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China’s modern architectural education and practice took off in the period of the 1920s through the 1940s, and the École des Beaux-Arts, which traveled to China via the Chinese architects trained at the University of Pennsylvania (hereafter abbreviated as “Penn”), has remained an unfinished legacy ever since. Contrary to a common belief that resistance is “an inevitable part of acceptance” that ideas and theories must encounter when they travel to a new cultural environment, American Beaux-Arts sailed smoothly into the Chinese context in the early part of the twentieth century. This accidental encounter, in other words, did not arouse much cultural shock; the Other could be unexotic and unalien and was not necessarily different. In the case of the Beaux-Arts in twentieth-century China, it is the nuance of “mutual entanglement,” to borrow a term from Nicholas Thomas, between universal virtues and localities that deserves close scrutiny and theorization. As Thomas argues, “Derivative lingua franca have always offended those preoccupied with boundaries and authenticity, but they offer a resonant model for the uncontained transpositions and transcultural meanings which cultural inquiry must now deal with.”

This essay looks at the early-twentieth-century adoption of American Beaux-Arts in China and examines what its “turning and twisting,” or its “social life,” as Thomas puts it, manifests in the Chinese context. It focuses on the education and architectural works of Yang Tingbao (1901–1982). Yang was one of a group of fifteen or more Chinese architects trained at Penn in the first half of the twentieth century; he later became one of the most influential architects in twentieth-century China, and remained the spiritual leader of Chinese architectural education until his death in 1982. In the 1920s at Penn, Yang was a star pupil and a protégé of Paul Philippe Cret’s. However, neither Yang’s teaching nor his architectural work has been known in the West. Within China, in 1983, the China Architecture and Building Press published Yang Tingbao jianzhu sheji zuoping ji (Yang Tingbao, architectural works and projects), the first monograph on an individual architect in the history of China. Yang did not get a chance to see his monograph; he died just a few days before it was printed. This publication indicates, at least in China, a strong acknowledgment of Yang’s significant position in twentieth-century Chinese architecture.

The First School

China’s architectural education, in the sense of the formal Western university training system, began in the first half of the twentieth century. It was perhaps a historical accident that the Penn curriculum during the days of Cret in the 1920s began its profound and long-lasting influence in China as the first model of architectural education. But it was certainly not accidental that this model was a universal one derived from the École des Beaux-Arts.

The earliest Chinese students of architecture went to
schools in Japan, Europe, and the United States. They were led, in 1905, by Xu Shi’er and Xu Hongyu, who studied in Japan and England, respectively. Whether these two pioneers had any impact on modern architecture in China is still undocumented. The first noticeable Western-trained Chinese architect was Zhan Jun (1888–1990), who received his bachelor of architecture degree in 1914 from the University of Illinois. Between 1914 and 1923, Zhan worked at Tsinghua College in Beijing, assisting American architect Henry Murphy. In 1923, the college asked him to escort a group of Chinese students to America; he himself enrolled as a graduate student at Columbia University. Zhan returned to China in 1924 and established his own practice in Shanghai in 1925.

As part of the reparation China was paying to the United States for the Boxer Rebellion, Chinese students were sent to the U.S. to study in the early twentieth century. In the 1920s and 1930s, among all the active foreign-trained Chinese architects practicing in China, the majority were American-trained. According to the 1925 membership list of the first professional institute, the Society of Chinese Architects, over 60 percent of its members were American-trained and the most eminent were Penn-trained, major, well-established Chinese architectural practices, such as Jitai (Kwan, Chu & Yang) and Huagai (The Allied Architects) in east-central China, were all in the hands of Penn graduates. Besides Yang Tingbao and Chen Zhi, prominent Penn-trained architects included Zhu Bing (Pin Chu, B.Arch. 1922, M.Arch. 1923), Fan Wenzhao (Robert Lent Fan, B.Arch. 1922), Zhao Shen (Shen Chao, B.Arch., M.Arch. 1923), and Tong Jun (Chuins Tung, B.Arch., M.Arch. 1928). Their early works, unsurprisingly, were very Beaux-Arts; although reductionistic in ornament, they showed conscious attempts to incorporate ornamental “Chinese motifs.” The 1930s and 1940s saw substantial experiments in European Modernism undertaken by Western-trained Chinese architects, however, and Penn graduates were no exception, a point I will return to later.

The first architectural course in China was initiated by Japanese-trained Chinese architects. This Department of Architecture, affiliated with Guoli Suzhou Gongzhuan (National Suzhou Polytechnic), was established in 1923 in Suzhou in east-central China. A commercial city since the eleventh century, Suzhou played a key role in China’s industrial development as well as in the area of higher education. From the very beginning, the Department of Architecture was not included in the then reputable Dongwu University in Suzhou; rather, it was set up in a polytechnic as a three-year course. Liu Shiyi led this first, and short-lived, architectural course, which included the later eminent historian of Chinese architecture Liu Dunzhen.

Although the kind of architectural education received in Japan at the time was the universal European historicism and eclecticism, it is interesting to note that all the above pioneers were trained at the more practical Tokyo Polytechnic rather than at Tokyo Imperial University. Architecture, in other words, was seen as a system of technologies, not as a form of fine art. This idea was reinforced by the experience of practicing architecture in China in the early years; Liu Shiyi’s first job, after his return from Japan in 1920, was site supervision for a British architectural firm. When, in 1922, together with two other Tokyo Polytechnic graduates, Liu Shiyi and Liu Dunzhen established their own architectural practice—Huahai Jiangzhu Shiwhoso—in Shanghai, the architectural design scene in China was dominated by Western architects. Chinese architects were hired mostly for site supervision in order to mediate between Western architects and local contractors. The Tokyo Polytechnic curriculum was therefore modified to meet this need.

The Department of Architecture in Suzhou survived for four years. During this period, the teaching and curriculum were far from that found in a formal university system. The course was taught by the above-named young architects, who juggled their teaching with their practices in Shanghai. The course was practical, with an emphasis on building construction. For example, in 1924 there were no units in the curriculum dealing with perspective and architectural drawing. “Reinforced concrete” and “steel structure,” however, were solid and independent subjects. Design-related subjects were offered mainly in the third year, among a heavy load of seventeen subjects. Two Western languages, compulsory in the first two years, were considered necessary in order to deal with Western architects. Many subjects were taught in the Civil Engineering Department, and the history of architecture was not even taught in the first two years of the course. In short, the Department of Architecture in Suzhou provided a three-year training course in building technology and construction.

In October 1927, the architectural course of the National Suzhou Polytechnic was taken over by the No. 4 National Zhongshan University in the capital city, Nanjing, one of the most progressive universities in China. The famed, Cornell-trained young architect Lü Yanzhi was the first to be appointed dean of the Department of Architecture, but while he was busy realizing his winning entry for President Sun Yat-sen’s mausoleum in Nanjing, the appointment lapsed. Lü’s design for Sun Yat-san’s mausoleum showed a typical strategy of “turning and twisting” Western neoclassic composition and modern building technology into a “Chinese style.” It featured a long and grand staircase, not unlike
the early-eighteenth-century Spanish Steps in Rome, following the hill slope and leading to the major mausoleum hall on the top of the hill; a Chinese pailou and several building gates formed the spatial sequence, and Chinese roofs crowned reinforced concrete buildings. The use of an austere color palette, predominantly deep-blue-glazed tiles and white granite, is architecturally non-Chinese and unconventional, and it corresponds symbolically with the “white sun against blue sky” motif (qingtian bairi qi) of the flag of the first republic in China. The conscious attempt to transform Western neoclassicism into a “Chinese style” was not unprecedented; American architect Murphy, along with a few of his American colleagues in China, promoted and produced some modern university buildings in Nanjing with caricature Chinese roofs. Liu’s design for Sun Yat-sen’s mausoleum perhaps achieved, rather intuitively, a better Chinese proportion than that offered by his Western peers, but the strategy was the same. For Liu and other kindred Chinese architects, instead of adding Western neoclassical details to concrete-and-steel structures, it was logical to dress them in Chinese motifs. This “flexibility test” in practice foreshadowed an interesting reception of the American Beaux-Arts in China’s early architectural education.

After Liu was unable to accept the deanship, the position was offered to architect Liu Futai, who held a master of architecture degree from Oregon State University. The recruitment policy favored Western-trained, and in particular American-trained, architects, and most new faculty members were given associate professorships. Liu Dunzhen, one of the two staff members transferred from the National Suzhou Polytechnic, was hired as a lecturer. The founder of the Suzhou course, Liu Shiying, did not come to teach in Nanjing. Most of the remaining students from Suzhou were transferred to Nanjing under the new university system.

The university was renamed the National Central University in 1928, and was treated by the national government as the most significant university in Nanjing. Penn graduates Lu Shusheng and Tan Yuan soon joined the school and played key roles in teaching architectural design. The faculty members before the 1940s were, however, diverse in academic background. In addition to those mentioned above, there were also University of Glasgow graduate Li Zuhong and German-trained Bei Jimei. A reflection of this diversity was a balanced curriculum between design-related subjects and other technical courses.

The second architecture school in China was started at the National Northeastern University in Shenyang in 1928, only one year after the establishment of the first school in Nanjing. Its founder was Liang, and the majority of the first faculty members were Penn graduates, including Tong, Chen, Liang himself, and Liang’s wife, Lin. The school adopted the atelier system, with a curriculum, based on the Penn model, that put great emphasis on architectural design and charcoal drawing. This school was forced to close down in 1931 due to the war threat from Japan. In Shanghai during the 1930s and the 1940s—other than a few short-lived architectural schools, mainly established and taught by Penn-trained Chinese architects—the most notable school was the Department of Architecture at St. John’s University; established in 1942, it had a strong Bauhaus influence. In 1952, however, a few architectural schools in Shanghai were amalgamated into one Department of Architecture to be affiliated with Tongji University. Interestingly, some Nanjing graduates began to play important roles at Tongji’s Department of Architecture from the 1950s onward, and the Bauhaus influence in architectural education did not survive after the founding of the People’s Republic of China in 1949.

The triumph of the American Beaux-Arts in Chinese architectural education began in the 1940s against the above background. The Department of Architecture at the National Central University (hereafter referred to as the “Nanjing School”) reached its peak in the late 1930s. In 1937, during the war with Japan, the whole university was temporarily relocated to Chongqing, in southwestern China’s Sichuan province. The Japanese invasion in northern and east-central China caused many major architectural firms also to relocate in the interior of southwestern China. In the early 1940s, Yang, Tong, and two other renowned architects practicing in the region were invited, through the initiative of students, to join the faculty. This seems to reflect the students’ conscious admiration of the École des Beaux-Arts and its atelier system. By that time, Yang and Tong, two of the outstanding Penn graduates, were already well established as the country’s top architects.

The department moved back to Nanjing in 1946, immediately after World War II ended, and Yang and Tong remained as the two most eminent professors in the Nanjing School until their deaths in 1982 and 1983. Yang was dean of the Department of Architecture between 1949 and 1959, and from 1959 until 1982 he was the vice-president of the university. Yang was twice elected vice-president of the Union of International Architects (UIA) between 1957 and 1965. In later years, he was also appointed vice-governor of Jiangsu province. The university went through a number of name changes, and is now known as Southeast University. Due to the Penn graduates’ involvement in the Nanjing School and, in particular, Yang’s teaching and leadership beginning in the 1940s, the American Beaux-Arts took root in China.
The Nanjing School served as a prominent educational prototype of virtually all the other architectural programs later established in China, and thus, to some extent, it is the precursor of architectural practice in twentieth-century China.

Affinities
At the Nanjing School, the adoption of the Penn model of the École des Beaux-Arts was not painful, although one could perhaps have expected some sort of “resistance.” A curious affinity for the Penn model was already evident when the first-generation Chinese architects were trained in the West. Exemplary in this regard were those who studied under Cret in the 1920s.

Between 1921 and 1925, Yang studied architecture under Cret at Penn and happened to be in the same atelier with Louis Kahn. On 2 September 1925, a Philadelphia newspaper, *The Evening Bulletin*, included Yang’s story. The article, titled “Chinese Student Gets High Honor,” quoted architecture dean Warren Laird’s description of the twenty-three-year-old Yang as “one of the most brilliant students there. . . . He has won more individual prizes for his drawings than any other student in many years.”

At Yang’s graduation ceremony in 1925, Cret asked his protégé to stay on and work for him in his practice, and Yang spent a year in Cret’s office. Before he returned to China, he took the expected Grand Tour of Europe to complete the last part of his architectural education. Unlike Kahn, who spent a full year in Europe, Yang’s tour was hasty; he spent only a few months crossing the entire continent while documenting historical buildings with his skillful sketches and watercolors. This finale was a rather symbolic rite of passage of Yang’s Beaux-Arts training, and it did not seem to have any obvious effect on his design and teaching after he returned to China; it was his Penn education that had a profound impact on his career both as architect and teacher.

Even Yang himself lost track of the number of prizes he won while at Penn, but, judging from his two student projects published in John Harbeson’s *The Study of Architectural Design*, one can easily imagine his remarkable success.20 Harbeson praised Yang’s First Prize and First Medal Class A Problem project, “A Municipal Market,” remarking that, in both the plan and elevation, the “restaurant” and the “market” are “unmistakably expressed” (Figures 1, 2). Though not an inventive design, it precisely illustrates what the Penn Beaux-Arts model is about: “The symmetrical axial plan ensures clarity in the arrangement of the program—several indoor markets (meat, fish, vegetable, and grocery), an outdoor flower market, and a restaurant. What Harbeson really appreciated was the successful achievement of a hierarchy in designing the program. As he said so succinctly, commenting on the importance of the parti in this exercise, “The program must be solved.”21 Although eclectic in terms of the elevation, the restaurant’s Spanish-style roof cleverly corresponds with the double-eaved roof of the market building, which, in the meantime, allows extra skylights between the two eaves for the deep and high indoor market.22 Yang’s design, and Harbeson’s appraisal, clearly indicate that skillfulness and sophistication within a common parameter are highly valued in the Beaux-Arts method.

In fact, most Chinese students did well at Penn in that period. Zhu was the first Chinese architectural student there; he received the AIA Award when he graduated in 1922 with a bachelor of architecture degree. Although it took him four years (the longest among all the Chinese students) to complete the degree, his brilliant performance laid an auspicious foundation for his Chinese followers. After Zhu, most Chinese students received exemptions for some related courses, which they did instead in Beijing’s Tsinghua College. Hence they were able to complete both the bachelor’s and master’s degrees in about three years. Chen, Liang, and Tong also were award-winners. Many of these Chinese architects, including Liang’s wife, Lin, served as teaching assistants and instructors while they were still students.

Chinese students, typically, drew beautifully. Yang was already a brilliant watercolor painter while a student at Penn. When he published his sketches and watercolors for the first time in the early 1980s, he emotionally recalled his watercolor teacher, George Dawson.23 One of the reasons that Yang and other Chinese architectural students experienced little culture shock may be the affinity that exists between the Chinese artisan tradition and the methodology of the École des Beaux-Arts training: Traditional Chinese art is often highly structured. Invention of unprecedented styles by individual artists of genius is rarely encouraged. In fact, any form of art, from calligraphy and painting to classical poetry, is practiced and reproduced within a strict set of parameters. For example, to be a good calligrapher requires many years of intelligent copying of a few commonly recognized masters’ styles. During the process of imitating, no analysis is necessary and reasons underlying “good taste” or “pleasing aesthetics” are never explained by teachers. This often appears as a traditional master-pupil relationship, wherein the master is not supposed to be questioned. The belief is that a talented individual will eventually be enlightened and will then begin to develop his or her own style. Excellence comprises, on the one hand, skillfulness and virtuosity in relation to the existing parameter and, on the other hand, innovation indicated by a clever recomposition or a
subtle transformation of that parameter. It is this nuance that is highly regarded. So the notion of art in this context is perhaps close to the artifact in an anthropological sense, and thus the artist is a craftsman.

The emphasis on craft virtuosity, rather than on individual artistic identity, is not at the expense of creativity and imagination. Paraphrasing Joseph Conrad, Paul Hirst sees craft as “a mixture of skill and discipline, creativity and honour.” To achieve craft virtuosity, Conrad tells us, is to push “your skill with attention to the most delicate shades of excellence . . . . But there is something beyond—a higher point, a subtle and unmistakable touch of love and pride beyond mere skill; almost an inspiration which gives to all work that finish which is almost art—which is art.” Like the learning of Chinese calligraphy, Beaux-Arts training demands a long apprenticeship and it acknowledges the work that goes into the craft, which is a necessary and vital step for going beyond the skill.
The key method of the École, or more precisely what was preached by Cret at Penn, is summarized by Harbeson: “Design is not concerned primarily with ornamentation or detail, but with making an arrangement that will satisfy the practical requirements, with the composition of elements, with the proportion of masses, with the arrangement and disposition of openings, etc., and with producing a building of pleasing appearance.” This could be a rather appropriate way of describing Chinese calligraphy. It is also what Yang practiced in his teaching and architectural work after he returned to China.

Western architecture in China can readily be traced back to the eighteenth century; by the early twentieth century, it was no longer exotic. It may be that the accidental affinity between the Chinese artisan mentality and the École method also contributed to the astonishingly smooth and rapid adoption of the American Beaux-Arts at the Nanjing School. During the 1930s and 1940s, the first twenty years, the foreign model of the École des Beaux-Arts was never questioned by the students. Architects trained during that period remember their student days as highly enjoyable, despite the tough physical conditions, and the atelier masters as highly respected. Many Nanjing School graduates recall that during the studio sessions Yang was always held in awe as he carefully amended students’ plans on a piece of tracing paper. Evidently the École’s atelier system echoed the traditional Chinese master-pupil relationship. It also seemed natural at that time that an architect, or a Chinese architect in this context, should be trained in this way. The teachers’ attitude toward styles—or the appearance of buildings, to be precise—was eclectic and rather relaxed. Chinese was ever an issue, the elevation could be “dressed” with Chinese motifs. For example, in a studio project of an observatory design, the First Mention, Placed was given to a scheme with careful consideration of Chinese motifs in elevation. One architect recalls that in the early 1930s a variety of styles, such as Spanish, modernist, Cubist, Renaissance, and French vernacular, were chosen by students for different purposes.

This eclectic attitude may seem superficial. Regardless of style, the expressions used at that time to discuss elevation, as well as the entire project, were universally abstract and included harmonious proportion, balance of masses, contrast between solidity and volume, coordination of vertical and horizontal lines, shadow effect, color, and texture. Most of these terms could easily be applied to the connoisseurship of traditional Chinese calligraphy, poems, and paintings. A deeper meaning, however, lies in what Cret terms a “complete liberalism.” At the École, pupils were treated as individuals; hence they had the right to choose their masters and to choose their artistic manners. Professors, of course, had very different ideas. If École training was not about style or any specific aesthetic taste, according to Cret, it was concerned with method. In his words, it embodied “the science of design.” Although there was a Beaux-Arts formal language, a building should not be subordinate to it. A dialectic relationship showed “respect for the program and the research of a special character proper for each kind of building.”

The Cret method has been clearly and astutely summarized by Rykwert:

Cret had brought with him a revisionist approach to the Parisian training, as he had been a star pupil in one of the more “advanced” Paris ateliers of the École des Beaux-Arts, and his teaching was therefore surprisingly free of the historicism prevalent in American schools. He concentrated on the virtues of the plan as the generating form, on the power of proportion, on humility before the builder’s task.

Interestingly, this “revisionist” approach was already evident in Yang’s Class A Project at Penn, “Pencil Study for a Crematory” (Figures 3, 4). Harbeson commented that a few columns of the existing elevation were changed from Ionic to Doric to improve the aspect significantly, but it is no surprise that he did not elaborate what the “aspect” is. Harbeson probably meant that the Doric order is more suitable for the theme of a crematorium. Of greater relevance is that these pencil studies, as Harbeson noted beneath Yang’s drawings, were made on a heavy paper and could stand a great amount of changing. Quite literally, “pencil study” in Penn’s Beaux-Arts training aimed to teach students the necessity for revision in architectural design. The fact that Yang left a few Ionic orders unchanged shows his understanding of this Beaux-Arts cultivation. Yang’s later keen method of teaching—revising a student’s design by tracing and redrawing on top of it—can be seen as an affirmation of the Beaux-Arts method.

Embodied in the master-pupil relationship, the affinity between the Chinese artisan tradition and the Beaux-Arts method in the process of cultivation and revision is surely more than a similar mode of imparting knowledge and a desired ability to make a judgment on craft virtuosity. A deeper affinity possibly lies in spatial organization. As at the École, the primary concern of the design teaching at the early Nanjing School was the plan. Surprisingly, given the strong nationalistic atmosphere in the first two decades of the Nanjing School (due to the Japanese invasion between 1937 and 1945 and the founding of the People’s Republic of China in 1949), the Chinese nature of a plan was not even an
issue. A formal affinity between Chinese architecture and that of the École des Beaux-Arts existed in the axial arrangement of the plan, and hence of the space. Arthur Drexler, although employing the ambiguous term “the Orient,” pointed out this interesting affinity: “The device of intersecting linear masses that change directional emphasis from level to level, with varying degrees of architectural incident at key points of intersection, is an École interpretation that has greater affinities with the temple and palace architecture of the Orient than with Rome.”

One may suppose that the Beaux-Arts design method of axial planning was naturally accepted by Chinese architects as a universal architectural parameter, since it did not invoke anything spatially alien or overwhelming. In his early years of teaching, Yang was remembered by the fact that he spoke very little; he preferred to trace and amend students’ drawings, and could achieve axial clarity in plan, often in minutes.

The affinities also extended to techniques. The emphasis on ink rendering, the use of a Chinese brush, the process of grinding India ink (it is in fact Chinese ink) were all very familiar. In the final rendu, good professors always had magical abilities to turn a student’s messy rendering into a pretty picture, often by adding, with their masterful strokes, lovely trees and people. Yang enjoyed doing this.

When the author started his architectural training in 1982 at the Southeast University, shortly before Yang’s death, nothing much had changed, except that the study of Vignola’s orders had been replaced by historical Chinese architectural compositions (Figure 5). This change occurred between the 1940s and 1950s in the Nanjing School, when Liang and Liu produced measured drawings of China’s historical buildings. The first problem in 1982, which was perhaps equivalent to the Penn analytique in the 1920s, was an ink rendering study of a historical Chinese architecture.
composition. In the arrangement, the two buildings were forcefully juxtaposed: the foreground stone tower is a Buddhist structure dated 937–975, and the background temple is a grand timber building dated 1023–1032. Although the ornamental details were eliminated and there was no analytical involved in the process, the study was more than merely an exercise in ink rendering. The choice of this type of composition was a conscious transformation from Western classics to Chinese traditions. The change of content merely ensured that the cultivation was about a “Chinese aesthetic”; the methodology remained Beaux-Arts.

Transformations

As in the field of education, transformations of the Beaux-Arts into Chinese architectural practice were smooth and impressive, both in quality and quantity. From 1927 to 1948, Yang designed eighty-six projects and realized most of them. The majority were public and institutional buildings. Between 1949 and 1982, although he devoted most of his time to teaching, Yang still managed to design and participate in twenty-six projects. By the time his Penn contemporary Louis Kahn established his own practice in 1935 and begun work on his first independent project, the Ahavath Israel Congregation, Yang had already restored some major historical monuments in Beijing, including the famous Temple of Heaven, and had completed over thirty large-scale public buildings, which included banks, universities, hospitals, and railway stations.

After his return to China in 1927, Yang joined the well-established Jitai Shiwusu as the principal design architect (its English name was initially Kwan, Chu & Co Architects & Engineers, and later, when Yang joined the firm, it became Kwan, Chu & Yang). Yang’s first project was a major railway station of about 7,000 square meters for Shenyang City in northern China. The first impression of this building—Beaux-Arts in its symmetrical axial plan and elevation composition—may seem unsurprising (Figures 6–8). Yang had initially proposed a European modernist building, but the railway officials as well as his architect colleagues all argued for a Western classical design that recalled an old neoclassical railway station in Beijing. As a compromise, Yang gave them a touch of Western ornamentation while maintaining a clean-cut simplicity. The power of the proportions indicated his extraordinary confidence as an architect. This building is Yang’s first successful “flexibility test” of his Beaux-Arts training. Without using classical orders and colonnades, the concourse space is grand, well lit, and, most important, open due to its steel-arch structure. The ticket windows, waiting rooms, and other facilities are housed in three-story flat-roof buildings that are tied together by the ground-level verandas, and these in turn surround the concourse symmetrically. The flat-roof components are dressed with Western eave details and gables, and the modern grand concourse is skillfully built into the overall massing as if the arched space grew out of the flat podiums. This integrity is further enhanced by a vertical compositional theme.

The nuances in Yang’s first Beaux-Arts building in China can be read on two levels: first, there is a physical tension between the classical elevation and the modern structural space; and, second, instead of creating a regional style, the station caters to China’s voracious appetite for things Western. In this sense, Yang’s Beaux-Arts revisionism is one of both matter and manner. The question is whether the process of adapting the Beaux-Arts method to a specific locality creates uniqueness.

At the time he designed the Shenyang station, Yang had
worked for about one year at Cret’s office in Philadelphia, and he had little practical experience. One may well question his capacity to manage a design of such scale and significance at the age of twenty-six. The success is perhaps due to another accidental affinity where the architect’s “humility before the builder’s task” (in Rykwert’s words) corresponded with the respect the builders held for the architect. It is well known that premodern Chinese architectural “designers” (literati or officials) drew with words, intensifying the collaboration between the architect and the builder. According to Alberto Pérez-Gómez, it is a modern belief that the architect can direct the builder’s series of operations through working drawings or precise detail designs. In so doing, the architect is no longer involved in the making of a building with its builder.39 At the École des Beaux-Arts, architectural design was an academic matter, and therefore architects did not have to pretend to know everything in terms of the technicalities of the actual building; there would be a natural collaboration between architects and builders. Yang had already learned this in Cret’s office; in 1925/26, he worked mainly on detail designs and construction drawings for a few major projects, notably the
Detroit Institute of Arts. Fifty years later, Yang admitted that, although Cret requested him to examine carefully the nature of each material and to use it in the most appropriate place in a building, he did not gain much construction knowledge as a student at Penn. After visiting an iron-gate manufacturer in Philadelphia, Yang concluded that detail design required collaboration with skillful builders and craftsmen.40

Traditional Chinese builders and craftsmen tackled all the tasks, from design to construction.41 Within the conventional parameters of building techniques and prototypes, however, the literati played an important role in design by creating narratives for the buildings. Chinese gardens from the Ming (1368–1644) and Qing (1644–1912) dynasties are good examples. The creation of a garden is described in detail in the celebrated eighteenth-century Chinese novel Hong-loumeng (Dream of the Red Chamber). The buildings of the garden Daguan yuan were commissioned to the craftsman-builder Shan Ziyi; Shan built the garden according to the owner’s brief but within the conventions—that is, the existing parameters for composing the essential garden elements: pavilions, covered walkways, artificial lakes, bridges, hills, rockeries, and plants. The process of making the garden, however, was not completed until one of the owners, Jia Zhen, a typically aristocratic literati official, took his kindred spirits and his son Jia Baoyu, a student of Chinese classics, on a walk through the entire garden to name each component with poems. In so doing, the spatial sequence was articulated through familiar literary narratives. Once the naming was finished, the names and poems would be engraved into rockeries, bridges, and horizontal and vertical plaques hanging on the buildings. In reality, literati were often employed by merchant patrons to design, and the practices of designing and building were intertwined. A garden was a result of collaboration among literati, owners, craftsman-builders, horticulturists, and others. 42

Yang’s revisionist position was clear in his first project. His concern was not with “styles.” He was eclectic in the sense that he could dress a building in different manners, but he would never compromise the virtues of the plan or the power of proportion. He seemed able to distinguish, on the one hand, the matter of taste or aesthetics and, on the other hand, the virtue of architecture in terms of the program. Yang’s primary interest in architectural design was ultimately the essence of Cret’s Beaux-Arts teaching: the importance of a beautiful plan, which, like a beautiful book, is beautiful by what you can read in it.43 Yang was most concerned with pleasing proportion and the fit between the inhabitants and the spatial disposition of a building, hence beauty and space. This mentality stems from a “professionalism” where the virtues of a craft are the ultimate goal rather than authorship or artistic identity. Therefore, his transformation in the Chinese context involved only nuances. They were subtle but not without power.

The Dahua Cinema in Nanjing, completed in 1935, appears as a work of intentional transformation and maturity (Figures 9–11). This 1,070-seat cinema is a clean and modest Art Deco building from the outside, while the interior is intensely designed with splendid “Chinese Deco.” Regardless of vagaries of taste in its ornamentation, the building has been in service for over sixty years as a powerful urban footprint that bridges the streetfront to the deep interior. The axial planning ensures a simple and smooth circulation of both leisure and emergency movements. The theatrical double-volume lobby is complemented by Yang’s “axis complex,” where the rich spatial layers—corridors, rooms, mezzanine balconies, columns, and the “grand staircase”—form what the architect called the “interest center,” which is the invisible soul of the lobby space.44 Given that Yang wrote very little, surprisingly he once theorized on the meaning of “architectural axis”: that it is both a concept and a method. Yang continued to give more evidence—from bodies and plants to machines and societies—of the axis as both anthropomorphic and conceptual. He emphasized, however, that architectural axis is not only three-dimensional, since it also involves a time factor related to movement; architectural axis generates “memories” and “imaginations,” thus it is a “mental axis.”45 Yang’s interpretation of the Beaux-Arts axis finds its affinity in Frank Lloyd Wright’s obsession with the Chinese appreciation of the virtue of space—a “usefulness” created by “emptiness.” In 1919 in Beijing, Wright became acquainted with the Oxford-educated Chinese scholar Gu Hongming, who translated the Chinese philosopher Laozi’s (571–471 B.C.) Daode jing into English.46 Daode jing occupied Wright’s mind, and he made Laozi’s “spatial theory” a popular architectural idiom in the twentieth century:

Thirty spokes are made one by holes in a hub
By vacancies joining them for a wheel’s use;
The use of clay in moulding pitchers
Comes from the hollow of its absence;
Doors, windows, in a house,
Are used for their emptiness:
Thus we are helped by what is not
To use what is.47

Accidental cultural encounters continued to emerge like a chain reaction: sometime between 1944 and 1945, Yang vis-
Wright and stayed with him at his Taliesin Spring Green in Wisconsin; they again talked about *Daode jing*.48

Dahua Cinema’s double faces—“inside Chinese ornamentation and outside Art Deco façade”—seem to pose a literal cultural juxtaposition, if not an entanglement. In early-twentieth-century northern China, a typical residential building consisted of a square courtyard enclosed by two- to three-story timber houses connected by open corridors. While the street façades were mostly Western style, Chinese ornamentation was adopted inside.49 Yang’s design echoes this residential trend. But, significantly, it is an intricate architectural representation of China’s “occidentalism” at the turn of the twentieth century: a move from the straight consumption of the West, enacted in Yang’s railway station, to a more complicated synthesis. Although students under Cret were encouraged to freely use architectural styles from different cultures, Yang’s Dahua Cinema is not merely a play of different styles and ornamentations.50 Westernization, in early-twentieth-century China, was inevitable and had already occurred at every level, from clothes to the political
system. This process did not proceed without intellectual debate. An important guiding voice, since the turn of the twentieth century, was the *tyiong* idea advocated by Liang Qichao.\(^5\) *Tyiong* (more fully expressed in Chinese as *Zhongxue wei ti*, *xixue wei yong*) suggests that Chinese learning should be the essence, while Western learning is good only for utility. Seen in the context of intense cross-cultural fermentation, the “double-face” of Yang’s Beaux-Arts in China displays a complex hybridization. Curiously, the columns in the lobby, painted with Chinese patterns, are neither Chinese nor Western classical orders. The capitals are based on those of the Egyptian Temple of Isis on the Island of Philae (332 B.C.–first century A.D.).

If there is any surprise in Yang’s oeuvre, it is the Beijing Peace Hotel (1951–1953), which was a shock when it first appeared (Figures 12–15). For those who were used to Yang’s work, this building was bare and modernist. A careful reading of its plan, however, reveals Yang’s subtle transformation to relate to a specific context. On the one hand, the asymmetrical and diagonal composition was determined by the three existing trees and an ancient well. A portion of an old courtyard house and a new wall were used to form an enclosed open space in front of the hotel that was intended to echo Beijing’s urban pattern of courtyard houses. On the other hand, one can safely assume that the plan, although asymmetrical, was worked out according to axiality.

The Beijing Peace Hotel reifies Yang’s further elaboration of the Beaux-Arts and its affinities with historical Chinese architecture. In Chinese temples and gardens, Yang points out, the spatial axis can literally be turned, twisted, and even slanted. The axis can be felt only if it is defined by buildings and by the making of the ground, or the site. In so doing, the *shi* (spatial propensity) can be created by the use of axis. Yang criticized Lü’s Sun Yat-sen mausoleum, and some classical examples in Western architecture, such as the Palais de Versailles, as having a “what you see is what you get” spatial sequence caused by using straightforward axes: the *shi* was not spatially “collected.”\(^5\) In contrast, the ground level of the Beijing Peace Hotel was a complex combination of axes for each spatial “interest center,” articulated by turn-

---

**Figure 11** Yang, Dahua Cinema, ground-floor plan, from Yang Tingbao jianzhu sheji zuoping ji, 96.

Key: 1. Lobby, 2. Ticket windows, 3. Exit corridor, 4. Plant rooms
ing and twisting axes. Yang’s discovery of the axial complexity in Chinese architecture and his sophisticated transformation of it were not incidental; Harbeson, in The Study of Architectural Design, devoted an entire section to asymmetrical plans and the significance of the program and site specificity.53

As early as the 1930s, Yang’s Penn colleagues Tong, Zhao, and Chen, dealing with more entrepreneurial clients at the time, had begun their essays in modern architecture. Their experiments stopped after the founding of the People’s Republic in 1949. Although Yang did a few reductive Art Deco buildings, he evidently had no chance to do a complete modern building before 1949. Because his firm’s clientele were mainly government officials, cultural images were often requested, be they Western or Chinese. The Beijing Peace Hotel was initially designed as a local hotel; halfway through construction, the government decided to use it to cater to the Asia-Pacific Regions Conference on Peace. Yang changed the design in order to have the building completed in fifty days, and he believed that a modernist building made the construction easier and faster.

The modernist look of the Beijing Peace Hotel had an interesting sociopolitical life. In the early 1950s, the Chinese classical revival was in vogue, and Yang had great difficulty in getting approval from the city authorities. After its completion, the efficient construction process and the modest budget were praised by the Premier Zhou Enlai. This building, to some extent, became a precedent for the government building policy for the next three decades in China, which was to be “functional, economical, and aesthetically pleasing whenever possible.” Yang built very little during the 1960s and 1970s. Unlike many of the high-profile intellectuals and professionals of his generation, he was not prosecuted during the Cultural Revolution (1966–1976). His distance from the cultural upheaval was strategic: he did what architecture he could and was able to resume some of his official positions in the late 1970s before the revolution ended. Yang’s charisma ensured the recovery of China’s architectural education after an almost decade-long suspension, and carried the Beaux-Arts method on into the late-twentieth-century China.54

Yang’s architectural works, as well as his teaching, show a unique interplay between “universal virtues” and
localities. Yang was never obliged to express regionalism or individual identity. He enjoyed a reputation as a guru both in his teaching and in his practice; it was the reputation of a master artisan who knew his work and did it well. If Yang transformed anything through his craft, he did it half-knowingly—through “habitus,” as Pierre Bourdieu might term it.³

Figure 13 Yang, Peace Hotel, typical guest room floor plan, from Yang Tingbao jianzhu sheji zuoping ji, 182.
Key: 1. Guest rooms, 2. Bathroom, 3. Floor service desk

Figure 14 Yang, Peace Hotel, ground-floor plan, from Yang Tingbao jianzhu sheji zuoping ji, 182.

“Boy Dislikes Rice”
The long-lasting impact of the Beaux-Arts on architectural education and practice in China has been supported and nourished by some deep-rooted Chinese artisan traditions. The Beaux-Arts, from its early encounters to its later transformations, has corresponded to these traditions, which include the process of cultivation in producing and appreciating a craft, axial planning, and a natural
Figure 15 Yang, Peace Hotel, aerial view of overall complex, redrawn by Xing Ruan, based on Yang and Qi, eds., Yang Tingbao tan jianzhu (Beijing, 1991), 2

collaboration between architects and builders. Although these traditions all seem to concern skills and techniques, their ultimate goal was to achieve a socially justified architectural meaning.

The previously mentioned news story, “Chinese Student Gets High Honor” in Philadelphia’s Evening Bulletin, had a rather amusing subtitle: “Boy Dislikes Rice.” Yang was reported to have told Americans that rice was not his favorite diet: “The American idea that rice is the chief food of the Chinese is wrong. Many eat it in the districts most visited by the American tourists, but in the province of Honan [Henan], where I lived, rice is eaten very little.” Yang was certainly willing to identify more affinities than differences between the two cultures. Yang’s complaint about an American impression of the Chinese poses a question that is still timely after three-quarters of a century: Do others have to be different? Half-knowingly, Yang made his choice. The boy who disliked rice had proved, through his teaching and practice of the American Beaux-Arts in twentieth-century China, that in architecture there are universal virtues that are worth pursuing.

The history of Chinese architectural education, and especially of Yang’s practice in twentieth-century China, has indicated identifying affinities rather than differences between two cultural frames. Any intelligible critique of modern and contemporary Chinese architecture must dwell on an understanding of this legacy of the Beaux-Arts that traveled via Penn to China. Instead of overemphasizing cultural differences and regionalism, a more universal model of architectural knowledge should be accepted in order to
identify the nuances produced when the universal encounters the local. Never an either/or matter, cultural affinity and difference are often intertwined to generate new directions and, ultimately, cultural renewals. In the case of Beaux-Arts in twentieth-century Chinese architecture, the entanglement is between a universally recognized "formal/spatial syntax" and its "social life." The syntax may be judged in relation to Jacques-Nicolas-Louis Durand's "formal language," where economy and efficiency were the very essence of the design. The Beaux-Arts concern for the building program emphasized this point. Harbeson, for example, compared the first-medal and the second-medal schemes of "A Shopping Center" design in terms of the economy of their circulation spaces. Most importantly, the Beaux-Arts approach concerned the "character" of a building. The "complete liberalism," in Cret's words, was a flexibility that allowed the Beaux-Arts syntax to be contextualized by its adapted localities—that is, its social life. A building, inevitably, becomes a metaphor of this process of entanglement. This essay has attempted to demonstrate an analogous model of critique in which, as Thomas has summarized it, "we will always be led away from the artifact, and then perhaps back to it, in a succession of movements and speculations around implicit effects and meanings."
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