm trying to skew, to turn architecture toward that, through the vehicle of social cause in Archeworks. The best work I can do—the best work I have done—has been in social causes. The Library for the Blind, a very good building. Anti-Cruelty Society, good building. Boy Scout camp for the disabled, Camp Hoover, a good project. Project for Camp Algonquin, a good project. This new whatchamacallit building for children, a terrific project—the Ounce of Prevention, the one that's under construction—the daycare center... I will make this clinic a good building.

Blum: Did you feel that there was a morality or sense of ethics with the activities of the Chicago Seven?

Tigerman: No, not particularly. But I'm not a part of the Chicago Seven anymore. I'm talking about now. As the years evolve, you focus and you distill what your beliefs are. That's the process of aging and it's normal to everybody. It's about distillation. So what I've distilled is that the single, by far most important, thing about architecture—and I intend to exploit it, but not for me, because I intend to cause it to happen to the best of my abilities—is to imbue architecture with a sense of morality. Yes, absolutely. Bottom line, end of the day, yes. That's where I'm at.

Blum: Would it surprise you to know that in 1997 the *Chicago Tribune* listed the most notable contributors to 150 years of arts in Chicago? The Chicago Seven were

among those listed. The comment was, "this group of rebels opened the way for a more inclusive version of Chicago's architectural history, including tradition-minded architects and unorthodox modernists left out from the standard modernist canon."

Tigerman: That wouldn't surprise me. We did that. So?

Blum: Do you have any regrets being a part of it?

Tigerman: No. But I'm done with it.

Blum: Would you do it again?

Tigerman: One can never answer that because nothing is ever the same. You know, that happened, it was a good thing. I was glad to be a part of it, to formulate many of these things. But that was then. This is now. There's no question that the Chicago Seven—the coalescence of disparate types—impacts even on Archeworks, because Archeworks is all these disparate types that show up. I think that's where architecture is going in architectural education—experimental education, alternative forms of whatever. That was good. But I've personally gone way beyond that. And the others do what they do. I have no antagonism toward the others. Many of them I'm very good friends with, no question. And I respect them and I like them. I go skiing with them, whatever. In a few cases, I even admire them, meaning Helmut and Beeby. But times change. And since I am nothing if not changeable—if that hadn't become clear to you in these past four days, then I guess you weren't listening. That's what I do. I'm about what in business is called the "delta" or change.

Blum: Well, Stanley, I've come to the end of my questions, do you have anything you want to talk about that I haven't thought to ask?

Tigerman: No. I mean, I think we've covered a lot. So, I mean, you can always invent things to say, but I don't really have anything else to say. We've talked about Archeworks, we've talked about morality, we've talked about where I'm at now. I've talked about my work, my writing. I continue to do—it's like the book on Kabbalah in architecture, *Failed Attempts*, that's been an abiding part of my interest, this sort of theological thing. But I have nothing to add. We did all that. So now it would become a circular narrative, it would be repeating. So that's it. Thank you, Betty.

Blum: Thank you very much, Stanley.

SELECTED REFERENCES

READINGS ABOUT THE CHICAGO SEVEN

- Boissière, Olivier. "Le Concours du Chicago Tribune Revisit ." *L'architecture d'aujourd'hui* 211 (October 1980):VII-VIII.
- Bourgeois, Denis. "Anciens Contre Modernes." *AI Cree* 179 (March / April 1980):74-79,152.
- Casari, Maurizio and Vincenzo Pavan. *New Chicago Architecture* (exhibition catalog). Chicago: Rizzoli, 1981.
- Chatain, Elizabeth. "On the Town With The Lively Chicago Seven." *Inland Architect* 22 (February 1978):22-23.
- Cohen, Stuart E. *Chicago Architects*. Chicago: Swallow Press, 1976.
- _____. "Late Entries." *Progressive Architecture* 61 (June 1980):94-99.
- _____. "Two Tales of a City: Chicago." *Progressive Architecture* 57 (September 1976):24.
- Cohen, Stuart E. and Stanley Tigerman. *Chicago Tribune Tower Competition & Late Entries*. New York: Rizzoli International, 1980
- "Exhibition Review: Seven Chicago Architects." *The Harvard Architectural Review* 1 (Spring 1980):240-247.
- Greenspan, David. "Letters." *Inland Architect* 21 (August 1977):22-23.
- Grube, Oswald W., Peter C. Pran, and Franz Schulze. *100 Years of Architecture in Chicago* (exhibition catalog). Chicago: J. Philip O'Hara, 1976.
- Houston, Andre F. "Opinion." *Inland Architect* 20 (September 1976):6.
- Kent, Cheryl. "The Chicago Seven: Retiring Rebels." *Inland Architect* 31 (July / August 1987):5-6, 9.
- Klotz, Heinrich. *Revision der Moderne: Postmoderne Architektur, 1960-1980*. (exhibition catalog) Frankfurt am Main: Prestel-Verlag, 1984.
- Knobel, Lance "Recent Work of the Chicago Seven." *The Architectural Review* (London) CLXVII (June 1980):362-371.
- Laine, Christian K. "The Tribune Competition, 1980." *Inland Architect* 24 (June 1980):11-17.
- "Les Myst res de Chicago ou l'histoire mystifi e." *L'architecture d'aujourd'hui* 186 (September 1976): XXII-XXIII.
- "Letters." *Inland Architect* 20 (July 1976):25-27.
- Miller, Nory. "Chicago." *Progressive Architecture* 61 (June 1980):71-72.

- _____. "Chicago Seven Playing the Role." *Progressive Architecture* 58 (April 1977):38, 43.
- _____. "Chicago's Design Yippies Stage an Art Show." *Inland Architect* 21 (March 1977):10-17.
- _____. "Projections on Projects." *Progressive Architecture* 59 (January 1978):29.
- _____. "War of Ideas." *Inland Architect* 20 (March 1976):6-28.
- Morrison, C.L. "Chicago: Chicago Seven." *Artforum* 17 (October 1978):72.
- _____. "Chicago: 'Seven Chicago Architects' Richard Gray Gallery." *Artforum* XV (April 1977):73.
- Pran, Peter. "The Diversity of Design Among Chicago Architects Today." *L'architettura* 23 (December 1977):434-74
- Schulze, Franz. "Letters." *Inland Architect* 22 (February 1978):24-25.
- Seven Chicago Architects*. Exhibition catalog with essay by Dennis Adrian. Chicago: Richard Gray Gallery, 1976.
- "Seven Chicago Architects" *Harvard Architecture Review* 1 (Spring 1980):240-259.
- "The Exquisite Corpse." *A + U* 93 (June 1978):93-104.
- Tigerman, Stanley. "Modernism and the Canonical Chicago Architectural Condition." *The Harvard Architecture Review* 1 (Spring 1980):171-180.
- Town Houses*. Exhibition catalog with foreword by Carter Manny. Chicago: The Graham Foundation for Advanced Studies in the Fine Arts, 1978.
- Walter Kelly Gallery. "Chicago Seven The Exquisite Corpse." December 16, 1977, (exhibition invitation).
- Woodhouse, David. "New Chicago Architecture." *Inland Architect* 25 (November/December 1981):36-37.

READINGS BY AND ABOUT STANLEY TIGERMAN

- Architecture 1980 The Presence of the Past* New York: Rizzoli International Publications, Inc., 1980 (Venice Biennale exhibition catalog).
- "Architecture is Alive and Well: Stanley Tigerman & Associates." *Architectural Review* 162 (October 1977):245-248.
- "Architecture: Stanley Tigerman." *Architectural Design* 43 (July 1986):130-136, 149.
- Boissière, Olivier. "Bannières Etoilées Pour Washington." *Architecture Interior Cree* 172 (June/July 1979):76-77.

- _____. "Les Delices de la Raison Stanley Tigerman." *Architecture Interior Cree* (May/June 1979):108-112.
- _____. *Trois Portraits de l'Artiste en Architecte*. Paris: Editions du Moniteur, 1981.
- Bowly, Devereux Jr. *The Poorhouse*. Carbondale and Edwardsville: Southern Illinois University Press, 1978.
- Casari, Maurizio and Vincenzo Pavan. *New Chicago Architecture*. New York: Rizzoli International Publications, Inc., 1981 (exhibition catalog).
- "Cité Linéaire au-dessous d'une autoroute." *L'Architecture d'aujourd'hui* 163 (October/November 1966):72.
- Clarke, Jane. "Tigerman on Teaching." *Inland Architect* 28 (September/October 1984):34-35.
- Coburn, Marcia Froelke. "Stanley Tigerman Architecture with a Whimsical Twist." *Chicago Sun-Times* (20 January 1985):3.
- Cohen, Stuart E. and Stanley Tigerman. *Chicago Tribune Tower Competition & Late Entries*. New York: Rizzoli International, 1980.
- Coombs, Robert. "Sorting Out Sources." *Architectural Forum* 140 (January 1974):68-73.
- Diamondstein, Barbaralee. *American Architecture Now II*. New York: Rizzoli International Publications, Inc., 1985.
- "Ferme Rénovée." *L'Architecture d'aujourd'hui* 163 (August/September 1972):62-63.
- Gapp, Paul. "Who Says Witty Can't be Serious?" *Chicago Tribune* (21 July 1985):18-20.
- Goldberger, Paul. "Building Against the Grain." *New York Times Book Review* (8 August 1982):9, 19.
- Greenspan, David. "An Interview with Stanley Tigerman." *Inland Architect* 31 (September/October 1987):49-51.
- Hines, Thomas S. "The House as a Relevant Object." *Progressive Architecture* 57 (August 1976):37-61.
- Hoekema, James. "Drawing Toward Architectural Drawings." *Artforum* 16 (September 1977):44-47.
- Ingraham, Catherine. *Stanley Tigerman: Recent Projects*. Chicago: Art Institute of Chicago, 1989 (exhibition brochure).
- Kent, Cheryl. "Perspectives." *Progressive Architecture* 70 (July 1989):31-34.
- Klotz, Heinrich. *Revision der Moderne Postmoderne Architektur 1960-1980*. Frankfurt am Main: Prestel-Verlag, 1984.

- Marlin, William. "To Surreal With Love." *Architectural Record* 162 (October 1977):89-94.
- "Meet the Architect." *GA Houses* 6 (1979):18-56.
- McCoy, Esther. "Young Architects in the United States." *Zodiac* 13 (1963):164-197.
- Miller, Nory. "Chicago On the Drawing Boards." *Horizon* 21 (September 1978):50-57.
- _____. "Illinois Regional Library, Chicago." *Progressive Architecture* 59 (April 1978):76-81.
- _____. "The Enfant Terrible Grows Up." *Metropolitan Home* (November 1982):81-84, 88, 90, 92.
- _____. "Tigerman Shapes a Fresh New Library for the Blind." *Inland Architect* 20 (September 1976):20-24.
- Miller, Ross. "Chicago Architecture After Mies." *Critical Inquiry* 6 (Winter 1979):271-289.
- Neisser, Judith. "A Domestic Quarrel." *Chicago*. (Summer 1989):35-36, 57.
- Newman, M.W. "Chicago Story, Upon Story..." *Horizon* 23 (July 1980):52-57.
- Orr, Anne Davey. "The Ghost of Mies vs. The Chicago Seven." *Plan* (Dublin) January 1980:23-24.
- "Projet de Douze Maisons en Bande." *L'Architecture d'aujourd'hui* 203 (June 1979):36-37.
- Roesch, Madelyn. "Architecture in the '80s." *Inland Architect* 24 (January/February 1980):8-19.
- Scully, Vincent. "Architecture: Margaret McCurry Stanley Tigerman." *Architectural Digest* 4 (April 1984):157-162,194-195.
- Sky, Alison. "On Being Just a Little Less Serious..." *Architectural Record* 160 (September 1976):111-118.
- Stephens, Suzanne. "Tigerman." *Progressive Architecture* 57 (August 1976):42-45.
- Stern, Robert A.M. "The Old '40 Under 40,' A Retrospective Glance." *Architecture and Urbanism* 73 (January 1977):29-48.
- Stern, Robert A.M., editor. "America Now: Drawing Towards a More Modern Architecture." *Architectural Digest* 34 (June 1977):381-383, 440-441.
- Stern, Robert A.M., guest editor. "Selected Drawings from the Drawing Center." *Architectural Digest Profiles* 6 (June 1977): complete issue (exhibition catalog).
- Tigerman, Stanley. "Beyond Scale: Two Projects for the Physically Handicapped." *Design Quarterly* 105 (February 1978):n.p.
- _____. "George Fred Keck 1895-1980." *Chicago Architectural Journal* 1 (1981):56-57.
- _____. "Modernism and the Canonical Chicago Architectural Condition." *Harvard Architecture Review* 1 (Spring 1980):170-189.

- _____. "Optimism and Skepticism and the Linear City." *Design Quarterly* 113/114 (1980):76-77.
- _____. "Significant Events Leading to the Revival of The Chicago Architectural Club." *Chicago Architectural Journal* 2 (1982):175-177.
- _____. *The Architecture of Exile*. New York: Rizzoli International Publications, Inc., 1988.
- _____. "Unsynthesized Dialectic Possibilities." *Threshold* 1 (1982):55-61.
- _____. *Versus*. New York: Rizzoli International Publications, Inc., 1982.
- Torre, Susana. "Architecture With People." *Design Quarterly* 109 (April 1979):16-33.
- "Travaux d'élèves a l'université de Yale." *L'Architecture d'aujourd'hui* 122 (September/November 1965):LIVII.
- "Trois Maisons de Stanley Tigerman." *L'Architecture d'aujourd'hui* 206 (December 1979):64-69.
- Underhill, Sarah Mollman, editor. *Stanley Tigerman Buildings and Projects 1966-1986*. New York: Rizzoli International Publications, Inc., 1989.
- "Weese Versus Mies." *Architectural Record* 157 (April 1975):83-90.
- Zotti, Ed. "Is There Life After Postmodernism?" *The Reader* (24 December 1982):9, 35.

Stanley Tigerman

Born: 20 September 1930, Chicago, Illinois

Military Service: United States Navy, 1950-1954

Education: Massachusetts Institute of Technology, 1948-1949
Institute of Design, 1949-1950
Yale University, B.Arch, 1960; M.Arch, 1961

Work: Keck & Keck, Architects, 1949-1950
Tigerman, Rudolph & Young, 1950
T. David Fitz-Gibbon, Norfolk, Virginia, 1952-1954
A.J. Del Bianco, 1954-1956
Milton Meyer Schwartz, 1956-1957
Skidmore, Owings & Merrill, 1957-1959
Paul M. Rudolph, 1959-1961
Harry Weese & Associates, 1962
Tigerman & Koglin, 1962-1964
Stanley Tigerman, Architect, 1964-1982
Tigerman, Fugman, McCurry, Architects, (now Tigerman McCurry, Architects), 1982-present

Teaching: University of Illinois, Chicago, Illinois, 1965-1971, 1980-1993
Archeworks, co-founder and director, 1994-present

Visiting Critic and Lecturer: Architectural Association, London, United Kingdom
Columbia University, New York City
Cooper-Union, New York City
Cornell University, Ithaca, New York
Harvard University, Cambridge, Massachusetts
Institute for Architecture and Urban Studies, New York City
Iowa State University, Ames, Iowa
Northwestern University, Evanston, Illinois
University of California Berkeley, California
University of Cincinnati, Ohio
University of Houston, Texas
University of Notre Dame, South Bend, Indiana
Washington University, St. Louis, Missouri
Yale University, New Haven, Connecticut

Selected Honors

and Awards: American Institute of Architects, various awards, 1970, 1974, 1975, 1984, 1987, 1991, 1992
American Institute of Architects, Chicago Chapter, various awards, 1971, 1973, 1975, 1977, 1978, 1979, 1981-1985, 1987, 1988, 1992
American Institute of Architects, Illinois State Council, various awards, 1976, 1977, 1978
Fellow, American Institute of Architects, 1973
American Academy in Rome, Architect-in-Residence, 1980
Alumni Arts Award, Yale University, 1985
Dean of Architecture Award (with Margaret McCurry), Chicago Design Sources and the Merchandise Mart, 1989
Hall of Fame, *Interior Design*, 1990
Illinois Academy of Fine Arts Award, 1992
American Jewish Committee Cultural Achievement Award, 1996

Selected

Exhibitions: "Chicago Architects," Cooper-Union, New York City, 1976; Time-Life Building, Chicago, Illinois, 1976
Venice Biennale, Venice, Italy, 1976, 1980
"Seven Chicago Architects," Richard Gray Gallery, Chicago, Illinois, 1977
"The Exquisite Corpse," Walter Kelly Gallery, Chicago, Illinois, 1977
"Chicago Architects Design," The Art Institute of Chicago, 1981
"New Chicago Architecture," Verona, Italy 1981; Graham Foundation, Chicago Illinois, 1982
"Revision of the Modern: Postmodern Architecture, 1960-1980," Deutsches Architektur, Frankfurt, Germany, 1985
"Stanley Tigerman: Recent Work," The Art Institute of Chicago, 1990

INDEX OF NAMES AND BUILDINGS

- Adrian, Dennis 156
 Agricultural College, Mymensingh, Pakistan 90-91
 Ahmed, Waquir 92, 94, 95
 Ainge, Gary 193
 Albers, Josef 34, 36
 Altoon, Ronald (Ron) 244
 Alinsky, Saul 71, 75
 Ameen, Farouk 99
 American Center, Paris, France 40-41
 Ando, Tadao 223
 Anselmini, Carol 211
 Anti-Cruelty Society, Chicago, Illinois 239, 250
 Anuszkiewicz, Richard (Dick) 36
 Archeworks 1, 89, 99-100, 136, 145-146, 202, 204-219
 Astor Tower, Chicago, Illinois 108

 Bacardi Building, Mexico City, Mexico 230
 Bach, Ira 100
 Baha'i Archives Center (project), Wilmette, Illinois 157
 Baird, Ellen (Bebe) 203-204
 Baird, Ida 91
 Bar-Kumar, Raj 244
 Barnes, Edward (Ed) 15, 16
 Barnstone, Howard 132
 Baskin, Sheldon (Shelly) 208
 Beeby, Thomas Hall (Tom) 13, 17, 22, 36, 69, 116, 120, 134, 139, 146-149, 151, 153-156, 158, 160-161, 164, 168, 179, 180, 183, 188-190, 192, 193, 195-98, 204, 212, 224, 251
 Beitler, Paul 245
 Bellow, Daniel (Dan) 147
 Benjamin, Susan 150
 Bess, Philip 193
 Bibiena brothers (Guiseppe and Antonio) 228
 Birkerts, Gunnar 132
 Blavatsky, Helena Petrovna 34
 Bloc, André 130
 Boardwalk Apartment Building, Chicago, Illinois 107, 121, 140
 Boissière, Olivier 131
 Boman, Thorleif 114
 Bonner, Darcy R. 190
 Booth, Laurence O. (Larry) 30, 64-65, 90, 104, 126, 136-138, 145-146, 148, 150, 154-156, 159, 160, 244, 247-248
 Brancati, John 136
 Branden, Nathaniel 7
 Brazier, Arthur 71, 86
 Breton, André 158
 Brooks, Cleanth 36
 Brown, Andrea Clark 221
 Brown, Andreason 213
 Brown, Roger (house), New Buffalo, Michigan 110-111
 Browne, Bliss 210
 Brownson, Jacques Calman (Jack) 16, 149
 Brubaker, William (Bill) 22
 Brueggemann, Robert (Bob) 68, 187
 Bryson, Bruce 21
 Bunshaft, Gordon 47, 48-49, 53
 Burnham, Daniel Hudson 80

 Camp Algonquin, Algonquin, Illinois 239, 250
 Camp Hoover, Yorkville, Illinois 239, 250
 Charnley, James (house), Chicago, Illinois 108
 Chermayeff, Ivan (son of Serge) 62, 195
 Chermayeff, Peter (son of Serge) 62
 Chermayeff, Serge 61-62, 82
 Chiat, Jay 223
 Chicago Children's Advocacy Center, Chicago, Illinois 239
 Clinton, Hillary 36
 Cohen, Stuart E. 91, 120, 134, 136-138, 143, 145, 146, 148, 150, 152, 156, 173, 179, 183-186, 220-224, 247
 Collens, Lewis (Lew) 212, 217
 Condit, Carl 137, 142, 145
 Coughlin, Charles E. 79
 Crabtree, Gordon 90, 104, 126
 Currie, Leonard (Len) 172, 178

Daisy House, Porter, Indiana 113, 114, 128
 Danes, Gibson 11
 Danforth, George 16, 144, 180
 Dart, Edward O. (Ed) 67, 69, 166
 Davis, Eric 187
 De Grazia, Victor 86
 Deam, Edward (Ed) 172, 177, 180, 189
 Del Bianco, A.J. 8, 38-41, 56, 59
 Dempsey, Mary 210
 Denise, René 27
 DeStefano, John 209
 Devon, Scott 202
 Diamant-Bérger, Renée 130
 Diamondstein, Barbaralee 2
 D.O.M. Corporate Headquarters (project), Bruehl, Germany 157
 Donatoni, Richard (Dick) 38
 Dougal, Terry 210
 Doyle, Deborah (Debbie) 161, 225, 248
 Driehaus, Richard H. 102
 Drier, Katherine 35
 Duchamp, Marcel 35
 Duff, John 212
 Durdin, James 132

 Eisenman, Peter 78-79, 82, 115-116, 119, 133, 143, 173-174, 176, 194, 201, 203, 218, 223, 226, 237, 238
 Eliason, Charles (house, project) 110
 Ellwood, Craig 12
 Elting, Winston 144
 Engman, Robert (Bob) 35
 Entenza, John 77-82, 84-86, 121, 125, 131, 132, 139, 164
 Executive House, Chicago, Illinois 8, 41
 Eyerman, Thomas (Tom) 50

 Falk, Suzanne (Susie) 94
 Favro, Diane G. 80
 Feather, Benjamin (Ben) 211
 Feldman, Roberta 207
 Fiat, Jerry 207
 Fielding, Randy 194
 Finney, Leon 71, 86
 First Wisconsin Bank, Milwaukee, Wisconsin 50

 Fitch, James Marston 191
 Fitz-Gibbon, T. David 31
 Floating Resort, aka Kingdom of Atlantis (project) 126
 Florian, Paul 44, 243
 Formal Generators of Style (project) 104, 124
 Foster, Norman 17, 195
 Frampton, Kenneth (Ken) 203
 Franklin, Richard (Richie) 88, 126
 Franzen, Ulrich 15, 16
 Freed, Hermine 141
 Freed, James Ingo (Jim) 82, 139, 140, 141, 149, 152-154, 160
 Freund, Peter 211
 Friedrichs, Edward (Ed) 211
 Frog Hollow, aka Harlow by the Lake (house), Berrien Springs, Michigan 110-112, 128
 Fugman, Robert (Bob) 161
 Fukuoka City (apartments), Kyushu, Japan 60

 Gadau, Lloyd 177, 181
 Gandhi, Mahatma 93
 Garofalo, Douglas A. (Doug) 101, 201, 204, 205, 207-209, 249
 Gateway Center, Chicago, Illinois 50
 Gehry, Frank 40, 51, 55, 79, 82, 115-116, 119, 131, 203
 Gelick, Michael (Mike) 198
 Getty Center, Brentwood, California 129
 Giamatti, Angelo Bartlett (Bart) 196-197
 Giedion, Sigfried 45, 53, 138, 142, 145
 Giurgola, Romaldo 143
 Glassman, Susan 147
 Goettsch, James (Jim) 161
 Goldberg, Bertrand (Bud) 69, 108, 142, 143, 166, 222-223, 236
 Goldsmith, Myron 16, 26, 46, 230
 Gonzalez, Joseph A. (Joe) 55, 109
 Grace, Peter 126
 Graham, Bruce J. 13, 22, 42-47, 48, 50-51, 54-55, 64, 92, 94-95, 102-103, 107-110, 175-176, 193, 245-246
 Graham, Jane 48, 194

Graham Foundation for Advanced
 Studies in the Fine Arts 35, 80, 143, 151,
 161, 163-164, 208, 216, 217, 247
 Graves, Michael 80, 116, 143, 176
 Gray, Richard 153, 156
 Greenberg, Allan 17, 116
 Greenwald, Bennet 26
 Greenwald, Herbert (Herb) 25-26
 Greenwald, Lynn 153
 Grinberg, Sara Topelson de 244
 Griswald, Whitney 55
 Gross, Steven 161
 Gropius, Walter 10, 16, 17, 127
 Gwathmey, Charles (Charlie) 17, 119, 143,
 176, 195-196, 198

 Habenicht, George (house), Nottingham
 Woods, Elburn, Illinois 64, 121, 123, 127,
 131
 Hadid, Zaha 23
 Haid, David (house), Evanston, Illinois
 230
 Hamilton, George Heard 35, 36
 Hammond, James Wright (Jim) 168
 Hammond & Roesch 179
 Hancock Center, Chicago, Illinois 51
 Hanson, Donald (Don) 178
 Harrington, Kevin 107
 Hartmann, John 91
 Hartmann, William (Bill) 45, 47, 193
 Hartray, Jack 46, 49, 57
 Hasbrouck, Marilyn 136
 Hatch, Thomas (Tom) 211
 Haverland, Michael (Mike) 208-209
 Hejduk, John 105, 107, 123, 134, 139, 141,
 143, 159, 181
 Herbert, Robert Lewis 107, 127
 Hill, Lewis (Lew) 66, 69, 70, 75
 Hitchcock, Henry-Russell 131
 Hodgetts, Craig 143
 Hoffman, Julius 156
 Hoffman, Rhona 220, 221
 Holabird, John A. 142
 Holl, Stephen 116
 Holland, B.C. (Bud) 35
 Hollander, Elizabeth (Liz) 70
 Hoops, John Christian 41
 Horn, Gerald (Jerry) 155, 161, 165

Hot Dog House, Harvard, Illinois 128
 Howard, Lucia 211
 Hull House, Chicago, Illinois 236
 Hunter, Carl 108
 Hurtt, Steven (Steve) 193
 Hutchins, Robert Maynard 213
 Huxtable, Ada Louise 140

 Illinois Institute of Technology, Crown
 Hall, Chicago, Illinois 229
 Ingraham, Catherine T. 201
 Inland City (project) 92, 105-106, 126, 128
 Inland Steel Building, Chicago, Illinois
 107-108
 Islam, Muzharul 89-91, 93-101

 Jacobs, Jane 53, 72-73, 74
 Jacobson, Hugh Newell 17
 Jackson, Jesse 71
 Jahn, Helmut 110, 120, 151, 154-155, 158,
 160, 165, 176, 207, 251
 Jaeger, Thomas (Tom) 172, 179, 181, 200,
 248
 Jencks, Charles (Charlie) 228-229
 Jenney, William LeBaron 138, 142
 Jinnah, Mohammed Ali 93
 Johnson, Fred 38
 Johnson, Philip 15, 16, 79, 81, 152, 223, 236
 Johnson, Ralph E. 22, 194, 238
 Jones, Gus 88
 Jones, John 9

 Kahn, Louis 15, 80, 82, 90, 127, 234
 Kamin, Blair 192, 249
 Kastel, Howard 160
 Keck, George Fred 8, 17-19, 23, 24, 26, 27-
 29, 56, 58, 59, 60, 67, 73-74, 111, 138, 142,
 166
 Keck, William (Bill) 16-18, 58, 67, 69
 Keegan, Ed 187, 192
 Keely, Hinman 181
 Kelly, Burnham 134
 Kennedy, Edward (Ted) 96
 Kennedy, John F. 134
 Kennedy, Robert 134
 Kerbis, Gertrude 42, 54
 Khan, Ayub 96

- Khan, Fazlur R. (Faz) 45, 51, 89, 92-93, 102-103, 126
 Khan, Yasmin (daughter of Fazlur) 103
 Khan, Liesl (wife of Fazlur) 92
 Khan, Yah Yah 96
 Kierkegaard, Soren Aabbye 34
 King, Martin Luther, Jr. 134
 Kings Cross (project), London, United Kingdom 55
 Kirschner, Judith Russi 203
 Klotz, Heinrich 233-234
 Knecht, Barbara 211
 Koenig, Pierre 131
 Koglin, Norman A. 1, 63, 64-65, 67, 70, 72, 85, 87, 123, 126
 Koolhaas, Rem 238
 Krone, Robert (Bob) 194
 Krueck, Ronald Adrian (Ron) 154, 155, 158, 185, 207, 238
 Kunstadter, Sigmund (house), Highland Park, Illinois 28
 Kupper, Gene 143

 Lafayette Park (project), Detroit, Michigan 107
 Lagrange, Lucien 68
 Lake Meadows, Chicago, Illinois 103
 Lambert, Phyllis 52
 Landahl, Gregory (Greg) 200-201
 Lebold, Donald (Don) 123
 Le Corbusier, Charles Edouard Jeanneret 27-28, 52, 73, 235
 Levin, Richard C. (Rick) 209
 Lewis, Benjamin (Ben) 245
 Library for the Blind, Chicago, Illinois 88, 250
 Lindenberger, Jim 18
 Linn, Gregg 201
 Little House in the Clouds (project) 157
 Longstreth, Richard 107
 Loop College (project), Chicago, Illinois 121
 Lorimer, Linda Koch 209
 Luckman, Sidney (Sid) 133
 Lumsden, Anthony J. (Tony) 143
 Lundy, Victor 16

 McCormick, Robert 25

 McCoy, Esther 131-132
 McCurry, Margaret I. (third wife of Stanley) 22, 23, 37, 49, 57, 58, 65, 69, 83-85, 98, 115, 120, 130, 137, 147, 154, 166-168, 184, 200-201, 240, 242, 245
 McCurry, Paul (father-in-law of Stanley) 22, 83-84
 McKim, Charles Follen 80
 Macsai, John 187
 Maddox, Eva L. 98, 100, 101, 130, 154, 201-202, 204, 206, 208-209, 214, 217-219, 233, 236, 248
 Magritte, René 159
 Maher, Philip B. 138, 142, 144
 Maeda, Jim 43
 Mangold, Robert (Bob) 36
 Manny, Carter H. 139, 162, 164
 Maremont, Arnold 85, 87
 Margerum, Roger 42
 Marks, Leo 128
 Meeks, Carroll Louis Vanderslice 11
 Mehaffey, Fred 132
 Meier, Richard 79, 115, 116, 119, 143, 183
 Merrill, John 52
 Mies van der Rohe, Ludwig 2, 10, 15, 17, 25, 26, 52, 59, 74, 83, 102, 107, 116, 117, 119, 136, 141, 142, 146, 152, 153, 166, 168, 180, 201, 229, 230, 231, 235, 250
 Millard, Peter 132
 Miller, Nory 140, 141-142, 156, 173
 Moholy-Nagy, Laszlo 27
 Monacelli, Gianfranco 136-137, 164, 191, 192, 238
 Mondrian, Piet 33-34
 Moore, Charles 56, 62, 63, 112-113, 223
 Moss, Eric Owen 194
 Murphy, Charles Francis 80
 Murphy, Charles, Jr. 35, 80
 Muschamp, Herbert 79
 Myhrum, Maglet 84

 Nagle, James L. (Jim) 30, 90, 104, 126, 139, 146, 149, 152, 154-156, 244, 247-248
 Nagursky, Bronislaw (Bronco) 133
 Naughton, Jack 200
 Neisser, Judith (Judy) 29, 57, 207
 Nelson, Maren 215
 Nereim, Anders 161

- Netsch, Dawn Clark 42
 Netsch, Walter A. 14, 41-50, 54-55, 64, 65,
 69, 103-109, 124, 127, 142-143, 222, 236
 Neumann, Hans 57
 Newhouse, Richard (Dick) 86
 Newhouse, Victoria 80
 Nicholson, Benjamin (Ben) 249
 Nicola, Robert (Bob) 200
 910-900 Lake Shore Drive, Chicago,
 Illinois 120
 Norfolk Museum of Arts and Sciences
 (aka Chrysler Museum of Art), Norfolk,
 Virginia 32
 Norgard, John 21
 Northern Baptist Theological Seminary,
 Lombard, Illinois 57
 Nun's Island Townhouses, Montreal,
 Canada 26

 Oats, Jocelyn 212
 Ounce of Prevention Center, Chicago,
 Illinois 240, 250
 Ouspensky, Piotr Demianovich 34
 Owings, Nathaniel (Nat) 51-52, 109

 Paepcke, Elizabeth (Pussy) 78
 Parrinello, Sal 153
 Pawlakowski, John 59
 Pei, Ioeh Ming 16, 128, 222, 236
 Pelli, Cesar 143, 151
 Pensacola Apartment Building, Chicago,
 Illinois 121
 Perry, Howard 132
 Piazza d'Italia Fountain, New Orleans,
 Louisiana 112
 Pickwick Plaza (project), Chicago, Illinois
 121
 Pickwick Village, Chicago, Illinois 121,
 123, 127, 131
 Poli, Joseph (Joe) 161
 Polshek, James (Jim) 17, 82
 Polytechnic Institute (Five), Barisal, Bogra,
 Pabna, Rangpur, Sylhet, Pakistan 91
 Pompidou Center, Paris, France 108
 Portoghesi, Paolo 228
 Post, George B. 80
 Prairie Avenue Courts, Chicago, Illinois
 73

 Pran, Peter C. 136-138, 140, 142, 161, 165
 Price, Bruce 138
 Prix, Wolf Dieter 203
 Promontory Apartments, Chicago, Illinois
 25

 Quinlen, Charles 21, 32

 Rackatansky, Mark 201
 Rahman, Mujibur 91
 Ranalli, George 15, 231
 Rand, Ayn 5-7
 Rapson, Ralph 29, 30
 Reyes, Benjamin (Ben) 44
 Richard Gray Gallery 136, 146, 153
 Richardson, Ambrose (Am) 192
 Roark, Howard 19
 Robertson, Donna 249
 Robertson, Jack 17
 Robertson, Ward 21
 Robinson, Sidney 193
 Rocah, Louis (Lou) 42, 54, 67, 177, 181
 Roesch, Peter 179
 Rogers, Richard 17
 Rose, Alan 31
 Rowe, Colin 134, 141, 184
 Rubin, Jerry 155
 Rudolph, Clarence 18, 24
 Rudolph, Paul 10-16, 22-24, 34, 36, 52-54,
 56, 62-63, 90-91, 121, 124, 127, 129-132,
 170, 173, 188, 197, 249
 Ruedi, Katarina 201, 249
 Russell, Beverly 204
 Ryder, Donald (Don) 42

 Saarinen, Eero 8, 15, 71
 St. Benedict's Abbey Church, Benet Lake,
 Wisconsin 106, 128
 Saliga, Pauline 150, 232
 Samuels, Nancy 64
 Schoenmaekers, Mathieu Hubertus
 Josephus 34
 Schroeder, Kenneth A. (Ken) 144, 148,
 155, 159, 161, 200
 Schulze, Franz 136-138, 140, 142, 144, 156,
 165
 Schwartz, Fred 38
 Schwartz, Milton M. 8, 39, 41, 42, 56, 59

- Schweikher, Paul 110-112, 138
 Scott, Stuart 51
 Scott Brown, Denise 116
 Scully, Vincent 35-37, 138, 234
 Segal, Gordon 211
 Skidmore, Louis 52
 Skidmore, Louis, Jr. 52-53
 Skidmore, Owings & Merrill (SOM) 9, 45-46, 49, 51, 55, 59, 63, 92, 109, 208
 Sklarek, Norma Merrick 80
 Smith, Adrian 55
 Smith, Sam 9
 Smith, Thomas Gordon 221
 Solomon, Richard Jay (Rick) 164, 193
 Somol, Robert 101, 201, 207-209
 Sorkin, Michael 115, 168
 Stern, Robert A.M. (Bob) 17, 51, 52, 79, 82, 115, 119, 128, 143, 176, 194
 Stirling, James (Jim) 12, 15
 Stone, Edward Durell (Ed) 71
 Sullivan, Louis H. 138, 142
 Summers, Gene 16, 149, 212
 Symbolic Museum (project) 158
 Syvertsen, John M. 69
- Tabor, Henry 77-78
 Tague, Robert Bruce (Bob) 18, 26-30, 62, 138, 142, 144
 Telleen, Melany 30, 167, 187
 Tigerman, Emma (mother of Stanley) 5, 8, 10, 33, 63
 Tigerman, JoAnn (second wife of Stanley) 22, 48, 87, 94, 97
 Tigerman, Judy (first wife of Stanley) 10
 Tigerman, Max (grandfather of Stanley) 5, 23, 34, 231
 Tigerman, Samuel (father of Stanley) 5, 10
 Train, Jack 69
 Travers, David 132
 Tupker, Hans 223
 Turnbull, William (Bill) 221
 2 Illinois Center, Chicago, Illinois 35
- Underhill, Sarah Mollman 122
 United States Air Force Academy, Colorado Springs, Colorado 42, 48-49
 United States Air Force Academy Chapel, Colorado Springs, Colorado 46, 105
- University of Illinois, Voorhees Center, Chicago, Illinois 207
 Urban Matrix (project) 126
- Valenti, Joe 39
 Valenti, Marge 39
 Valerio, Joseph (Joe) 238
 Venturi, Robert (Bob) 56, 112-113, 118, 223, 234
 Vinci, John 141
 Vollen Barn, Burlington, Wisconsin 128
 Vreeland, Timothy (Tim) 143
- Walter Kelly Gallery 158
 Ward, Robertson (Bob) 9
 Wardropper, Ian 215
 Weese, Benjamin Horace (Ben) 57, 67, 136-138, 145-146, 148, 150, 156, 164, 166, 221, 247
 Weese, Cynthia (Cindy) 69, 144, 155, 161, 166
 Weese, Harry Mohr 19, 48, 56-57, 61, 63, 69, 85, 139, 142-143, 166, 222, 236
 Weese, Kate Baldwin (Kitty) 57, 166
 Weinstein, Joan 25-26
 Weiss, Paul 36
 Weissbourd, Bernard (Barney) 26
 Welling, Harriet 78
 Wexler, Jerrold (Jerry) 41
 Whitaker, Richard (Dick) 202
 Whitney, Patrick 217
 Wierzbowski, Stephen 185, 247
 Williams, Todd 223
 Wilson, Frederick (Freddie) 187
 Wines, James (Jim) 131
 Wood, Elizabeth 73, 74
 Wood, James (Jim) 81
 Woodlawn Gardens, Chicago, Illinois 71, 74, 76, 85-88, 100
 Woollen, Evans 131
 Wong, Y.C. 132
 Wright, Frank Lloyd 15, 17, 19, 116-117, 127, 138, 142
 Wurster, William (Bill) 17
- Yequl, Fikret 80
 Young, Michael K. 18, 24
 Youngren, Ralph 41, 42, 46

Zand, Lily 205
Zeckendorf, William 57
Zimmerman, Bernard 132
Zipper Townhouses (project) 113
Zukowsky, John 19, 39, 68, 185, 202, 224
Zurcher, Suzette Morton 78