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The book you hold in your hands evolved from a debate-platform, the Holcim Forum for Sustainable Construction on Urban Transformation, which took place in 2007 at Tongji University in Shanghai, China. For three days more than 250 professionals from over 40 countries — architects, urban planners, engineers, scholars, representatives from business and governments — met in working groups and for panel sessions to discuss the challenges cities face today in respect to urban change. The Forum was the second international symposium for both academics and practitioners hosted by the Swiss-based Holcim Foundation for Sustainable Construction to encourage a dialog on the future of the built environment. The first forum addressing the issue of basic needs took place at the Swiss Federal Institute of Technology (ETH Zurich), Switzerland, in 2004. Continuing the three-year cycle, the next Forum will be held in 2010.

Dedicated to the topic of Urban Transformation, it seems only fitting that the book would also undergo a good deal of transformation in the process of its making. Thus, this publication does not reproduce the conference literally, but develops it further. In addition to a selection of the best papers and keynote lectures given at the Forum in Shanghai the book also features a number of additional contributions by experts whom we have specially invited to contribute to the publication. The structure of the book has evolved out of the Forum's program, which was divided into five thematic working groups focusing on various phenotypes of urbanism today: green, touristic, informal, temporary, normative. Finally, we added a sixth chapter dedicated to the topic of public and private, as it turned out to be one of the most pertinent themes of many contributions.

Indeed, if there was a recurrent theme running through it all, then it was the collective awareness of the need to elevate the discourse of urbanism to match and catch the myriad of expressions materialized in the city today. After the failure of the big urban narrative of Modernism — which had attempted to subject urban realities worldwide to the reductive model of the contemporary city in the wake of CIAM — and, likewise, after the failure of Postmodernism to retrodate the present city to a past that never existed by reverting to past urban typologies, we have finally come to understand that any urban discourse has to first and foremost embrace the city as a multitude of conditions that do not (and don’t have to) conform to one universal model. The end of the grand narrative has enabled us to go beyond the phantom pain of the disappearance of urbanism as a profession — as suggested by Rem Koolhaas — and embrace the city as it is experienced from outside the professional realm. For clearly, the very notion of urban is arguably one of the hot topics of contemporary culture; it has become the synonym of cool and serves as a Zeitgeist indicator of lifestyle, music, food, fashion, and design. Yet precisely what urban means in regard to urbanism and the city has become increasingly blurred. Depending on specific geographic, climatic, economic, and cultural conditions, there are many, and often radically conflicting implications of urban developments. The hyper-dense megalopolis coexists with endless sprawl; traditional street life exists side by side with massive web traffic; the hardware of architecture is augmented by the software of the event; high-speed urbanism in China happens simultaneously with the phenomenon of shrinking cities and the slow dying-out of small towns in the highly industrialized developed countries. Even the very idea of the city as the result of planning has been deeply questioned by the roaring surge of informal favela-style housing settlements, which represent the type of urban condition that more than half of the world’s population today calls their home. As opposed to the colonial era of the 19th century, the term urban today no

---

longer indexes a normative cultural concept – such as expressed, for instance, in the European City – but represents a cosmos of extremely varied notions determined by geographical, cultural, and individual preferences. Tell me what is urban for you and I can tell you who you are. Hence, if we want to get a grip on what is urban today, we have to capture it in all its disguises, gradations, and transformations occurring simultaneously on a global scale. This is exactly what this book is about. Its contributors take us on a global dérive to discover emerging urban conditions in very different places ranging from global cities that we all know about and have been to as well as remote areas we may have heard of but where we are unlikely to ever set foot. All of these urban conditions are equally relevant regardless of the perceived critical mass of their issues. There is neither hierarchy nor ranking between them, as it should be clear after frustrating years of boycotted global climate conferences that the challenges of our urban age can only be met with a concerted action. Whatever happens in one place is bound to have consequences beyond its own local perimeter, and sometimes even proliferate globally as the, by now, proverbial butterfly effect of chaos theory. The hic et nunc of global society clearly needs to incorporate other places and times in its definition of presence.

The contributions in the book can be differentiated into basically four types: theoretical essays, case studies, projective prototypes, and artworks. They all use their respective means of expression to uncover different aspects of the discursive landscape of the city that this book wants to probe. The theoretical essays try to trace some of the major vectors of urban transformation today. They attempt to frame the larger perspective on crucial developments, shedding light on the important shifts that have occurred within recent debates on the city and proposing new priorities for the makers of the city today. The case studies are acute observations of specific urban conditions from all over the globe. Analyzing urban transformation on a local level, they expose their inherent logic in order to allow us to see that they are not only locally relevant, but offer potential prototypical conditions which could be applied in other contexts as well. The projective prototypes are both speculative and real projects by architects, urban designers, engineers, and others which test alternative modes of urban organization, such as: how to use social housing subsidies in order to double the built housing surface; how to retrofit a favela city with its own public transportation system connected to the entire public transportation network of the larger metropolitan region, or how to re-route state funds for demolition of housing into its conservation and substantial upgrading. Lastly, the artworks selected unfold yet another view onto the city: our attention is guided to aspects of the book’s topic that would otherwise escape verbalization, aspects that fly below the radar of critical commentary.

We would like to thank all contributors for their help in making this book possible, for their efforts in reworking their Forum papers, supplying illustrations and constructive feedback during the making of the book. And in the name of all of them, we would like to thank the Holcim Foundation for its generosity in organizing a conference as inspiring as the Forum in Shanghai and in sponsoring this book to make the substance of the conference accessible to a global audience of city aficionados. With its engagement the Holcim Foundation aims to provide a vital platform for contemporary discourses, which are necessarily heterogeneous and not limited to represent a specific position, but are meant to explore the city as the most crucial ecology of the 21st century in all its complex and controversial aspects. Last but not least, we wish to express our distinguished gratitude to Marc Angélil, member of the Management Board and of the Technical Competence Center of the Foundation, and to Edward Schwarz, General Manager of the Holcim Foundation, who have each in their own ways been instrumental in the making of this book with tremendous support and invaluable advice.

Ilka & Andreas Ruby
City of “and...and...and...”

Marc Angélil and Cary Siress

Drawn, as with a fine camelhair brush, the line registers subtle oscillations of the horizon. Before us is the skyline of a magnificent city depicted with the swiftness of the architect’s hand – as in the famed sketch by Le Corbusier approaching that very city on a steamboat by night, possibly lured by sirens. Were this line to be redrawn today, it would waver and lose its clarity, for the edges of the city are blurred. Not merely an architect but a crusader of a vision for the modern metropolis, the self-appointed urbanist arrived in the city to peddle his urban wares – in a corner of the world, however, where a very different mentality reigns.

We are in foreign territory and are reminded of a sensibility so poignantly captured by Jorge Luis Borges, who made us aware that other than familiar landmarks of our thought exist. Laid out on a table in which animals are sorted according to unprecedented categories, the difference of this sensibility is made more than clear. Borges’s Chinese encyclopedia, so often cited by those spellbound by the charm of exotic taxonomies, bears witness to another mode of thinking whereby the sequential ordering system of the list does not cohere with the unexpected associations set free by the individual items listed. It might be said that rationality and irrationality operate in close proximity to each other. Strange bedfellows intermingle in a struggle, where both vie for the upper hand. The laughter that ensues from unlikely juxtapositions shatters the ordered surface upon which the
A Green Masterplan
Is Still a Masterplan

Mark Jarzombek

In the last ten years, we have seen the first generation of greened masterplans. But while planning and even zoning – generally speaking – are certainly important, the masterplan culture needs to be challenged. It developed in the 1960s, when, with the failures of cities looming over history, urban leaders wanted a way to restore confidence in the downtowns and to create a positive sense of destiny and purpose. Originally, the masterplan was the basis upon which the zoning ordinance and site usage regulations were defined and enforced, but then in the 1980s the reach of the masterplan expanded to include questions of tourism and culture. City centers were no longer to be torn down arbitrarily, but were to be preserved as civic environments. In that sense, the ideals of the Modernist city came to be fused with the remnants of the so-called traditional city. Holding all this together was the image of a city that was not too new and not too old, an image based on a modern notion of block ownership in combination with a rationally-controlled sentimentality.

Masterplans, however, have always promised more than they could deliver. Even today most preserve the notion of static square blocks and of individual buildings. Most envision the urban core as a tourist and convention center destination surrounded by residential blocks and of individual buildings. Most envision the urban core as a tourist and convention center destination surrounded by residential

...}

1. In Sustainable Architecture and Urbanism we read that “the principles of sustainable development encompass an appreciation of social and cultural roots,” which lead the “protection of characteristic residential districts” [Dominique Gauzin-Müller, Sustainable Architecture and Urbanism (Berlin: Birkhäuser, 2002) p. 8]. This means that it is impossible to shape a city in the context of the eco-revolution, unless these historic districts are recognized as part of museo-urbanism suitable for attracting boutiques, restaurants and residences for the elite.


3. There are several projects that seem to defy the purpose of the book, like Landsberger Allee in Berlin (Daniel Libeskind) and the revitalization of Savona Italy (Valerio Saggini&Stefania Belloni). What they have to do with eco-urbanism escapes me.

4. Most of the projects, as Richard Ingersoll has already noted, are, in fact, not urban, but suburban developments. Richard Ingersoll, “Building Nature’s Ruin?” in Harvard Design Magazine 18 (Spring/Summer 2003), p. 4.
Zone
Keller Easterling

Some of the most radical changes to the globalizing world are not expressed in the language of law and diplomacy but rather in the language of architecture and urbanism. Indeed, the notion that there is a proper realm of forthright political negotiation usually acts as the perfect camouflage for this extrastatecraft that resides in the unofficial currents of cultural and market persuasion. Capricious, hilarious, and illogical, here is the rich medium of subterfuge, hoax, and hyperbole that finally rules the world. From this medium both epidemics of belief and prolonged stalemates have emerged. As global powers juggle national and international sovereignties or allegiances to citizens or shareholders, their behavior is, by necessity, discrepant. Theories of globalization that concoct epic binary wars between these powers (e.g., national/transnational or global/local) are nowhere near sneaky enough. It is much more likely that the multiple realms of influence are kept in play to lubricate the obfuscation so important to the maintenance of power. The nation state is not dying in the face of the increased power of transnational forces. State and non-state forces are rather deciding together how to release, shelter, and launder their identity. Crucial then might be a working knowledge of the logics of duplicity rather than the practices of righteousness. While architecture and urbanism are clearly delineating some of these realms of extrastatecraft, the profession often claims to be excluded from political decision-making or claims to be not at the table when policy is determined. Yet the good news is that the most influential policies are controlled by discrepant characters like butlers, go-betweens, shills, and confidence men. And architects, as the classic facilitators of power, have long been seated at that particular table. Perhaps the most vivid urban organs of architectural extrastatecraft, the technique of contemporary space-making – most hidden in plain sight – is the zone.

The Zone Is Ancient and New

A zone may be one of any number of variants including the Foreign Trade Zone, Export Processing Zone, Special Economic Zone, Free Trade Zone or Free Economic Zone among many others. Each zone type provides its own cocktail of exemptions that might include tax exemptions, foreign ownership of property, streamlined customs and deregulation of labor or environmental regulations. Heir to ancient pirate enclaves, the free ports of the Genoese, or the ports of the Hanseatic trade, the zone is the perfect legal habitat of the corporation. The earliest historical urges to incorporate express a desire for freedom and exclusivity. If it is the corporation's legal duty to banish any obstacle to profit, and the zone is the spatial adjunct of this externalizing – a mechanism of political quarantine designed for corporate protection.

In 1934, emulating free port laws in Hamburg and elsewhere of the late 19th century, the United States established Foreign Trade Zones. As the zone merged with manufacturing, Export Processing Zones appeared in the late 1950s and 60s. China’s Special Economic Zones, allowing for an even broader range of market activity, emerged in the 1970s. Since then special zones of various types have grown exponentially, from a few hundred in the 1980s to between three and four thousand operating in 130 countries in 2006. Moreover, special zones handle over a third of the world’s trade. Some zones consist of a few hectares; some have grown into conurbations that are hundreds of kilometers in size.

The Zone Is Breeding

Breeding more promiscuously with other parks or enclave formats, the zone now merges with tourist compounds, knowledge villages, IT campuses, museums, and universities that may complement the corporate headquarters or offshore facility. The zone has become a new primordial civilization and a warm pool for the latest cocktail...
The Santiago Inner Ring Initiative is an Urban Recovery Strategy promoted by the Chilean government as one of the emblematic projects for the celebration of the bicentenary of the Republic in 2010. The inner ring concept was developed early on by a group of students and researchers at the Universidad Católica, who detected the opportunities for recovering the urban areas degraded by the presence of abandoned railway infrastructure and under-utilized industrial zones around the old belt-line of Santiago. The development potentially covers about 250 hectares located near the center of the city, most of which is owned by the State Railway Company, the Office of National Assets, the Housing and City Planning Service (SERVIU), and some municipalities. This significant amount of land owned by governmental agencies makes it possible to implement a strategic management plan that is driven by the public sector.

The Inner Ring Initiative aims to create the conditions necessary to convert degraded areas into neighborhoods equipped with better public spaces, new green areas, community services, and enhanced connectivity and transportation. These improvements will trigger the necessary real estate development to increase building density in the city center, reduction of travel time and pollution, and the creation of a new urban image for this neglected section of Santiago.

The old railway line coincides with the boundary between the municipalities of Santiago and the twelve municipalities that surround it; an inter-district sector structured over four axes: the Mapocho River to the north, Exposición and Matucana Avenues to the west, the Zanjón de la Aguada to the south, and Vicuña Mackenna Avenue to the east.

The potential of this area has been recently recognized with a significant amount of investment, both public and private, including new urban highway concessions, the extension of the subway system (Metro), the recent construction of the 120,000 m² New Justice Center, the Quinta Normal Intermodal Station, the Matucana 100 Cultural Center, and the new Regional Library, totaling more than US$ 350 million in construction and implementation.

The Inner Ring Initiative aims to convert degraded areas into neighborhoods equipped with better public spaces, new green areas, community services, and enhanced connectivity and transportation. These improvements will trigger the necessary real estate development to increase building density in the city center, reduction of travel time and pollution, and the creation of a new urban image for this neglected section of Santiago.

The old railway line coincides with the boundary between the municipalities of Santiago and the twelve municipalities that surround it; an inter-district sector structured over four axes: the Mapocho River to the north, Exposición and Matucana Avenues to the west, the Zanjón de la Aguada to the south, and Vicuña Mackenna Avenue to the east.

Fig. 1: Scheme of downtown Santiago depicting the area comprised by the Inner Ring Initiative, red lines correspond to former rail yards.

Fig. 2: Schematic areal view of the Aguada Flood-Park.
The Good, the Bad, and the Utilitarian: Singapore’s Schizophrenic Urbanism

Ting-Ting Zhang and William Tan

Any attempts to characterize Singapore’s unique conditions stem from Western oriented appropriations: “Virtual City” and “Disneyland with a Death Penalty” are simply tongue-in-cheek punch-lines that do neither the city nor the critics justice. This city is, as it describes itself, *Uniquely Singapore.*

Singapore lives in fear – in fear of the lack of natural resources, in fear of its infinitely larger neighboring states, in fear of being the only secular state in the region, in fear of being forgotten by the potential investors as international attention focuses on India and China as the emerging Far East market, and in fear of being seen as a Third World ex-colony. As these fears drive the state, the state drives the nation with fears. In fact, it is by this incredibly intense urge to emancipate itself from its Third World colonial past and to make itself a First World country that results in the Singaporean dream of creating a society as a seamless operating system of constant economical growth with a life-long subscription to efficiency – hence, *Singapore Inc.*, a Singapore dream: a truly First World Singapore with all its citizens as employees. Economic well-being and urban transformation are seen as vital goals of being a part of the First World; total control is seen as the only way to achieve these goals. Therefore, a social agreement was accorded whereby the citizens give up their political participation in exchange for the government’s promise of security and prosperity. Armed with this Singaporean dream and an authoritarian power, the state begins master-planning social upgrades, *urban renewal*, and economic growth. Singapore Inc. is in fact a true Taylorist operation with every aspect of the society having a specific function. Everything that one can or cannot imagine is orchestrated, planned, and designed, “managed by a regime that has excluded accident and randomness.”

---

1 Deyan Sudjic, “Virtual City,” in *Blueprint* (Feb 1994).
3 Singapore Tourism Board’s marketing slogan for Singapore.
Running the Numbers

Chris Jordan
Cityness

Saskia Sassen

The vast urban agglomerations taking shape across the world are often seen as lacking the features, quality, and sense of what we think of as urbanity. Yet, urbanity is perhaps too charged a term – charged with a Western sense of cosmopolitanism and of what public space is or should be. In fact, it may be part of our current history-in-the-making that we have yet to find a term that triggers a new interpretation of urbanity. The term cityness suggests the possibility that there are kinds of urbanity that do not fit into the definition developed in the West. So cityness, in a way, could be described as an instrument to capture something that otherwise might easily get lost: types of urbanity that are non-Western or that are novel and depart from traditional notions in the West.

We need to open up the discussion to a far broader range of urbanities. In my work on global cities, I confront a paral-lel problematic in dealing with globality. Yet, urbanity is perhaps too charged a term – charged with a Western sense of cosmopolitanism and of what public space is or should be. In fact, it may be part of our current history-in-the-making that we have yet to find a term that triggers a new interpretation of urbanity. The term cityness suggests the possibility that there are kinds of urbanity that do not fit into the definition developed in the West. So cityness, in a way, could be described as an instrument to capture something that otherwise might easily get lost: types of urbanity that are non-Western or that are novel and depart from traditional notions in the West. We need to open up the discussion to a far broader range of urbanities. In my work on global cities, I confront a parallel problematic in dealing with globality. It is often assumed that globality entails cosmopolitanism. However, I posit that there are also non-cosmopolitan forms of the global and, further, that these also need to be distinguished from familiar vernacular cosmopolitanisms.¹

The architect Ma Qingrun argues that the Chinese city does not need public space – instead, it makes public spaces: when, for example, at night, a bus shelter in Shanghai becomes a public space when people set up tables to play cards. The notion of public space as developed in a Western European context will be of little help in reading key aspects of urbanity in Shanghai, or perhaps even Mexico City. Ergo, our concept of urbanity must be stripped of its currently overcharged meanings. In the process, I have identified a couple of categories that allow us to understand something about alternative kinds of urbanity. In traditionally defined urbanity, multiple elements come together in the context of an urban aggregate and produce something that is more than the sum of its individual parts. The urban agglomerations that proliferate across the world today – vast expanses of urban built space – seem to produce a formula, whereby the whole is not more than the sum of its parts. If these urban aggregates actually contain urbanities, it would be an obstacle to a unified notion of urbanity derived from the European experience. It would indicate that we need to open up the meaning of urbanity to a wider range of empirical instances.

Cityness is a concept that encompasses innumerable types of urbanity, including, indeed, an intersection of differences that actually produces something new; whether good or bad, this intersection is consequential. A very practical and subjective example comes from London, a city inhabited by many different types of Muslim groups; the notion of Muslim woman is actually multifaceted: Muslim women from Bangladesh intersect with Muslim women from Turkey, from India, from Pakistan, from Africa or the Middle East. Something happens in this intersection of differences even within what we might think of as a very narrowly defined group. Cityness must accommodate these intersections which constitute a form of subjectivity and perhaps untranslatable into an immediate tangible outcome. Cities contain a multitude of such examples.

Another more practical example can be found in Midtown Manhattan. Midtown Manhattan architecture sends out signals of neutrality, precision, engineering. But if you are actually there at lunchtime, the visual experience is conjoined by the experience of the smell of grilled meat coming from immigrant vendors. A juxtaposition of two different conditions is taking place – but not necessarily of two autonomous worlds, each existing on its own terms. The people who are eating at those vendors at noon are not only the tourists and the secretaries but also the professionals who may not have time for a power lunch every workday. They inhabit a high-speed work space, and there will be days when grabbing a sausage from the vendor on the street is the most efficient use of time. Here we have, then, the junction of two high-speed velocities even though each is produced in enormously diverse settings. The intersection of two such different worlds which produces a third space is an instance of cityness, though it doesn’t necessarily register on the conceptual radar of what we define as urbanity. We could multiply these examples endlessly but what matters here is the notion of intersection and its capacity to make a novel condition.

These examples point to an order, albeit not that which corresponds to the formal logic of planners. These juxtapositions may be following a fuzzy logic that enables a type of making not containable in the spaces of the formal plan. In this juxtaposition, making cityness becomes possible.² Public space, not as a representation of what it ought to be, but public space as the activity of making it such, is one key vector into cityness. An important distinction must be made between public space and a space with public access; the latter is not by itself or as a design, a space for poesie. The publicness of that space needs to be made – through the practices and the usages of people. This also means that public spaces can seem chaotic. If there is, in fact, some order underlying chaotic-looking spaces, it is a nebulous order; this way of looking at such chaos opens up to the


² The Greek verb poiesin translates as “making” or “creating.”
Re: Doing Dubai

Wes Jones

The name *post-critical* has been adopted by current architectural discourse for the brand of activity pursued by theoretically inclined (i.e., *formerly critical*) practitioners and academics. The name announces a perception of the failure of criticality, the belief that after decades of assuming critique’s ability to challenge authority, it is instead critical practice’s limitations in that regard that have become most apparent. The conscientious problem addressed by thinkers today – the difference from the critical period of post-structuralism – is *accommodation*. It stems from recognition that authority has prevailed because there is no place from which to offer a significant critique that is not somehow already compromised by the system. Accommodation has two senses in here. First, the accommodation of the potential critique by the system before that critique is even offered, and second, the accommodation by the critic to the terms of the system in hope of making the critique intelligible and thus effective. In the first case the system’s comprehensiveness denies the critique any privileged position outside from which its efforts might gain legitimacy, while its seamlessness prohibits any independent operational maneuverability. The result is that, however transgressive the intent of the critique, its very presence – necessarily within the system – is an indication of the system’s acceptance of the critique, as a contribution to the system. In the second case, the critic finds that the system controls the discourse to the extent that it controls the rule of logic, rationality and significance. Since the critic wants to make a point, to communicate, he/she must subscribe to the conventions and assumptions of utility that permit this communication. In the case of architecture, this means that requirements of licensure, financing and functionality must be accommodated at a minimum, and if the critical architect wants to operate at the larger architectural or even urban scale then the price of admission grows commensurately.
Sustainable Difference

Simon Hubacher

Urban planning instruments refer to the global concept of the welfare state as interpreted by time and (country-specific) space. As a consequence, urban environments look more and more generic regardless of which scale is used. This normalization conflicts with the growing demand for the personal or lifestyle benefits of distinction and visibility. Resulting from the city’s competition for investors and qualified workforce, this quest for difference equally drives public and private investments into the urban living environment and the urban economy. However, the capacity to effectively influence urban change and to deliver the welfare promise diminishes as the new scales of urban realities are no longer congruent with the reach of urban planning instruments. How can municipal urban policies react to this potentially detrimental ambivalence? How can the capacity to implement a self-determined, sustainable urban change be regained?

To provide responses, urban policies need to critically assess the impact of normative parameters on their future cityscapes, such as lifestyle regimes, the privatization of public interests or resource shortages. Considering these parameters, re-focussing urban policies on the city’s demographic characteristics and resources presents a starting point for a sustainable and a self-determined urban change. It is a key to pro-actively manage urban specialization, to increase local identification as well as to minimize social segregation. Unlike the temporary distinctiveness, this process leads to sustainable difference. Applications on different scales suggest that fostering sustainable difference presents a potentially normative approach to foster and implement sustainable urban transformations.

What Drives Urban Change?

According to latest reports by the UNFPA (United Nations Population Fund) almost 3.35 billion people are inhabitants of urbanized areas, i.e., half of the world’s population. In some of the world’s most competitive regional economies in Western Europe, more than 70% of the population already lives in urban agglomerations. The social and economic motivations of this attractiveness and steady
Caribbean Strips: 
Tourism in the Caribbean

Juan Alfonso Zapata and Supersudaca

According to the WTTC (World Travel and Tourism Council), tourism accounts for 11% of the global GDP and employs nearly 8% of its working force. The Caribbean has a modest 2.3% share of the world’s tourism market, with approximately 20 million visitors per year. But when considered as a part of the regional GDP, tourism currently accounts for 52% of the local economies. It has been estimated that the overall impact is over 60%, when taking the indirect benefits of the industry into consideration. For some countries the impact of tourism in their economies is estimated at more than 90% of their GDP. Direct employment is estimated at 2,400,000 or 15.1% of the total workforce in the region.

Still, with such a relevant role, tourism has not yet generated widespread benefits among local populations. This could partly be explained in the lack of linkages between tourism and other sectors of the economy and the subsequent leakages that this generates. Many of the goods and services demanded by the industry are imported, leaving local enterprises and workers with limited participation or with lower and less remunerated jobs. World Bank and U.N. estimates point that only about 10% of the total amount spent by a tourist in an All-inclusive hotel stays in the destination countries while the rest is spent in payments made abroad for travel, lodging, and logistics. Out of this, 55% of the revenues leak back to developed countries.

It is worth observing that many individuals, organizations, and development agencies, both local and foreign, are making efforts to influence governments and private investors in their decisions concerning the future of the tourism industry and the development of a more inclusive model of operation; however, few of the many stakeholders in the industry have real participation in the process of decision making when it comes to very big investments and the huge revenues generated.

Only a few multinational corporations have almost absolute control of the industry, especially in the All-inclusive enclaves and the cruise ship business. 50% of the world’s cruise ship business takes place in the Caribbean and yet it is controlled by just two

---

1 “Leakage is a term used to describe the percentage of the price of the holiday paid by the tourists that leaves a destination (in terms of imports or expatriate profits) or never reaches the destination in the first place due to the involvement of ‘Northern’ based intermediaries.” Dorothea Meyer, Caribbean tourism, local sourcing and enterprise development: Review of the literature (Sheffield Hallam University: Centre for Tourism and Cultural Change, January 2006).

2 Ibid.

---

Fig. 1: New hotel in Uvero Alto, at the far end of the Bavaro hotel strip.

Fig. 2: Residential development in Veron, Higuey, Dominican Republic, and the new boulevard built by the Dominican government in association with private investors.
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Permanent Visitors

Donald L. Bates

Tourism as a spatial and urban condition assumes an arrival, a visitation, and a departure. But what happens when the tourist doesn’t leave? What urbaneity emerges when the visitor settles down and becomes a resident? Originally an enclave of foreigners and now a village of expatriate inhabitants, do resort communities have a 3rd status – neither transient nor permanent, neither local nor global? Be it China, India, Spain or the Cape Verde Islands, resort communities offer relief from the cold climates of old Europe or troubled America, offering convenient lifestyles at lower prices. Seen as vacation resorts, with mild weather, abundant facilities and amenable exchange rates, many of these projects are now marketed as alternative homes for those who seek retirement to an easier life, or who relish the more open, more tropical lifestyle, a home truly away from home.

Enclave Tourism

In search of ever-newer locations, untouched and unspoilt (or at least, not yet inundated), tourist resorts have sprung up across the world – from the first world to the second world to the third world. In a particular iteration, and as currently evidenced at sites across the third world, resorts act as exclusive and segregated enclave compounds for tourists who desire a tropical or exotic vacation, but without the inconvenience of actually having to encounter the local population. These controlled experiences seek to provide safety, certainty, and no unpleasant confrontations with the day-to-day life in countries often beset by depressing poverty and unemployment, minimal infrastructure, basic hygiene, and dysfunctional governments.

The combination of plentiful sun, beaches (or interesting landscapes and architectures), new foods, and music, all provided at a low cost or with an exceptional array of pampered services or both, has lead to the widespread development of these enclave resorts, where a visitor is both there and not there at the same time. In many of these locations, there are varying degrees to which these cultural and social separations are enforced or are seen as acceptable. They present the promise and paradox of interaction and exclusion. The extent to which the visit can be controlled for maximum enjoyment and minimal disruption is a part of the guarantee of resort tourism. Within the phenomena of global tourism, it is clear that such operations do indeed inject significant foreign revenues into the local economies, provide for an enhanced job market, and offer developments that, at least on the surface, are part of an industry that is not dirty or overtly polluting or degrading to the environment. However, the ever-expanding field of tourism and its compounding effects suggests that this calculation be rendered somewhat differently, as the connective consequences and secondary impacts of mass tourism go far beyond the immediate development of resorts, hotels, and visitor facilities.

The Resort Community

Classic tourism implies an intrusion that clearly distinguishes the difference between the visitor and the local. Enclave tourism is a more exaggerated example, in which complete difference is maintained and well delineated. This delineation begins to blur not just when the visitors go native – getting into the spirit of things – but even more so when the visitor never leaves. The search for a more authentic experience, of an immersive encounter (often in reaction to the packaged deal) is still defined by the relationship and duration of visitation and then departure, of the tourist and the local, no matter how in-depth or affective. The progression from tourist to repeat-visitor, to expatriate and on to resident, defines a rather new condition.

Within the last three decades, a very substantial market has developed for those who not only want to experience foreign adventures, but who see resort living as a new or alternative lifestyle. It is clear that to a very large degree, the existence of these new resort communities is marked by good weather and a temperate or tropical climate above all else. Marketed extensively (if not exclusively) for northern Europeans, resorts in Spain, Portugal, Morocco, Tunisia, the Canary Islands, Turkey, South Africa, Dubai, and now the Cape Verde Islands have been or are becoming part of a large development scenario based around second-home ownership.

The transformation of large sections of the Spanish and Portuguese coastlines, first into resort developments and now into resort communities, is being repeated again and again across the Mediterranean basin, into Africa, the Caribbean, the Persian Gulf, India, Southeast Asia and China. These changes are bringing significant development impacts, far beyond the mere addition of the resorts themselves and the supporting tourist facilities. Expanded airports, new transportation links, hospitality services and support are all part and parcel of the package necessary to sustain these holiday resorts. Their transformation into communities of long-term residency also changes their nature and status, replacing one type of uncertain integration with another. The migration of necessity from the third world to the first, is being countered (at a reduced extent) with a migration of choice from the first to the third.
Mallorca: Island in Progress

Marc Räder
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During a conference in Beijing in October 2006, environmental politics expert Klaus Töpfer made a memorable statement: “The battle for a sustainable society is won or lost in the city.” As the moment draws near when two thirds of the world population live in cities or at least in an urbanized environment, it is clear how urgent this statement has become.

The city is our center of culture, science, politics, and trade. Various recent studies by social scientists have made it clear that cities are the breeding grounds of economic growth and innovation. Apparently, density attracts density and leads to intensive interaction. Intensive interaction, in turn, leads to innovative activities. Henri Lefebvre once described how the interaction between various social networks leads to the emergence of new networks. In Delirious New York, Rem Koolhaas writes about the Culture of Congestion and the City of the Captive Globe, which consists of a compression of extreme expressions of culture and life styles; in his book Creative Cities, Richard Florida identifies the three Ts (Technology, Talent, and Tolerance) as the most important factors for the emergence of creative industries. All this indicates that the high-density city is not just a transitional phase in the development of human settlements that would eventually be replaced by a state of Arcadia, as Frank Lloyd Wright hoped for in his book The Living City and visualized in his utopian project Broadacre City. 1 The high-density city must be regarded, now more than ever, as an inevitable and constituting form of organization of life on earth.

At the same time, the city also is the stage upon which extreme energy consumption, pollution, social abuse, and social conflicts have emerged. In Beijing, for instance, the air quality sometimes has become so bad that even radical measures like the strict limitation of private car use has had only negligible effects. The enormous water consumption has lowered the groundwater level to such an extent that the entire region now suffers from water shortage and droughts, not to mention impending geological problems. In Lagos and other tropical mega-cities, the shortage of clean water and appropriate sewage systems, the proliferation of refuse dumps, the ubiquitous open garbage dumps have led to serious threats to the public health and to an almost irreversible pollution of the soil. In São Paulo and Johannesburg, excessive differences in income and prosperity between social groups has resulted in cities that consist of archipelagos of gated islands where the crime rate is sky high. Los Angeles is all but paralyzed by its enormous suburban expansion combined with the lack of adequate public transportation.

1 Broadacre City was the antithesis of a city and the apotheosis of the newly born suburbia, shaped through Wright’s particular vision. It was both a planning statement and a socio-political scheme by which each U.S. family would be given a one acre (4,000 m²) plot of land from the federal lands reserves, and a Wright-conceived community would be built anew from this. In a sense it was the exact opposite of transit-oriented development. There is a train station and a few office and apartment buildings in Broadacre City, but the apartment dwellers are expected to be a small minority. All important transportation is done by automobile and the pedestrian can exist safely only within the confines of the one acre (4,000 m²) plots where most of the population dwells. “The city is in debt to the surrounding country,” says Töpfer. “It uses her natural resources and the products of its cheap labor, and, in return, gives back waste, erosion, and crime.” Of course, this is a bit rhetorical: as part of the urbanized landscape, city and country are complementary and inseparably bound to one another in an ever more complex relation. In Edge City, Joel Garreau points out that polycentric agglomerations form productive organisms where local centers and peripheral developments function complementary to each other (i.e., city dwellers go to the countryside for recreation, and suburban dwellers go to the city to shop), and Saskia Sassen, in her book Global City, stresses the co-dependency of urban agglomerations and their global economy environments.

As far as the use of resources is concerned, we are now faced with a paradox: the so-called developed world has arrived at a so-called sustainable urban culture and a humane standard of comfort. However, despite widely-applied sustainable technology, the growth of wealth has led to a steady increase of energy-use, hence an increase in the waste and carbon dioxide emissions. And although the trend is digestive, a turning point, a significant reduction of pollution, is nowhere in sight. On the other hand, the so-called developing world lives in a so-called unsustainable way – i.e., living without sewer systems, the proliferation of refuse dumps, and the burning of wood, etc. But on the whole, the developing world uses only a fraction of the energy produced, and the pollution generated per person is in no way comparable. Most people in the First World find it difficult to re-adjust their consumer lifestyle with an eye towards environmental responsibility, whereas most people in the Third World want to live like people in the First. The First World’s concerns about the ecology of the Third World have been interpreted as hypocritical and moralistic. This may partly be true, but, of course, one of the motives of this concern is the question whether the developing nations may skip a few stages in the evolution towards a more sustainable condition. Development rests on cumulative acquisition and management of knowledge, which results in economic growth and technological innovation. Apparently, we have to go through an evolution of trial and error, of consumption and squandering before we can sublimate our life into sustainability. The efficiency and the effectiveness of the combustion motor has more than doubled since its invention. The Internet has become an indispensable global communication instrument with unprecedented positive effects. We owe it to the American army, which developed it in order to have an anti-hierarchic communication network that would remain operational even if great parts of it were destroyed by enemy attacks.

The notion of trial and error has led some people to believe that innovation can only prosper under non-compulsory conditions. This has been
Two Houses in Seoul

Minsuk Cho

We are inverted utopians. While utopians cannot make what they envisage, we cannot envisage what we are making.

Seoul is a megapolis that is located within a two-hour flight from two other megapolises: Tokyo to the east and Beijing to the west. Indeed, the idea of the city of Seoul occupies a particular spatial niche: not unlike Korea’s unique geopolitical location, Seoul is somewhere in the middle. If Tokyo has elevated its state of ultimate urban chaos to an art form (which peaked decades ago), Seoul’s landscape is still marked by a primitive dynamism: it is continually refining and intricately reinventing itself. While Beijing plows ahead with an ambitious (if remarkably cohesive) radicalism in a quest to add to its collection of architectural enigma (in time for the 2008 Olympics), Seoul already feels ideologically spent and jaded by the economic reality.

Hilberseimer’s Dream: The Average Salaryman’s Spatial House

Outside of the citystates, Korea is now the most urbanized country in the world. Over 80% of the country’s 48 million people currently reside in urban areas, and the figure is expected to exceed 90% by the year 2030. Seoul is filled with architecture that, in effect, has been prodigiously commodified and branded by a market economy. With 16,000 persons per square kilometer, Seoul is the most densely populated city on the planet – five times the population density of Los Angeles and 1.5 times that of New York City. In fact, Seoul has surpassed Tokyo and Hong Kong on the list of the world’s costliest cities to live in and is second only to Moscow.

In present-day Seoul, approximately 80% of its residents live in apartments (which Koreans refer to phonetically as a-pa-te) that comprise some 98% of recent residential construction. The wealthiest Koreans have voluntarily exiled themselves to high-rise apartment buildings that boast a floor-area ratio of 1,000%. Presumably, the privileged class has chosen to house themselves in such close quarters not for the most efficient use of space in a small country but rather because the apartment has proven itself to be an incredibly efficient source of profit. As a result, the apartment has become the most co-
Re-Searching (for) the Public: Other Means of Design in Former East German Cities

Ines Weizman

In the post-World War II era, most major European and North-American cities experimented with the idea of new towns – Modernist satellite cities mostly consisting of rows of housing blocks. The reasons varied from massive housing shortages to the strategic requirements of a population dispersal that has become part of the security doctrine of the emerging nuclear age. For the GDR as much as for the rest of the Eastern Bloc, the new cities and large-scale city extensions of the mid-1970s were no longer direct products of necessity but also offered a possibility to fulfill an ideological promise. Far from the banal and depressing stigma attached to them at present, some of these housing projects, particularly Leipzig-Grunau, represented enthusiastic experiments in realizing new forms of human habitat. These housing projects were, for the most part, received favorably by the public that sought and often competed to live in them, while its critics would describe them as normative. After the collapse of Socialism in 1989, a new Western perspective created an imaginary geography in which Socialist architecture was essentially regarded as culturally alien to the traditional German city.

Leipzig-Grunau, like many other Modernist projects, was considered a failure which consequently led to the premature destruction of a half-completed housing project. A spatio-temporal framework was shattered that otherwise would have allowed for citizens to debate the future of their urban space. Local voices were not heard as the role of the new political subject was yet undefined within a new diversified urbanism. 

Fig. 1: Architect’s vision of the street scenery for Leipzig-Grunau, 1984.

Fig. 2: Destruction of a high-rise in Leipzig-Grunau, 2004.
Empty Lots: Collective Action of Experimental Urban Occupation

Louise Marie Cardoso Ganz

The Empty Lots project was a collective action organized by artists and architects to transform private lots into temporary public spaces. The project took place throughout the year 2005 in Belo Horizonte, a Brazilian city with some 2.5 million inhabitants and 70,000 vacant lots (which is equivalent to about 10% of all its properties). Based upon the mechanisms of the financial market, the urban fabric as we know it stimulates speculation and encourages fear and segregation. This collective project, on the other hand, proposes thinking into another direction – and certainly the possibility of occupying land for free presented a problem: notions of property, environment, community, ethics, and aesthetics were all called into question.

Empty Lots generated a network of public spaces that were easily incorporated into the neighborhoods. Each group of artists walked across the city in search of empty lots and then negotiated a temporary loan from their respective proprietors (which constituted the most difficult part of the whole process). The actions helped forge relations with the local population and the places, indeed, directly provoking their involvement. The idea was to create a temporary public space on unused private property.

The notion of land as private property didn't exist in colonial Brazil. Since the 16th century, several systems had been adopted for land concession to the Portuguese elite, as a means of encouraging exploration. With the abolition of slavery by the end of the 19th century, the number of landless people increased enormously. The lower classes have always lacked access to owning land in Brazil due to the agrarian and urban reforms; consequently, property has been concentrated in the hands of a few, that is, in the hands of real estate speculators or the privileged class of proprietors. This minority group holds the majority of the land: the ratio presents one of the most shocking statistics in the world. Since the beginning of the 20th century, the landless population has resorted to informally occupying more vacant lots (which is equivalent to about 10% of all its properties). Based upon the mechanisms of the financial market, the urban fabric as we know it stimulates speculation and encourages fear and segregation. This collective project, on the other hand, proposes thinking into another direction – and certainly the possibility of occupying land for free presented a problem: notions of property, environment, community, ethics, and aesthetics were all called into question.

Located in the southeast of the country, Belo Horizonte was founded in 1897. It was in the empty privately-owned lots that we founded in 1897. It was in the empty privately-owned lots that we proposed a procedure that would allow them to be temporarily used by the local population. Some of the lots are diversified green areas or the sites of demolished or abandoned buildings. In the dense area of downtown, it became a profitable business to convert the empty lots into parking lots. In the city outskirts, these lots were being used by the neighbors to plant corn, beans, manioc, and other vegetables. Empty lots, therefore, became potential sites for urban breathing. All in all, they constitute a large quantity of free, open, green gardens. Each area has its own special characteristics, but they are almost always between walls. By incorporating these empty lots into the daily lives of the population living in proximity, the city is inevitably redesigned.

The areas officially recognized as public places are the parks, squares, and streets. In contemporary cities, the parks are big recreation areas; they constitute the distant destination to where dwellers of different neighborhoods relocate on the weekend. The squares are located in almost all of the boroughs and are frequented by the locals daily; however, they have come to resemble traffic islands. In the past, the streets were used as an extension of the home and of commerce; but they are becoming more and more inhospitable, even aseptic: the street has become an endless sequence of walls and electric fences. Therefore empty lots have an evocative potential. They can change the perception of the neighborhood by exposing the absence of use, the absence of activity and, at the same time, providing a sensation of freedom. Another dynamic is established: behaviors change and new programs can emerge. When these empty lots are transformed into gardens and meeting spaces, an experiment with nature takes place on the micro-urban scale. Emptiness becomes the site of ad-hoc invention: the empty lots become places for raising milk cattle or for parties and picnics, for weddings, or even as collective living rooms, places for watching TV and listening to crickets.

Likewise, the gardens might be a wild bed of flowers or a tamed row of vegetables. They can constitute spaces for trading products, for rest or reading, for observing the stars, or a place for games, a makeshift hairdresser’s shop, small concerts, etc.

This instant programmation is the opposite of the real-estate speculation that has caused these lots to be empty in the first place. Actively appropriating these spaces, the local population invents new types of ecologies and systems for the contemporary city. It is a form of resistance to the society of control. Today there are many public spaces which are under complete surveillance – like shopping malls, Disneylands, and resort hideaways, to name but a few – where functions and desires are defined and controlled: they present an increasingly false neo-liberal sense of a sustainable discourse. Entrenched in a politics of elitism and privatization, these spaces ignite fear and, moreover, actively restrict the collective ways of urban life.
Ciclopaseo in Quito: Cycling Citizenship in the City

Ximena Ganchala

Ciclopaseo is a 30-km route opened on Sundays every two weeks only for cycling, walking, or any other non-motorized means of transport. This route crosses the main streets of Quito with an average of 40,000 participants each time. A group of young urban cyclists called the Biciacción Foundation promoted this project, which was also supported by the municipality. Ciclopaseo not only encourages the use of bikes as an alternative mean of transport but also encourages the recovery of public spaces for people. After more than four years, Ciclopaseo has created an alternative form of transportation in the city. Since the beginning of the project, Quito has changed greatly. Ciclopaseo not only promotes an ecological consciousness, but also has created a sense of citizenship, identity, and sustainable urban mobility. Ciclopaseo represents the possibility of re-understanding our rights to urban spaces, and of considering, as citizens, our obligations to the places where we live.

Some Antecedents

The analyses of urban spaces have been the focus of much social research. Beyond other possible analytical approaches to urban spaces – such as economic growth or architectural aspects – a conceptual frame allows us to look at cities in a broader way: after all, the city is a most complex human construction, the most meaningful cultural production in human history. They have become ideal places for citizenship development. Hence, the social construction of our cities has become a necessary element in discussing their sustainability. Quito has a population of two million people and approximately 300,000 cars circulating around every day. According to Corpaire, Quito has the highest percentage of car usage growth in Ecuador at some 5 to 8% annually. Recently, Quito has become a city for automobiles, resulting in a negative effect in how urban spaces are planned and understood. The city seems to be a place where the principal actor is the machine, not the human being. That is to say, the rights of citizens have turned into the rights of cars. Although the automobile users are in the minority, the city has been established and is still being constructed according to the dominance of car culture. A kind of hierarchical system seems to have been installed in the streets and the everyday life. Cars have become the symbol of modernity that determines the design of urban spaces. As in other Latin American cities, the city planners of Quito have given priority to the highways, wide and long streets, and small sidewalks. As the Catalan investigator Jordi Borja says, the public space is a performative place where society is made visible. Hence, the city that privileges public spaces before the private ones is a city that privileges the quality of life of its inhabitant. The problem of our current urban places is that they are non-places, as Augé emphasized: places with no identity, no history, and no interaction.

Ciclopaseo: A Many Ways Street

Since 2003, the Ciclopaseo in Quito has become the most important sport and recreation activity in the city. Though the municipality has supported this project from the beginning, it was initiated by several civil and social groups such as the Biciacción Foundation, a non-profit organization created in 2002 to promote bicycles as an alternative means of transportation in the city. The Biciacción began as a group of cyclist friends who based their proposals on obtaining respect for other means of transportation. Some of them came from an important environmental organization in Ecuador called Acción...
How does a city materialize?

How does the production happen?

How to achieve a work and life balance?

Those are fundamental questions to set up a story.

The city materializes when complex social relationships can take place.

The city materializes when a critical high density is reached.

The city materializes when it offers a multiplicity of activities.

The city materializes when we can live and work together.

Production happens when work is being done.

Production happens when outcomes are tangible.

Production happens when a certain level of standardization is reached.

Production happens when we can live and work together.

Overall, the city of production is about balancing life and work.

First of all, it is said that workers need to work.

In one way or another, everyone has to produce.

One can say that production is the result of work.

But apart from a process, what is work really?

Remember Arendt's text *The Human Condition*.

As she suggested the differentiation between labor and work:

Meaning the distance between the final outcome and the labor.

Capitalist production cannot fulfill the requirements of the self.

The idea of labor is embedded in the conception of life.

The labor maternity room hears the first cry, the child's first breath.

So life could be the starting point for defining work.

Without life, there is no work therefore no production is possible.
Going Public

Sarah Whiting

Architects have a fondness for things public. Discussions about the rebuilding of the World Trade Center have revolved primarily around the public nature of the site, students want their thesis projects to explore public space, and the duality of public and private life has become the binary of choice for academic as well as journalistic inquiry. Increasingly, however, architecture faces a public problem. Our public interest has become schizophrenic of late: theory’s investment in publicness tends toward pluralization, while practice’s public is increasingly marked by an interest in singular consensus. Perhaps most problematic for those of us with egos (and just try to find an architect without one) is that neither pole encourages, or even allows for, architectural assertion. As an instrument of progress, our commitment to a collective civitas risks becoming a posture (instead of a stance). Our altruism may well have become the enemy of architecture’s forward motion, even at the very moment when our understanding of the public has entered a vastly more sophisticated era.

Public Opinion

Unlike “begemony,” the public sphere is less on the side of rule, more open to opposing views. Unlike “culture,” it is more obviously a site of intersections with other classes and cultures. …Public sphere invokes “identity,” but does so with more emphasis on actions and their consequences than on the nature or characteristics of the actors.

By 1993, when Bruce Robbins penned the words above as part of his introduction to The Phantom Public Sphere, critical theorists were already immersed in unpacking what public might mean. Decades of important writing have profoundly advanced our understanding of the multifaceted nature of this term. We are now acutely attentive to the dangers of oversimplification, homogenization, and marginalization. We know a great deal more today about the tricky terrain of politics, agency, and action. For better or worse, we even know enough to state unequivocally that we frankly don’t know much at all. This writing has had an enormously positive influence on schools of architecture, including a resurgence of interest in the work of Henri Lefebvre, Michel de Certeau and Michel Foucault, and a production of sophisticated analyses of buildings and cities across broad historic and geographic spans. An inadvertent parallel to this public labor, however, has been the emergent role of the architect as public crossing guard: a generator of and mediator among multiple publics. While mediation has been rendered a productive strategy by theorists like Fredric Jameson and K. Michael Hays or practitioners like Peter Eisenman and Rem Koolhaas, who already long ago understood mediation as an active between (that is, an engaged interaction that itself generates new possibilities rather than compromise), more often than not, mediation has been misunderstood within architecture to mean a passive between – a simple conciliation between two sides.

Public Safety

We represent a broad-based citizenry, composed of public and private sector leaders, community activists, and multidisciplinary professionals. We are committed to re-establishing the relationship between the art of building and the making of community, through citizen-based participatory planning and design.

The public design charrette, where residents, practitioners and local politicians work together to generate design solutions, epitomizes what has become a numbing drive for consensus or conciliation within an increasing majority of architectural and development projects. Lower Manhattan, for example, is now under the watch of millions of eyes. Will this hyper-supervision guarantee that the outcome of the WTC rebuilding project will be less banal than the harrowingly dull six schemes initially proposed? Probably not. The implication that the broadest of publics needs to approve the WTC proposition – or that it ever could reach consensus – is an assumption that should raise a red flag for architecture today. This assumption is precisely where architecture’s public crisis lies and where architects, schools, and clients should take notice.

Ideologies of inclusiveness and accommodation have unknowingly become the progenitors of such forms of compromise. The neutralities that (don’t) steer architectural actions in today’s compromise urbanism find a strange resonance in the DNA of our intellectual upbringing. Could it be that The Critical, in its contemporary guise, has placed us into a Novocain-laced stupor where we can’t recognize the simultaneous dilution and desiccation of what were once potent critical strategies? Recognizing and exposing options, differences, and similarities should not become an end in itself. The richness of alternatives has become an opiate whose ingestion satisfies our desire for the extraordinary, while drawing us ever deeper into a public coma.

Public Image

In the Downtown Athletic Club each “plan” is an abstract composition of activities that describes, on each of the synthetic platforms, a different perfor...
A More Socially and Environmentally Sustainable City

Enrique Peñalosa

Today the market economy has been adopted by the entire world as the best way to manage most of society’s resources – and though resources are used very efficiently, nonetheless, a market economy creates income inequality. But there are other forms of equality, such as the quality of life, or making effective the democratic principle which states that the public good must prevail over private interests. Cities can do much to create equality, and I believe that this should be one of the main criteria when designing cities.

Tell a three-year-old: Watch out! A car! The child will jump in fright, and with good reason. There are some 200,000 children killed by cars every year. Today cars are to children what wolves used to be to children in the Middle Ages. But in any given week in our world today, there are as many children killed by cars as by wolves in the whole of the Middle Ages. What is more disturbing is that our society is not troubled by this. After some 5,000 years of urban history, and hopefully, progress, are we content to know that children grow up in fear of being killed? Once I saw a documentary about some herons in a Brazilian wetland. When baby herons are learning to fly, they often fall into the water, where hungry alligators can devour them. I feel sympathy for the herons’ parents. They live in circumstances in which their children are in permanent risk of being killed. But then it dawned upon me that our children, likewise, grow up under a similar predicament: the permanent fear of being hit by a car.

In terms of urban quality of life, the 20th century will be remembered as a disastrous one. We have built cities much more for the mobility of cars than for human happiness. Today we look upon 1800 London as a horrible living environment. Yet, at that time, it was the most advanced city in the world and regarded by all others as an example. I am certain that in 300 years people will look upon our cities today and perceive them as appallingly undesirable as we now perceive 1800 London. And, of course, the 20th century’s most successful society, the United States of America, was the one that inflicted the most damage because it had the resources to pursue the prevailing model to its fullest.

The question is: do we dare create a different, better city? There will be two billion more inhabitants in Asian cities alone over the next 50 years. Cities will more than triple their population and their built area. What is yet to be built around today’s developing world cities will practically be built from scratch. Are we going to repeat our mistakes? If we had a magic wand and we could dispose of half of Paris, London or New York, for example, I am sure that they would be rebuilt totally differently. But the new cities of developing countries are bad copies of what we already have.

We tend to copy the worst elements from the advanced cities; we replicate their mistakes, not only the elevated highways and low density suburbs, but also the lacking network of pedestrian streets, and so on.

The measure of a civilization’s success is not its GDP or its technology but its citizens’ happiness. A quality city can provide an end less source of joy. Cities can provide even more joy than material consumption. Yet, in the new post-industrial society and its service economy, the most critical competitive factor will be the quality of life. What is critical is to attract and retain the most qualified and creative individuals, and certainly quality of life is necessary in order to achieve that. In the past, the greatest source of wealth was land. Countries and states waged territorial war on each other. Later, capital became the source of wealth. All sorts of subsidies were given to attract capital to nations or states. But in the new economy, the most crucial element is people. So in the end, designing good cities for people, for happiness and equity, has become a crucial element for economic competitiveness, as they attract and retain creative and productive individuals.

Political pressures from car owners and other car-related interests have become so massive, that often it is forgotten that cities are for people and not for cars. And this is even more so in the developing world. But can we design a transporta-

Fig. 1: Lack of pedestrian infrastructure reflects insufficient democracy (Johannesburg).

Fig. 2: Even school children are less important than cars and their owners when there is inequality (Dar Es Salaam).
In-Between Legal And Illegal

Philippe Cabane

Poverty and illegality are shaking hands. Illegal immigrants, slum dwellers, and the poverty-stricken—who make their living in the informal sector—live and work under utmost insufficient protection of the law. More than a billion people are living in slums today, most of them without legal claims to the land they occupy. According to the estimations of UN-Habitat, more apartments are built worldwide in the informal than in the formal sector. In expectation of a better income, the poor settle in barren areas near the urban centers without any legal rights to occupation. With small jobs, such as street vendors or shoeshiners, in the so-called informal sector, they generate a modest income. These conditions also yield to organized crime, drug abuse, and prostitution, however, the majority of the poorest urban population survives far-off from this world of crime, albeit, under extremely difficult conditions.

The Informal Sector

After some thirty years of on-the-ground experience in self-help projects, development organizations— spearheaded by UN-Habitat—have actually come to the conclusion that not the problem but the solution to urban poverty lies within the informal social organization of these settlements. The microeconomic activities of the poor combined with the informal constructed settlements in which they live form a complex urban system. This system functions much more efficiently based on networked activities and informal relations, which make use of social capital and low-investment risks, than the solutions provided by governmental policies on poverty distorted by bureaucratic and uniformed standards. While the illegal economy of the poor indeed creates an opportunity to produce a very modest living with minimal capital expenditure, it nonetheless brings the risk of prosecution and eviction. The permanent danger of criminal prosecution and eviction deprives the poor of the security necessary in order to set up a sustainable economy, tailored to their needs and possibilities.

Forced Eviction—The Criminalization of Poverty

Also the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, signed by a predominant majority of the international community, "considers that instances of forced eviction are prima facie incompatible with the requirements of the Covenant and can only be justified in exceptional circumstances, and in accordance with the relevantly principles of international law." In spite of this international recognition of the rights of slum dwellers, millions of people are still forcefully evicted worldwide today. According to the Geneva Center on Housing Rights and Eviction (COHRE), violent evictions are characterized by the circumstances, that is, these evictions are performed against the will of the inhabitants. The institute estimates that during 2003 and 2006 approximately 4.3 million people were forcefully evicted from their homes. Thereby, a high dark figure can be added to include all those cases where evictions are not performed with direct force, but rather with structural force, which is difficult to measure. There are, of course, exceptions to this rule where the evictions are aimed directly against a certain section of the population (as in Darfur, for example). As a rule, the reasons reside in economic interests, and evictions are performed where, in the course of dynamic growth and modernization, the prices for property have become interesting to investors. Officially, however, it is the illegal status of the inhabitants in particular that is most oft cited, in addition to the stigmatization that the settlements are strongholds of crime. In the course of extensive modernization, it is not only countries like Zimbabwe, China or India that are resettling vast areas of settled populations. Even in the well-to-do Parisian suburb Cachan, a disused residence hall on a campus, indeed the largest squat in France, was cleared out in 2006. It was not a handful of punks who were evicted but rather several thousand homeless, who had provided themselves with urgently-needed living space. A violation is all that is needed for the governments to enforce the law upon request of the owner. But can a constitutional state tolerate illegal actions or even support them? From an ethical point of view, this question hardly raises a problem. The basic rights of the people are inalienable. On the other hand, from a perspective of the philosophy of law, it becomes a dilemma. Can the constitutional state tolerate an illegal action if its basic premise is based upon the validity of the legal system? And how can criminal offences against the law be restricted by justifiable ones? In order to draw these boundaries more sharply, looking to the political philosophical debates surrounding civil disobedience can be helpful as it operates in a similar field of action outside the legal boundaries.

Formal vs. Informal Actions

Civil disobedience is a form of middle-class resistance that deliberately breaks the law in order to call attention to a concern or to protest an injustice. Since the 18th century, this form of resistance was widely adopted by the peace and environmental movements in


Evasion Of Temporality

Srdjan Jovanović Weiss

Temporality is tied to political transition – and abrupt transitions of politics give birth to many emerging and even disappearing forms in space. Most of them are known worldwide as shantytowns, temporary zones, disaster settlements, camps, temporal borders and spatial arrangements, check-points, customs areas or tents, and sometimes even new forms of cities. All of them are normally seen as B versions of high architecture or high urbanism, as exceptions to the stable and obedient arrangement of space. And normally, the acceptance of a temporary solution is an acceptance of lower standards. At the same time, it is strongly believed that these temporary solutions are an appropriate method in order to reach the next level: the promise of stability. This scenario depends on prioritizing limited time over available space. The temporary solution, in fact, depends on accepting a deadline of its own expiration.

The Serbian case has proven to be a telling one. The current impasse in the public realm can be seen as the result of repeated resistance to a deadline. Denial has proven larger than the acceptance of temporality. Milošević’s transitional power never once fossilized into architectural monuments or ceremonial urban schemes – his spatial politics were not urban but territorial and were mainly concerned with carving out, expanding, and cleansing to create a new national space. As a result, this abstinence has given birth to the emerging populist architecture – a bastard child of glitzy-corporate and folk-nationalist architecture called Turbo Architecture.

How Did the Culture of Optimistic Urbanism – Which Built New Cities – Become the Culture of Evasive Politics And Illegality?

Milošević’s deep entanglement with the overall crisis of the Balkans gradually put the public sphere of the cities into a deadlock. Interest in the city fell well behind the interest in the rural landscape and territory under the ethnic conflicts. Additionally, it is estimated that nearly half a million young professionals and students left Serbia alone in the 1990s, which contributed to a certain evacuation of the public discourse into an academic diaspora in Western Europe and North America. What was left behind was a myriad of anachronisms in the urban realm, a rollover of urban laws and regulations from the Socialist Yugoslavia under Tito. In order to balance out this instability caused by the professional emigration, eased on planning regulations and accepted ethnic refugees de facto as settlers on the public land in the cities. The former Socialist regulations were temporarily disabled as a solution for the sudden housing crisis, and the planning powers were kept at bay. While this was intended to be a temporal solution, the weakening of city planning practically opened up the doors to an informal economy. Once inside, the need of the informal city to solidify its presence led to a series of evasions of temporality: that is, temporal urban forms were hardened into complexes, and construction tactics would capture more illegal space within this new private realm.

As a counterpoint to the nation undergoing urban turbulence, the man without passion, as Slobodan Milošević was called throughout the Balkan crisis by international journalists, did not choose to build Belgrade as a manifestation of his power. The evasive aspect in this strategy was quite simple: the less Milošević built, the wider the gap opened for uncontrolled construction and for more political support. In spite of the political and economic isolation during the last decade and a half, as well as the lost wars with Slovenia, Croatia, Bosnia – and the lost wars with world over Kosovo – Belgrade has witnessed an explosion of construction. The estimates are that as many as 150,000 houses and buildings were built in Belgrade in the last decade, and between 800,000 and 1,000,000 in all of Serbia.

Four building typologies have emerged out of this passionless system. The first type is the corporate-meets-folk Turbo Architecture. Second is the vertical expansion of temporary structures that have been called Mushroom Houses. The third type are the blown-out additions – the so-called housing upgrades – that have been registered as a radical preservation of post-war Modernism. On a more suburban scale, the last type is the pixelated landscape, marked by the new Christian Orthodox presence in the north and Islamic architecture in the southwest. That is, the newly constructed objects in the suburban landscape took on the visual effect of the pixel, with all of its inherent divisions and demarcations of the greater picture. This new pixelated low-rise mix consists of single-standing shrines and churches, built as contemporary copies of Medieval Serbian architecture as well as mosques and minarets combined with urban villas, all similar in scale, which lends them the look of a mosaic.

Turbo Architecture

Milošević’s deceptive absence and lack of clear vision resulted in an alibi for an army of self-appointed saviors of lost values from the Serbian past. Middle-aged architects, the frustrated generation that came second in line after Tito’s first and most privileged generation to build the Communist city of New Belgrade, saw this as their chance to act. As Milošević bowed to popular participation in policy making, which had been Tito’s main taboo, so did the architects...
In observation of the current stagnating practice of contemporary architecture and urbanism, Rem Koolhaas has lamented the lack of optimism once exhibited by Le Corbusier’s grand vision of the modern city starting from scratch, tabula rasa. In Koolhaas’s enthusiastic search for the next model of urban development, Shenzhen was heralded as the miracle city that leapt from nothing to a large metropolis without any intermediary steps. Certainly, he is not alone in this assumption: ask anyone who has ever heard of Shenzhen and most will tell you that it is a young city with plenty of bling and no history. Since the year 2000, Shenzhen has had higher GDP per capita and a higher rate of economic growth than Beijing or Shanghai, exceeded only by neighboring Hong Kong. Presently, Shenzhen has amassed a population of 12 million from an original number that is commonly perceived as dismissible, or by Mr. Koolhaas’ account, zero. However, had it begun as a true tabula rasa, Shenzhen could hardly exist as we know it today. The pervasive legend of Shenzhen’s development does not accurately represent the complex and unique processes of the territory’s urban growth and transformation.

Shenzhen was called into existence in 1979 with the establishment of the Shenzhen Special Economic Zone under the grand vision of then Premier Deng Xiao-Ping. Some 2000 km² of territory in China’s Pearl River Delta region were chosen, which was occupied by several thousand agrarian villages at that time. These villages had cultivated the regional land and water for hundreds of years and each village collectively owned the land of their living settlements and farmlands. Under Deng’s rousing slogan of *To Get Rich is Glorious*, Shenzhen was designated to become the Chinese government’s controlled experiment of *Capitalism with Socialist Character* where the generation of wealth rules the day. The central government eventually purchased all land from the villages. Payment varied depending on individual negotiations. When money was given, the land value was calculated at a rural farming land price. In most cases, each male member of the villages received a plot of land to build a private residence as compensation. The designated land parcels were clustered together, mostly on the communal grounds of the original villages. Considering the issue of the villages settled, the government went about the serious and profitable business of turning the rice fields and fishing ponds into a brand-new and super-modern city. If that was the end to the history of the original villages, Koolhaas et al. would have been mostly correct, and we would have missed an opportunity to examine the remarkable development of resilient self-organization and a powerful display of informal urbanization.

At a glance, present-day Shenzhen is a textbook example of a centrally planned modern city with large distinct districts of zoned developments linked by high-speed vehicular arteries set within manicured lush greenery. The city’s fast-paced urban development is applauded and emulated as a monumental precedent of modern urban planning in Asia. However, within this planned landscape there exist hidden pockets of anomalous developments packed with illegal construction, substandard housing, and colorful nightlife. Dubbed *Villages in the City*, these are the resilient remnants of the former dismissed villages.

---

Hiromi Hosoya and Markus Schäfer

Urban Flux

The size of the burgers indicates the number of burgers that can be bought with one hour of work at average net salary.
You once defined your architectural creed as "never demolish, always change, add, reprogram." Interestingly enough for an architect, this position excludes the notion of building anew, which is what most architects would probably see as the essence of their discipline. Why don't you?

I really think that building anew represents only a small share of architecture and not its essence. Essentially architecture is adding things to something existing. Even if you build an entirely new building, you ultimately add on to a preexisting organization of space – be it houses in the neighborhood, a city quarter, a group of trees or a landscape. And I think that an addition can become meaningful when we analyze this proto-condition of architecture sincerely, in order to determine what it might lack – for only this should be added. Emilio Ambasz once said that if nature were perfect, we would not need houses. Following this logic, here I would throw in the idea that architecture should only add to reality what it lacks in perfection.

But how do you define the existing? In the contextualism of the 1980s, the existing was understood as the built heritage of the city. This often led to Postmodernist pastiches of history, a mimicry of existing building configurations devoid of any creative surplus: architecture had become a kind of pre-emptive conservatism. It failed to produce a vital city just as much as the tabula rasa thinking of Modernism which contextualism had sought to overcome once and for all. How do you avoid this pitfall of contextualism?

By identifying those elements, forces, and energies which are genuinely determining the spatial performance of a given situation. And for us, this is very often not architecture, but the activities that take place in or around it, thanks to or despite architecture. The famous square Djemaa El-Fnaa in Marrakesh provides the perfect example. It is one of the most exciting urban spaces I know, but its quality would be inconceivable if you look at it from a purely western-European point of view. The square is essentially a big open space only vaguely defined by a perimeter of fairly non-descript buildings. The urban quality of Djemaa El-Fnaa is not derived from its architecture, but from the ever-changing sequence of events that take place here in the course of a day: in the morning, it is completely flooded with cars driving over it in all directions. After a while, an acrobat, poet or musician sets up a stage in the middle of the bustling traffic and begins a performance. Within moments a circle of passers-by forms to watch him. Soon thereafter, another acrobat joins him. In this way, the square is gradually filled with performers and spectators until it seems to consist entirely of circles of people around which the traffic must weave absurd routes. Later on the square will be transformed into a huge market, and, in the evening, it will be covered by a myriad of fast-food stands. The place is whatever takes place on it.

When we designed Palais de Tokyo in Paris, we basically started out with Djemaa El-Fnaa as a conceptual model. This leads us to Cedric Price and his definition of architecture as an enabler, which poses the question of solid and void, and to what degree they contribute to shaping the space of the city.

Yes, it's a question of priorities. Ultimately architecture is a means to an end, not an end in itself. The meaning of the walls of a house does not reside in the walls themselves, but in the space they define – because you can do something within space, but not within walls. I think there are architects of the solid, who believe that architecture is an absolute value in itself, and architects of the void, for whom the value of architecture lies in what architecture allows to happen though and beyond its own material body. We (Anne Lacaton and myself) tend to be members of the latter species.

How can you practice such an architecture of the void given that architects are mostly asked (and paid) to make solids?

By first and always scrutinizing every commission whether its task makes sense and is necessary. One should never take this for granted. And architects should not automatically build something beyond its own material body. We were given a small triangular square near the main railway station called Place Léon Aucoc, a square like any other in France, certainly not spectacular, but charming in its modesty. When we came to see it, we were puzzled. For us, it was already beautiful the way it was. We could see neither how nor why we should embellish it. In order to devise a meaningful intervention, we carefully started to study it. We analyzed the architecture of the surrounding houses, the surface materials and urban furnishings of the square, the organization of traffic, and also interviewed the inhabitants. In the end, we found only minor misfits, none of which would have been solved by an architectural project.

Instead we drew up a catalogue of maintenance measures which were strikingly obvious and yet, completely neglected, including regularly

Fig. 1. Place Leon Aucoc, Bordeaux, 1996. Before and after the intervention.
Leisure Nomads of the New Third Age: Nomadic Network Urbanism of the Senior RV Community in the US

Deane Simpson

Liberated from the responsibilities of the first and second phases of life – education during childhood and work/childcare during adulthood – and uninhibited by the physical or mental limitations of the fourth phase of life (the old-old), the demographic segment known as the new third age (or young-old) has emerged as the site of some of the most radical experiments in subjectivity, collectivity, and urbanism.

The senior Recreational Vehicle (RV) community in the US is one exemplary case study of this tendency. Producing a form of nomadic network urbanism, it challenges established models of sedentary urbanity, inasmuch as it is mobile, informal, non-hierarchical, and network-based. In the US, this community conservatively numbers between two and three million retirees communicating predominantly via satellite internet.

While nomadic communities are clearly not a new occurrence, one of this size, sophistication, and connectivity is unprecedented. It continues to grow at a rapid rate with the expectation that it will more than triple in size over the next two decades as the Baby Boomer generation reaches retirement age – anticipating a future nomadic city greater in population than the largest city in the US. Nomadism, traditionally defined as the negation of urbanism, in this case produces a sparse flexible urban field of dense social connectivity.

RV Urbanism

In 1965, Buckminster Fuller proposed the end of urbanism as it was understood at the time. In a contemporary age of hyper-mobility, Fuller deemed “…the notion of self-contained permanent settlements obsolete.” Instead, he outlined an “urban strategy termed ‘unsettlement,’ consisting of a network of hyper-mobile nomadic bodies operating at the scale of the entire world connected through invisible radio links.” Here Fuller anticipated a form of urbanism that would emerge as a reality on an unimaginable scale thirty years later.

Between 1990 and 1994, Canadian anthropologists Dorothy and David Counts conducted field research into an emerging social formation that would lead to their 1996 publication Over the Next Hill: An Ethnography of RVing Seniors in North America: “While young people have been spending their energy in senedetary pursuits, buying homes in the suburbs, working in factories and offices, and raising kids, a generation of elders have become nomads. (...) There are literally millions of them. Nobody knows how many because there is no way to count them, but millions (two or three millions [in 1996] appears to be a conservative estimate) do not just leave home to wander a few months of the year. These people live in those motor homes or trailers; they have no other home.”

Leisure Nomads

The senior RV community operates similarly to the conventional logic of nomadism, but with two important distinctions: the first concerns the theme of categorization, the second of interaction. While the three basic categories of nomadism (hunter-gatherers, pastoral- and peripatetic nomads) rely on nomadic practices for subsistence, the nomadic RVer does not. This would suggest the need for a fourth term: the leisure nomad, the emergence of which may be understood in relation to broad demographic, sociological, and cultural transformations. These include: a) the widespread ageing of the population and the subsequent emergence of a new third age – a new generation of young-old who no longer work, but enjoy extended years of good health; b) the process Ulrich Beck calls individualiza-
Refugee camps are often perceived of as representing extraterritorial zones and tied into a global network of enclaves and *non lieux*, or “non-places” (Marc Augé) that are literally dislocated and disconnected from any immediate context. Their precise location seems to be of little concern. This view, which has gained a certain prominence within architectural discourse and cultural studies, ignores the social, legal, and economic interrelations that exist on the ground and the immediate physical context that refugee camps are located within. It is also blind, firstly, to the problems that are triggered on a political or developmental level, and, secondly, it is blind to these relationships that are implicated in the instrumentalization of refugee camps and the dilemmas of humanitarian aid, ultimately indicating the responsibilities of the planners. Common consensus is that refugee camps should be temporary. Preferably, refugees should be allowed to return to their towns, villages, and homes once the situation no longer presents a danger. Normally, or ideally, the emergency aid delivered to refugee camps is of a completely different nature to the developmental aid delivered in situations of economic plight, urban slum dwelling or reconstruction after disaster. While the latter aims at improving living conditions by upgrading and stabilizing impoverished neighborhoods, for example, the former aims at providing security and immediate care of the most urgent needs, and predominantly at saving lives – again, the emphasis here is on this aid being of a temporary nature. As poverty and a low level of development often characterize the context in which conflicts unfold – and refugee tragedies take place – by necessity, aid for refugees has an impact on non-refugee populations as well as on local culture, local infrastructure, and the whole strata of political life.
Model Houses and Show Flats or How to Buy an Apartment in Korea

Haewon Shin

The first high-rise apartment complex in Korea was built between 1962 and 1964 and contained only 642 units. Today, more than 50% of the population, equaling 24 Million people, lives in apartments, and the market for buying these is divided in two: the open market which deals with all second hand units, no matter how recently built, and Bunyang, meaning literally by the drawing of lots, a unique system through which all new units are sold in Korea. Each Bunyang sale is held prior to construction of the apartments – roughly two to three years before move-in date. Though pre-built sales have become standard in housing markets around the world, due to the extreme discrepancy between the desire to own a home and the capacity to (ful)-fill this wish in Korea Bunyang is not merely a market, but a Lottery. Participants in Bunyang don’t simply purchase an apartment they enter a competition in which the prize is the right to buy.

Depending on timing, quality and location, the chances of winning this right vary from 1:100 to 1:2000 in areas around Seoul and newly built cities. (Those who do not win at Bunyang must either enter another round, or move to the open market where the less desirable older units are sold at much higher prices.) The extreme demand for new apartments has led to fierce competition among Korean developers who have created their own unique genre of marketing in which apartments are branded and sold like soft drinks, jeans and other consumer items. Along with television, radio and print ads, the marketing of Korean apartments involves a whole sub-culture of temporary architectures that function like catalogs. Both the Show Flats, mocked up prototypes of the would-be apartment interiors, and the marketing complexes or Model Houses, in which these are displayed, have become architectural phenomena in their own right. At any time, literally hundreds of Model Houses dot Seoul alone, each filled with potentially dozens of different apartment designs ready for aspirants to inspect.

The Model House

As most new apartments built in Korea are sold prior to construction, pre-built prototypes must be constructed for potential buyers to view. Because of the large number and high turn-over of apartments, buyers have many different designs to choose from. To facilitate this process, along with the usual print and TV ads, Korean developers display mock-ups of their wares in large showrooms called Model Houses. A Model House is both a marketing center and a warehouse. Inside it will contain several mock-ups of the interior of apartments (Show Flats), along with site models displaying the contexts, sales desks, financial kiosks (where loans can be negotiated) etc. Competition has now become so fierce for these coveted, though not-yet-existent spaces, that the most desirable are open for only a single day. Aspirants have just a few hours to visit a Model House, examine the Show Flats contained therein, scrutinize the extensive catalogues for all relevant details – size, cost, financing plans etc. – and make their choice, i.e., purchase a ticket for the right to compete for a specific apartment. These Open Days are like fairs, complete with cheerleaders, Dowoomi,1 slipper helpers, who look after everyone’s shoes (in Korea wearing shoes indoors is the height of incivility, even in temporary buildings), and celebrity guests. They even include lotteries within lotteries in which aspirants distract themselves by entering raffles for furniture and other accessories for the homes they have only a slim chance of buying. Due to the fact that success often occurs only after many tries, lottery-home buying requires much time. It is not surprising therefore that the largest group of participants are female homemakers. With demand being so high, another Model House appears with a completely new set of designs as soon as one lot of apartments is sold. It takes just 4-6 weeks to build a Model House and the Show Flats it contains, both being destined for demolition as soon as their tickets are sold.

Model House Architecture: Permanently Temporary

Because Model Houses are categorized as Temporary Buildings, they are exempt from conformity to standard building codes. Though the interiors of the Show Flats erected inside a Model House are precise simulations of the real units, the exteriors of these buildings bear no relation to the apartment complex facades. There is only one opening in the external skin of a Model House – the entrance. Model Houses are located for the convenience of shoppers, not where the actual apartments will be built. They are like three-dimensional billboards presenting full-scale images of what potential buyers might think the exterior of a stylish building should look like. Since most real facades of apartment buildings in Korea are quasi-indistinguishable – all presenting the same un-designed housing-block appearance – Model House facades are actually illusions; projections of a desire to how life could be, not true simulations of what they will actually be. These curious structures form the zone of the as if, the

1 A Dowoomi is a sales lady, who specializes in assisting customers in the process of buying an apartment. They actually resemble sales ladies in a department store who promote a product.
International Aid Cities:
A By-Product of Reconstruction in Postwar Cities

Pushkaraj Karakat and Snehal Hannurkar

Cities witness various remarkable phases in their life cycle. War is one such remarkable phase, a dark and unforgettable one which many cities undergo. Some of them also witness the next phase, which brings them into limelight, a long and seemingly never-ending phase of Reconstruction. This paper, a specific case study of Kabul, analyses the structure, character, and dynamics of such temporary aid cities as well as their effects on, and latent potentials for, the host cities.

In the remarkable process of reconstruction of a postwar city, what goes un-noticed is the metamorphosis of a seemingly temporary urbanism that is happening parallel and simultaneously to this reconstruction process, which initiates enormous activities that re-structure the urban fabric of the city. It brings the International Aid Community into the postwar city, both as providers and consumers, creating a breeding ground for new trades, economies, politics, lifestyles, cultures and traditions. This generates a new side effect urbanism: an urbanism with inverse dynamics of its own, an urbanism which responds to Western standards and needs, an urbanism that gives birth to a temporary city, which coexists within the to-be-reconstructed host city. Characterized by imported urban and social values, it remains an insoluble bubble within the fluid of the almost dying, victimized city. Kabul, Afghanistan, serves as an excellent example for such a dual layered urbanism.

The needs and the luxuries for the numerous UN agencies, international peace-keeping forces, NGOs and INGOs inject delirious, Western urban elements and symbols into the hungry for basic infrastructure Kabul. Apparently temporary in nature, they creep in as a package with complete infrastructure: expensive nouveau cuisine restaurants, bars, golf courses, red light districts, etc., therefore, creating restricted areas for the locals, abnormal traffic jams, and the total destruction of indigenous public spaces within the city.
Strategies for the Reuse of Temporary Housing

Cassidy Johnson

Providing sustainable temporary housing, notably in the disaster/crisis situation, depends on the ability to reuse units in a second life. Housing, even in a temporary location, is one of the main factors that can help a family re-establish a sense of normalcy in their lives in a chaotic and unpredictable post-disaster situation. However, temporary housing projects have been proven problematic in the long-run; what can be a valuable resource for the community often becomes a headache due to a lack of strategic design for sustainable outcomes for the units once they are no longer needed as temporary housing.

Temporary housing is defined as a place where families can re-establish household responsibilities and daily activities for an interim period until a permanent housing solution can be found.\(^1\) It is acknowledged that temporary housing during a crisis has many similarities to that of the post-disaster temporary housing; however, this paper deals specifically with the post-disaster situation. Temporary housing has occurred after most recent large-scale disasters,\(^2\) and the type of temporary housing varies from very basic shacks or distributed materials that are placed alongside the damaged properties, to the construction of temporary suburban settlements including all the necessary amenities and infrastructure.

Problems of sustainability in current temporary housing practices temporary housing can promote the success of the overall reconstruction process because it enables families to begin immediate recovery while allowing adequate time for proper community planning to reduce risk and increase sustainability for future construction. However, due to their nature, formal temporary housing projects (see footnote 1) are an extremely unsustainable form of housing because major investments are made in units that will only be used for a short amount of time (typically planned for six months to three years of use). Even though temporary housing is intended only for short-term use, the ensuing housing crisis in most post-disaster areas means that temporary housing has a great likelihood to become permanent, unplanned housing for the lowest income residents.

The research conducted seeks to understand how the permanence of temporary housing, or what we may call the second life of temporary housing, can actually be a sustainable practice, 1) economically, in terms of getting a longer life out of the upfront investments in temporary housing; 2) environmentally, by recycling buildings, building parts and rational use of land near the city; and 3) socially, by providing much needed low-cost housing to the market.

Based on the case study of the temporary housing programme in Turkey, this paper looks at the long-term outcomes (four years after construction) of four temporary housing projects in Düzce, an earthquake affected town. It asks: what happened to the temporary housing once it was no longer used for disaster affected families? Which outcomes are the most sustainable, especially in addressing housing needs and rational urban planning? What sorts of design and planning considerations are needed?

Building Responses to The 1999 Earthquakes in Turkey\(^3\)

In August and November 1999, two large earthquakes devastated the industrializing urban regions to the east of Istanbul, including Izmit, Yalova, Adapazarı, Düzce, and Bolu. Almost 18,000 people died, many more were injured, and 250,000 people were made homeless.

In response, the government, aid agencies, and non-governmental organizations (NGOs) initiated a housing strategy requiring three distinct sequential stages of building. These were: 1) emergency tents and winterized tents put up and managed by the Red Crescent and the Military that were used for the first year as houses, schools, and other types of facilities; 2) temporary housing provided by the Turkish and foreign governments, international and local NGOs; and 3) permanent housing built through international loans by the government and also smaller projects by various NGO groups. These formal responses to housing needs were also accompanied by many informally or privately built responses initiated by the affected families.

Temporary Palaces - Geçici Saraylar

The temporary housing programme included the provision of 40,621 housing units; 31,339 units provided by the government and 9,282 units by NGOs in 136 settlements throughout the earthquake-affected region, ranging in size from 20 units to 2,000 units. Designs for the various government-built settlements were similar as they were procured through a centralized public tendering process, whereas NGO projects varied from rudimentary wood or paper shacks to slick factory produced units with separate bedrooms, kitchens, and bathrooms.

Even though the temporary units were small and offered very basic accommodation, families were grateful to have a place to call home after spending several months in tents or makeshift shelters. Residents affectionately referred to the temporary houses as geçici saraylar or temporary palaces— and treated them as their own. Many families were forced to migrate to another town to find temporary housing, and often the locations were far from the city or their former home; nevertheless, 95% of the houses were lived in. Neighborly

---


\(^2\) For example, formal temporary housing projects, meaning that units are specifically built by governments or non-governmental organizations (NGOs) for the purpose of temporary housing, have been implemented in Thailand (2004), Bam, Iran (2003), Izmit, Turkey (1999), Armenia, Colombia (1999), Kobe, Japan (1995), Florida, United States (1992), Loma Prieta, California, United States (1989), Kalamata, Greece (1986), Mexico City, Mexico (1985), Friuli, Italy (1976), Lice, Turkey (1975), Managua, Nicaragua (1972); Skopje, Macedonia (1963). However, after all disasters, families will use some kind of temporary housing which may or may not be formally provided temporary housing. Informal types of temporary housing include: building own shack, staying with relatives, renting an apartment, or staying in a hotel/resort.

\(^3\) The material used for this paper was collected through field research using interviews and observations during various visits to the earthquake-affected region and to Düzce between 2000 and 2005.
Florian Lippe

Whatever Happened to Nomadism?

Mongolians have been living as nomads for centuries, for thousands of years even. On the move. They have persistently cultivated and elaborated upon a mobile culture that seems to feel secure and comfortable in the status of the resolute and recurring flow. A flow that is almost caressingly arranged around the ger, the round tent-like nomadic dwelling more commonly known as yurt or jurt. The ger is the means by which the nomads cope with the barren landscape of the vast Mongolian steppe; it is a circle of highly condensed functionality, that has never even had to consider the very idea of urbanity. A tough structure with a fragile appearance, today the ger is in danger of becoming obsolete as urbanization and the flux of nomads to Ulaanbaatar have created a situation where gers form vast agglomerations on the outskirts of the capital. Ger cities – a contradiction in terms. From a Western point of view, the ger seems like an anachronistic relic that is either to be transformed or overcome. It has miraculously appeared on the Global Aid Agenda, allegedly begging for relief from the ever-growing pressure of urbanization, modernization, and westernization. With the ger, an entire culture seems at stake. I decide I want to discover it while it is still there.

Urban Nomad
Berlin, September 2007

Mongolia, a country in a clandestine fetal position, trapped and sheltered between its foster parents in the north and south, the protective mother Russia and the demanding and rigorously absent father China. Mongolia, ideologically fed by the umbilical cord of the Trans-Siberian Railroad, is flocking towards its nucleus Ulaanbaatar. Interfused not only by former and current Socialist parental care, but also driven by a wish for consumerist relief from nomad privations. Life in the steppe is tough, always has been.

Having lived in a constant nomadic state since the beginning of Mongolian thinking, i.e., with the unification of the Mongolian tribes by Genghis Khan, and thus forever, the ascetic purity of the nomadic,
Indifferent Urbanism or Modernism Was Almost Alright

Robert Somol

Both critical and market-driven approaches to the city (radical and pragmatic) have made a fetish of difference over the last half century: from collage cities and contemporary digital visions of presumably non-standard production (the repetitive differentiation of cellular transformation) to niche marketing, just-in-time production, and consumer profiling. Indeed, the value of difference has achieved such a cult status across all ideologies of architecture and urbanism that, like motherhood and apple pie, it now represents an apparently unassailable consensus. Against Modernism’s presumed homogeneity, Postmodernism, in all its diverse guises, has marketed a vision of the heterogeneous. While once a productive terrain of investigation for a liberative agenda, the space of differentiation today has increasingly been absorbed by the market and technological default.

Recent architectural and urban design-research has become increasingly reanimated by two concerns: representation (what warrants expression or requires signification) and agency (how do things get done or who has the authority), or, in a slightly more specified formulation that registers the contemporary bias for exchange, particularly among the cybernetically-inclined, communication and participation.

In this particular post-war construct of Modernism, when it wasn’t seen as eschewing forms of applied representation entirely, the question of what was worthy of being represented was presumably self-evident: the spirit of the age, technical-material systems, the needs of a universally generalizable human collective. The professional agency for this translation from facts to artifacts was equally obvious: the objective expertise of the architect-planner. Beginning as early as the 1950s, however, a well-rehearsed series of internal and external transformations made this shared consensus subject to increasing suspicion and doubt, just as its corollary faith in neutral forms of expertise also began to evaporate. For the last half-century Modernism has survived, paradoxically, only through the critiques of its myriad discontents, uniformly accused (for various ends) as offering only homogenous and reductive forms of language and knowledge, its period of institutional critique by now far in excess of its period of imagined dominance.

Against this backdrop of the extended enumeration of Modernism’s failures, the new consensus, hidden behind (or instantiated through) a rapid turnover of conflicting architectural and urban ideologies and styles, has been an unquestioned embrace of difference. From early varieties of Postmodernism on, the crisis of expertise and the inability to credibly identify any form of collective consent has resulted in the representational obsession with how to figure difference—from collage and contradiction, through the unconscious and parasites, to continuous variation and the non-standard—and the procedural question of how to generate it. The sundry, invariably antithetical, modes of abdicating expertise have ranged from giving the people what they want (advocacy planning, community charettes, design preference surveys, the celebration of the vernacular and everyday forms of architecture without architects) to more abstractly autonomous or unconscious modes of form-generation. While early versions of the latter aimed to remove the subjectivity of the architect in favor of variously specified design procedures (architecture as conceptual art), in today’s neo-surreal context they often conversely imply removing the objectivity of the architect in favor of algorithmically-scripted construction processes (building as chia pet). Combining ecological metaphors and computational logics, the indexically autonomous moment of the day, with its rhetorics of emergence and self-organization, issues from a new form of...
The healthy man does not flee before the problems posed by sometimes sudden interruptions of his habits, even physiologically speaking, he measures his health in terms of his capacity to overcome organic crises in order to establish a new order.1

Good Manners, Bad Behavior

The Normal cannot be determined without the Pathological, its dialectical counterpart. But pathologies or crises are not merely dysfunctional. In processes of normalization, they are the driving forces for the establishment of new systems of order. To understand the character of transforming urban territories (spaces/societies) and to be able to act on them, it is indispensable to acknowledge this generating role of crises situations. As urban design and architecture are disciplines that are preoccupied with normalizing and ordering processes, we want to introduce a design tool that promotes a design practice that actively integrates crises into the creative process: subversive standards.

Standards are unified or aspired modes of operation, be they formalized or informal, and generally an outcome of processes of normalization. Subversion as a critical attitude requires an understanding for the prevailing mechanisms that are producing the current normative setting. Instead of overthrowing or negating these conditions, subversion latches into the processes at work and transforms them from within. Subversive standards are aware of their double agenda of both following and generating ordering systems as well as allowing for transformational deviations.

What if a design practice would be based on subversive standards and achieve sustainability by the following operations: faking, undercover operating, parasitism, mimicry, fare dodging, misuse, and camouflage?

Modern Standards

Discourses on normality and the resulting processes of normalization and standardization have been constituent elements of modern societies. They can be roughly described as reactions towards a world of growing complexity and disorder. As normality is never a given, but a product of a discourse of the powers that be, there are alternative normalities at stake. Jürgen Link has differentiated two discourses on normality: proto-normalization (Proto-normalismus) and flexible normalization (flexibler Normalismus).2 Whereas proto-normalization sets a norm based on an average condition and strictly defines the aberrant as pathological or abnormal, flexible normalization includes occurring deviations from the average into the normal condition and defines them as part of the normal. Those deviations are even considered necessary as catalysts for societal development and the establishment of new normalities. The advantage of flexible normalizing processes is that they acknowledge change and the possible shifting of standards opposed to the status-quo dictum of proto-normalization.

The history of industrial norms starts at the beginning of the 20th century in Europe. Rather proto-normalizing by character, the industrial norm’s function is the coordination of man (producer and consumer) and the machine (device) under the paradigm of economic and logistic efficiency. Their goal is the national and finally international implementation or coordination of those processes. Those industrial norms were strongly influencing architectural practice at the time. Central to the architectural and urban agenda was to ensure standards of living and spatial production in order to better the conditions of the urban population. Modern architects were both infatuated with the concept of the machine (Le Corbusier’s architec-


**Elemental:**

**Housing As an Investment**

**Not a Social Expense**

Andrés Iacobelli and Alejandro Aravena

---

**Elemental** is a Do Tank. Our field of action is the city. **Elemental** seeks an approach to urban life in contexts of scarce resources, whether in the housing field, public space, transportation or infrastructure, using the city as a source of equality, here and now. If there is anything everyone in the world today can agree upon, it is that we need to correct the inequalities of our societies. For that, the only sustainable, but long-term, solutions are education and income redistribution. The city, if well-designed, might provide the necessary shortcut.

Do Tank is a term invented to describe our modus operandi: the city is a powerful and efficient vehicle to improve the welfare and the opportunities of people who might have been originally excluded from the benefits of development. In **Elemental**, we are trying to make effective and efficient quality of life improvements for the poorer segments of society, through concrete urban projects, privileging those projects that require innovation and research. As Geetam Tiwari from the IIT (Indian Institute of Technology) in Delhi says, questions raised by complex systems (such as cities) tend to require counter-intuitive answers; in order to resolve these questions, time and dedication are needed – and, in general, the resources are insufficient. Hence, if the question cannot be formulated correctly, it becomes difficult to obtain a proper answer; but far more dangerous is the risk that there might be a good answer to the wrong question.

---

As think tanks (i.e., universities, study centers, foundations), we seek to identify, debate, and concern ourselves with unexplored complex issues of social interest and public scope; specifically, in our case, the realm of the city. And like many other stakeholders in society (i.e., governments, consultants, NGOs), we are interested in making a contribution to the common good by means of concrete projects: in short, by doing things. This two-fold operation of a Do Tank (operational towards the common good) forces one to accept all the restrictions of a given problem (economical, legal, political, social temporary, etc.) without losing the greater picture of general interest. To put it differently: if the Do accepts the restrictions, the Tank sets the conditions. The Do is in charge of accepting the restrictions and ideas that must be internalized in order to become real; the Tank looks after the conditions that this new reality must encompass. Just as it makes no sense in doing something without quality, it makes no sense to imagine something without implementing it. This leads to what one might call a relevant pragmatism, in which from one side, theoretical debates are filtered out, but at the same time, care is taken so that the process of implementation doesn’t miss the general purpose of the operations.

Even though the contribution of a Do Tank must come from its capacity of articulating, representing, and validating poorer families’ interests, its most distinctive aspect consists in understanding that for implementing an action, one has to be able to read the multiplicity of stakeholders’ interests and provide them all with a common language, i.e., that of works which are able to synthesize those interests.

What distinguishes a Do Tank from other modes of operating is very specific and reflects upon a profound principle: the funding that enables an autonomy of particular interests, ergo an independent defense of the common good.

In order to contribute professional quality work to urban projects, perhaps even generating public welfare, since 2002, **Elemental** has worked under the wing of the Universidad Católica de Chile, and, since 2006, with the support from the Chilean Oil Company, COPEC.

---

For Example

In this article we will present an example of our work on a housing project. In order to trigger a qualitative leap-forward, **Elemental** works under the same policy conditions as the rest of the market and within the framework of the current local housing policy, bringing together the best practices in architecture, engineering, and social development. The project makes use of a US$ 7,500 subsidy (given from the government to the families) which pays for the costs of land, construction, and infrastructure – in the best of cases, this allows for around 30 m² of built space. When the given money is the equivalent to just half of a house, the key question becomes *Which half do we do?* We have chosen to provide the half that a family would unlikely build on its own.

Our point is that social housing should become a public investment, not just a public expense. Hence, we have identified a set of design parameters that allow a housing unit to increase its value over time. Thus far, we have designed and built projects with a middle-income standard unit which gains in value over time. In effect, we have
Caracas, Venezuela, is located some 1,000 m above sea level, in a 20km-wide valley – a megalopolis of 800 square kilometers, home to nearly six million people. To the extent that the rest of the world knows Caracas, they associate it with Venezuela’s staggering economic growth, its membership in OPEC, the machinations and manipulations of its leadership. This is one Caracas. But Caracas is two cities: the formal city of tall buildings, gated homes, enormous wealth, and private transportation, and then there is the informal city. The latter, sprawling to the east, covers an area four times larger than the city’s 1950s metropolitan boundaries and is home to some one million families. Much of this informal city of densely packed, ramshackle structures clings to Caracas’ steep mountainsides. Planned and built almost exclusively by the residents themselves, these barrios have no streets in the conventional sense, no paved roadways; people move around on foot, along pathways established by habit, and up and down steep stairs. To the extent that there is a transportation system: it is pedestrian. Barrio-dwellers do not own cars.

Since petrol is cheaper than water in Venezuela, it is hardly surprising that formal urban development has favored the private automobile. The program of highways was laid out in the late 1940s by none other than Robert Moses, then New York City’s chief planner and master builder. Today, Caracas’ freeway system has come to resemble that of Los Angeles in its effect: the arbitrary and irreversible separation of entire communities from one another.

It is possible to visit Caracas – indeed, to spend considerable time there – and remain unaware of the barrios. They are, to adapt an expression of the architect Peter Eisenman, present in their absence from the daily life of the formal city. They are also absent from any presence on Caracas city maps.

Caracas MetroCable: Bridging the Formal/Informal City
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Since petrol is cheaper than water in Venezuela, it is hardly surprising that formal urban development has favored the private automobile. The program of highways was laid out in the late 1940s by none other than Robert Moses, then New York City’s chief planner and master builder. Today, Caracas’ freeway system has come to resemble that of Los Angeles in its effect: the arbitrary and irreversible separation of entire communities from one another.

It is possible to visit Caracas – indeed, to spend considerable time there – and remain unaware of the barrios. They are, to adapt an expression of the architect Peter Eisenman, present in their absence from the daily life of the formal city. They are also absent from any presence on Caracas city maps.

Not the Brave New World

In recent years, the visibility, if not yet the circumstances of the barrio-dwellers, has begun to change. Following the uprisings of 1989, constitutional reform produced a new legal structure enabling barriodwellers to participate actively in the public sector and to influence formal government and its public policies. Coupled with other, even more revolutionary changes – not least of these the new information-sharing technologies – enfranchisement brought new ways of thinking to the barrios, whose occupants have gone, as they themselves describe it, from resistance to action. They are increasingly unwilling to cede complete authority and responsibility to politicians and experts.

In this climate, the Urban-Think Tank (U-TT) has been working for some years now. Our premise from the beginning has been to work with residents of the barrios, specifically with their informal but well-established leadership, to discover their needs and wishes and, with them, to devise solutions that are in every sense sensible. And it is in this climate that a government transportation scheme for San Agustín crumbled in the face of fierce resistance from the residents of that barrio.
In the early 1980s, the Pearl River Delta (PRD) region was transformed into a vast manufacturing hinterland for Hong Kong, as well as an experimental zone for China’s new economy. Massive foreign investments from the British colony boosted a region that aspired to become the fifth Asian dragon. Established by entrepreneurs, a politics of laissez-faire was successfully injected into local infrastructural projects. Joint ventures and private money propelled a leap that responded to the global economy and accession to the WTO in 1997. The most visible trace of this more recent development is a private highway – a 120km elevated strip between Shenzhen and Guangzhou. Owned by the developer Hopewell Holding and CEO Sir Gordon Wu, the Guangshen Superhighway is a unique platform which links cities and transfers merchandise from factories to container terminals. This suggests that the configuration of this strategic network is no longer determined by local factors but by a private empire that controls the economy, the planning, and, ultimately, the culture of a region. The dual 3-lane toll expressway provides 18 interchanges designed by Sir Gordon Wu (who is also an architect). Obviously the strategic position of these junctions has increased the surrounding land value and encouraged the formation of an urban corridor that will eventually transform the PRD region into a single sprawling metropolis (eventually encompassing a population of 40 million and 41,698 km²). A commercial structure was built at each interchange. Inspired by Le Corbusier’s Plan Obus for Algiers, the buildings were intended to serve an ambitious mixed-use program – commerce, office, factory, and dormitory – directly plugged into the underbelly of the infrastructure. Most of the 18 buildings were abandoned soon after completion. Today they shelter migrant squatters. Traveling at 120 km-hour down the highway, careful to avoid frequent car crashes, stray domestic animals or wreck-
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Dr. Amer Moustafa is an Associate Professor of Architecture at the American University of Sharjah, Ajman, United Arab Emirates. His teaching and research interests are in the areas of urban design, city forms, urban transformation, and the democratic city. Before coming to the UAE, Dr. Moustafa spent over fifteen years in consulting, research, and teaching in the USA, both in California and Massachusetts. He has held teaching positions at the University of Southern California, California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo, and California Polytechnic, Pomona, California. He holds a PhD from the University of Southern California, a Science Master of Architecture Studies from the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, and a Bachelor of Architecture from the University of Aleppo, Syria.

Enrique Peñalosa

Enrique Peñalosa is an accomplished leader who has achieved positive results in diverse activities. He is also an influential thinker on urban challenges, particularly those related to sustainability, mobility, equity, public space, and well-being. His vision and proposals have significantly influenced policies in numerous cities throughout the world. He is currently a consultant on Urban Vision and Sustainability Strategy and has worked with many local, regional, and national governments as well as other organizations all over the world. He is also Senior International Advisor to the IDTP (Institute for Transportation and Development Policy) and the Hewlett Foundation. As Mayor of Bogota, with 7 million inhabitants, Peñalosa profoundly transformed the city, turning it from a city without bearings, nor self-esteem or hope into an international model for improvements in sustainability, quality of life, mobility, and equity by prioritizing public transport, public pedestrian spaces, and children’s happiness. Peñalosa’s writings have been published widely and his work and ideas have been featured in publications in many countries.

Marc Räder

Marc Räder (1968) studied photography at the Folkwang-School in Essen, Germany as well as at California College of Arts, San Francisco, USA. In 2000, he received the Krupp scholarship for Contemporary German Photography. His photographs have been shown widely throughout Germany, Europe, America, and Asia at places such as the Photographers Gallery, London. His art work is included in private and public collections like the Museum of Modern Art, New York. Marc Räder’s work arises from documentary photography and is focused to the genre landscape. His photographs are characterized by a playful use of scale and acuity (of vision). Räder has also written several books, including Scanscape (Actar, Barcelona, 1999) and Malorca - Island in Progress which was recently published by Nazraeli Press, Portland (2007).

José Rosas

Professor José Rosas is an architect and received a master in urban and regional planning from the Universidad Católica de Chile and a Doctorate of the Escuela Técnica de Arquitectura at Barcelona, UPC. He won the Urban Award in the Biennale da Arquitectura, Chile, for a new town in Valparaiso and one of the seven first prizes in the Elemental Competition for a new housing proposal. He was the Director of the School of Architecture at the Universidad Católica de Chile (1997-2000) and Head of the School of Architecture “Carlos Raul Villanueva” in the Universidad Central de Venezuela (2000-2002). He was also a partner of Makowski and Rosas architects, an architecture office in CCS with several projects. He has been a visiting professor to several school of architecture in Chile, Venezuela, Colombia, Argentina, Brazil, USA, and Spain. Among his numerous publications, the most recent is “Cities within the Cities: Urban and Architectural Transfers.” He is the Dean of the Faculty of Architecture, Design, and Urban Studies in the Pontificia Universidad Católica de Chile.

Ika & Andreas Ruby

Andreas Ruby is an architectural theorist and Ika Ruby is an architect and graphic designer. They are founding partners of “textbild,” an agency for architectural communication based in Berlin and operating in the fields of publishing, curating, teaching and consulting in Europe, USA and Asia. Besides their regular contributions to international art and architecture magazines, they have written and designed a number of books on contemporary architecture minimal, such as “Images A Picture Book of Architecture” (2004), “Groundscapes” (2005), and “Domingue Perrault: Meta Buildings” (2008). They have organized a series of architecture symposiums at various European universities and curated a number of exhibitions on contemporary architects, such as “Leonard Basset” (2005), and “Appropriate Design” (2007). They have taught architectural theory and design at the University of Kassel, the Peter Behrens School of Architecture Dusseldorf, Cornell University, Ecola Politecnica Federal de Lausanne, University of the Arts Berlin and the Metropolis Program of the Universal Polytechnica de Catalunya Barcelona. [www.textbild.com]

Saskia Sassen

Saskia Sassen is now the Lynd Professor of Sociology at Columbia University after teaching for a decade at the University of Chicago and the London School of Economics. Her recent books are Territory, Authority, Rights: From Medieval to Global Assemblages (Princeton University Press, 2006) and A Sociology of Globalization (Norton, 2007). She has just completed a five-year project for UNESCO on sustainable human settlement for which she set up a network of researchers and activists in

Haewon Shin
Haewon Shin graduated from Yonsei University, Seoul and the Architectural Association School of Architecture, London. She worked for major architectural offices in London, Berlin, and Hong Kong before setting up her own practice, Lokalidesign, which is now based in Seoul. She exhibited at the 2007 Shenzhen-Hong Kong Biennale and the 2006 Venice Biennale 10th International Architecture Exhibition. She taught at the Department of Architecture of the Chinese University of Hong Kong and is currently a visiting professor at the Korean National University of Arts, Seoul.

Deane Simpson
Deane Simpson is an architect teaching at the ETH in Zurich, where he is currently also working on his dissertation. He was educated at the University of Auckland in New Zealand and at the Graduate School of Architecture and Planning at Columbia University in New York where he received his Master in Architecture in 1997. Formerly an Associate with Diller + Scofidio in New York, he collaborated from 1997-2003 on projects including ICA Boston, Eyebite, Brasserie, Blu, and JFK Travelogues. He has received a Fulbright scholarship, an SoM Foundation Essaying iCa Boston, Eyebeam, Brasseur, Blu, and JFK Travelogues. He is the director of the Centre for Research Architecture at Goldsmiths College, University of London. Before taking on this position, Weizman was Professor of Architecture at the Academy of Fine Arts in Vienna. In Israel, he has been working on architectural projects related to art and theatre. Weizman also works with a variety of NGOs and Human Rights Groups in Israel and Palestine. He co-curated the exhibition A Civilian Occupation: The Politics of Israeli Architecture, and co-edited the publication of the same title. These projects were based on his human-rights research and were banned by the Israeli Association of Architects. They were later shown in the exhibition Territorial in New York, Berlin, Rotterdam, San Francisco, Malmo, Tel Aviv, and Ramallah. Weizman has taught, lectured, and organized conferences in many institutions worldwide. His books include Hollow Land [with Verso Books], A Civilian Occupation [Verso Books, 2003], the series Territorial 1, 2 and 3, Yellow Rhythms. In addition to editing books, Weizman is also a regular contributor to many journals and magazines and an editor at large for Cabinet Magazine (New York). Weizman is the recipient of the James Stirling Memorial Lecture on the City Prize for 2006-2007.

Gary Sisess
Gary Sisess teaches architecture design and theory at the School of Arts, Culture, and Environment at the University of Edinburgh. He completed his PhD at the Swiss Federal Institute of Technology in Zurich (ETH) where he was also a member of the architecture faculty. He is also visiting professor at the Graduate School of Architecture at the University of Nanyang. His forthcoming book, edited with Julian Varas, is entitled Architectures: A Manual for Peripheral Buenos Aires (University of Palermo Press, 2008) and pertains to nascent urban cultures in the Mercosur region of Latin America. His articles have appeared in international journals such as LOE, SUMMA+, A21, Trans-, and Assemblage. He is currently working on another book concerning the strategic role of the city in Asian campaigns of cosmopolitanization.

Robert Somol
Robert Somol was appointed Director of the School of Architecture at UC in August 2007. An internationally recognized design theorist, Somol was most recently professor in the Knowlton School of Architecture at Ohio State University and visiting professor at the Princeton School of Architecture, and taught design and theory at the University of California, Los Angeles, from 1997-2005. He has served as the Max Fishman visiting professor at the University of Michigan and as the Cullinan Professor at Rice University, in addition to teaching at Columbia University's GSAPP and Harvard's Graduate School of Design. Somol is the editor of Autonomy and Ideology (Mnacelli Press, 1997) and has served on the editorial boards of Any and Log. His writings have appeared in publications ranging from Assemble to Wired. He is the co-designer of "off-use," an award-winning studio and residence in Los Angeles that extends his interest in combining the speculative discipline of Modernism with the material excesses of mass culture: beinahe nichts meets la dolce vita. His collection of essays, Nothing to Declare, is forthcoming from ANY Books and the MIT Press. He is also a member of the Research Board of the Berlage Institute in Rotterdam.

Kaarin Taipale
Kaarin Taipale is a Senior Visiting Fellow at OHR Institute of Helsinki School of Economics and a post-graduate student at Helsinki University of Technology. She speaks and writes on sustainable urbanism, the impact of globalization on cities, and the privatization of the public sphere. On behalf of the Ministry of the Environment of Finland she chairs the Marrakech Task Force on Sustainable Buildings and Construction. She is also a member of the World Future Council. She has been guest professor at Chalmers University of Technology, Goteborg, Sweden and has worked as an architect in Zurich, New York, and Helsinki. She was Editor of The Finnish Architectural Review, CEO of the Building Department of Helsinki and Chairperson of ICLÉ - Local Governments for Sustainability Locally, she is a member of the Commission of the Port of Helsinki.

Jean-Philippe Vassal
Jean-Philippe Vassal graduated from the School of Architecture, Bordeaux in 1980, and spent the following five years in Niger as an architect and town planner. He lectured at the Schools of Architecture in Bordeaux (1982-1999) and Versailles (2002-2006), and was guest professor at the Peter Behrens School, Dusseldorf (2005) and TU Berlin (2007-2008). In 1987, he founded the architectural practice Lacaton & Vassal in Bordeaux with Anne Lacaton. Their renovation of the Palais de Tokyo contemporary Art Center in Paris was completed in 2001. Openly declaring their commitment to architectural economy, the work undertaken by Lacaton and Vassal focuses on economic and precise solutions for transformation and construction, upgrading the city, and promoting dialog with the building industry, in order to propose generous conditions for living with pleasure. They have published the book + in collaboration with Frédéric Drust.

Eyal Weizman
Eyal Weizman is an architect based in London, where he studied architecture at the Architectural Association and completed his PhD at the London Consortium, Birkbeck College. He is the Director of the Centre for Research Architecture at Goldsmiths College, University of London. Before taking on this position, Weizman was Professor of Architecture at the Academy of Fine Arts in Vienna. In Israel, he has been working on architectural projects related to art and theatre. Weizman also works with a variety of NGOs and Human Rights Groups in Israel and Palestine. He co-curated the exhibition A Civilian Occupation: The Politics of Israeli Architecture, and co-edited the publication of the same title. These projects were based on his human-rights research and were banned by the Israeli Association of Architects. They were later shown in the exhibition Territorial in New York, Berlin, Rotterdam, San Francisco, Malmo, Tel Aviv, and Ramallah. Weizman has taught, lectured, and organized conferences in many institutions worldwide. His books include Hollow Land [with Verso Books], A Civilian Occupation [Verso Books, 2003], the series Territorial 1, 2 and 3, Yellow Rhythms. In addition to editing books, Weizman is also a regular contributor to many journals and magazines and an editor at large for Cabinet Magazine (New York). Weizman is the recipient of the James Stirling Memorial Lecture on the City Prize for 2006-2007.

Ines Weizman
Ines Weizman is an architect and critic based in London. She is director of the MA Cities, Design and Urban Cultures at the Department of Architecture and Spatial Design, London Metropolitan University. She is also teaching and theory at Syracuse University’s Architecture Program in London. Additionally, she has taught at the Architectural Association, the Berlage Institute of Architecture in Rotterdam, and in the department of Architecture at Goldsmiths College, London. In recent years, she has been researching utopian visions within the context of urbanism after the collapse of the Iron Curtain. She has particularly concentrated on the architectural transformation of former East German cities since reunification. The topics of several articles she has published include the political and ideological spectacles enacted by Soviet-era architecture, the urban historiography of former East German cities, and the phenomena of "shrinking cities.”

Sarah Whiting
Sarah Whiting is on the faculty of the Princeton School of Architecture, where she teaches courses in history and theory. Her writing has been published in numerous anthologies, journals, and newspapers, and she is currently completing a book manuscript, entitled Superblock City: Chicago’s Elastic Grid. Additionally, Whiting is a partner, along with Ron Witte, in the firm WW, based in Princeton, New Jersey. WW’s current work includes the Golden House, in Princeton, which broke ground this spring, an office tower proposal in Ho Chi Minh City, Vietnam, renovations for the Drama Division at the Juilliard School, Lincoln Center, New York, and a competition in The Netherlands.

Juan Alfonso Zapata
Juan Alfonso Zapata is an architect and an urban planner working on new urban development in Latin America. His recent projects include the assessment of local and regional strategic plans in the Dominican Republic and the Caribbean in collaboration with governments and educational institutions; the collaboration with the Supersemea Think Tank in the project AL-Caribe (about tourism and human settlements in the Caribbean), which is scheduled to be published in 2008; and assessing private investors in the region in regard to investment strategies. He has taught and lectured on sustainable urban development and tourism at several universities in the Caribbean and Spain. He is also a founding member of Common Asset, a management consultancy firm focusing on mixed investments in Latin America.

Ting-Ting Zhang and William Tan
Ting-Ting Zhang and William Tan are currently designers at Zaha Hadid Architects, London. They were educated at the National University of Singapore and Cornell University. Their collaborative works have been exhibited in exhibitions such as AIA New York, Students Exhibition 2006, and the Architecture Biennale Beijing 2006. These projects have also appeared in publications such as Collective Intelligence in Design – Architectural Design (Udo Wies, Sons, Inc., 2006) and Emerging Talents, Emerging Technologies (China Architecture and Building Press, 2006).