Woods, Lebbeus. *Radical Reconstruction*. New York: Princeton Architectural Press, 1997. Print.

Radical Reconstruction
Lebbeus Woods

Walls

The projects presented here for Sarajevo, Havana, and San Francisco propose various forms of peripheries and edges commonly referred to as "walls." These most primordial of architectural elements are necessitated by the state of contemporary culture, which finds itself in the midst of a crisis that can be met fully at its peripheries and edges, but not at its core, even though that is where its causes and most fatal effects are found. At the core, this crisis is effectively disguised, while towards the boundaries, which are always to some degree neglected or at the limits of control from centers of authority, the disguise slips somewhat, and the crisis is revealed. The disguise is, of course, not simply an effect of the crisis, but a primary cause of it. Some essential realities are being masked by what has been referred to as the "self-satisfaction" of mass culture.

This culture is maintained at the expense of creativity that can emerge only from an imagination stirred by confrontation with every kind of experience and actuality. Crises arise from the confrontation of disparate realities, when things of different orders meet and contend. However, through the predictable entertainment of television and movies by which the world's growing number of consumers feel they are in touch with themselves and one another, and by the fashions in everything from clothing to buildings, which give a reassuring illusion of cultural unity and vitality, consumers are encouraged to suppress their inherent differences and conform. This serves well enough those who thrive on consumers' dependencies, but reduces consumers themselves to a type of passivity that is historically new. It is the passivity foreseen by Aldous Huxley in *Brave New World* (1932), when he wrote that the way to control people is not with pain (the *modus operandi* of the police state), but with pleasure. What was once a privilege to be won has become a right to be demanded and received. The consumer waits to be pleased and in this way is continuously pacified.

The maintenance of this passive state is possible only in the absence of crisis, simply because crisis throws things out of balance and into some sort of unpleasant, yet dynamic, state. The crisis of consumer culture, then, is that it pretends there is no crisis, or at least none "here." Crisis exists somewhere else, in African-American ghettos and the Balkans, and there it will be contained, either by the police or a peace-keeping contingent. The "fall of communism," symbolized by the tearing down of the Berlin Wall, has been proclaimed not merely as the triumph of the Western powers over the East, but as the victory of the Western way of life. Now there can be a Disneyland in Dresden, a Mafia in Moscow, and everywhere a predictable sameness—everywhere but at the edge.

The walls of these projects for Sarajevo, Havana, and San Francisco do not simply separate other spaces, but define spaces within themselves, spaces "between," zones where the norms and conventions of living on either side of the wall's divide do not or, more likely, cannot apply. They are not simply outlaw zones, feeding on themselves, but the critical edges of urban life and culture as a whole. They may be a university campus or an ethnic ghetto, or, at a geopolitical scale, an entire city or nation, that has found itself between abrading or colliding ideologies or cultures. These zones of crisis are the only places where actualities of the dominant culture are confronted, and from which new ideas essential to the growth of a new culture can emerge.

A wall of this type can be metaphorical, but it can also be literal. In the latter case, it acquires an immediate tectonic presence, and at an architectural scale may become a room, a street, or a city. Or the wall may become pure space, in other words, the negation of architectonic mass and materiality and of the comforting assurance of their cause-and-effect certainty. There are always people who will come to inhabit the difficult spaces of the wall. They are the people of crisis, pushed usually unwillingly to confrontation with limits, borderline cases of every sort, adventurers, criminals, inventors, con artists, opportunists, people who cannot, or have not been allowed to, fit in elsewhere. They are nomads of the body, refugees of the mind, restless, itinerant, looking without much chance of finding a sure way either forward or back. Instead, they turn the situation to an advantage, making uncertainty a virtue, and strangeness an ally.

Accordingly, the architects of the spaces within the walls do not make predictive designs. Rather, they produce visual evocations that, however precise and detailed, are intended only as heuristic aids, guides that will stimulate transformations by others. These architects cannot rely on the conventions that serve well enough elsewhere, so they invent geometries and methods of construction, in this way provoking new ways of moving or resting in space, new and always transforming relationships between both people and things. To be more precise: the heuristic inheres only within a knowledge commonly shared with, though not codified through habit into, the conventional, that is, that which is so easily assumed it cannot be considered as either intentional or consequential. To inhabit the spaces of walls, edges, peripheries, borders, and the "in-between"—the spaces of the extreme conditions brought into being by radical transformations—is not a matter of creating entirely new knowledge, even less of discarding existing ideas or systems of knowing, but rather a matter of expanding them, precisely at their former, or present, limits. The new human landscapes created at the boundaries of the formerly known are those that increase the possibilities of choice among those people who find (or need to place) themselves on or against those boundaries. These landscapes may seem startling, even irrational, but they are nothing if not extensions of reason.

Knowledge is at the core of reason. People learn, remember, and are self-aware. They "know" not only as an end in itself, but in order to have a basis for acting. Is the knowledge on which inhabitants of the wall base their actions objective, concerning a reality independent of subjective human cognitive processes? Yes, according to principles of classical science: Plato's "idea," René Descartes's "duality," and Isaac Newton's "mechanics"—also, Einstein's "classical causality." This is a reality in which authority—source of wisdom—resides in hierarchies and in the static balances of rational determinism.

Or, is their knowledge existential? Does it concern a world in which existence precedes essence, in which knowledge cannot be verified by the assumption of a reality external to the processes of human cognition? Yes, according to principles of quantum theory (matrix mechanics, Copenhagen Interpretation) and cybernetics (recursive, closed systems). This is a reality in which authority moves within the shifting, dynamic fields of the self-determining, self-organizing systems known as "heterarchies" According to these principles, absolute and relative, objective and subjective, no longer have any meaning.

Which set of principles is true? As any good (amoral) scientist would say, the one that works the best. As any good (moral) existentialist would demand, the one confirmed by experience. Architecture is, first and foremost, a process of creating (and not merely an expression of) knowledge. Because of this, the making of architecture is a major coalescing activity in society, bringing together many flows into a single complex stream. In classical terms, architecture is a socially significant synthesis of the old antitheses: public/private, art/science, capital/labor. As long as society is dominated by institutions of authority that require a basis external to themselves for their existence (divine right of kings, social contract), monumental, that is, institutional, hierarchical architecture is required to embody objective knowledge. Subjective knowledge is deemed relevant only within the personal sphere, and therefore is embodied in idiosyncratic private works, tolerated publicly as works of art. But when society can no longer define itself in classically deterministic, objective terms, but only in terms of continuously shifting, dynamic fields of activity, then architecture must forsake the monumental, because there is no hierarchy to valorize anymore, no fixed authority or its body of knowledge external to human experience to codify.

In such a society, the classical distinction between art and life disappears. Art and life flow together, inseparable. Architecture then concerns itself with dynamic structures: tissues, networks, matrices, heterarchies. Both social structures exist within the present one: the fixed and the fluid, the hierarchical and heterarchical. The heterarchical of necessity embraces the hierarchical, but the hierarchical (in its extreme form, the ideological) cannot, of necessity, embrace the heterarchical, and will therefore suppress it by any means, including intentional violence or its threat, and even war. The one that works, the one confirmed by experience depends on one's point of view. For many today the heterarchical offers the best chance to realize the potential of the human. To a religious fundamentalist, the opposite is true.

In all matters concerning the coalescence of knowledge, ideologies act as inhibitors. While promising freedom of thought (a prerequisite for invention), they have promoted conformity to fixed ways of thinking. Ideologies insist on enforced belief, and thus on non-choice. It makes no difference what the ideologies are, of the right or left, of nation or race or religion. Freedom of choice is nothing more and nothing less than the freedom to choose between as broad a range of possibilities as conditions present. Freedom of choice obviates ideologies by placing them on a landscape of incessant dialogue and inescapable relationships with others. There it is not possible to choose non-choice.

Ideologies enforce beliefs by means of fear. Freedom of choice, they claim, will lead to the victory of the strong over the weak, of (if they were honest) the non-believers over the believers, the free over the non-free. This is the victory of evil over good, of chaos over order. Freedom of choice, however, leads not to chaos, but to a new and more subtle form of order. The development of new information and communication technologies resulting from existential knowledge has made it possible to comprehend a new form of order in chaos, one appropriate to present human conditions. Today, knowledge has caught up with the human potential to choose, to shape, day to day, its own presence within the presences of many others. The right to self-determination can now be enabled not only at an ideological and totalizing, a national and ethnic, scale, but at an individual level.

Now it is possible to create complex, fluid and multilayered societies, rich with diversity and choice. For the moment these technologies are controlled by public and private hierarchies who use them as a means of domination from above, frustrating the emergence of a more inclusive human society. But that will change, and has already begun to change. The building of new urban tissues where the old ones have been torn to pieces by war is one crisis point—beyond the immediate provenance of hierarchies—where the struggle to form new, heterarchical societies will be engaged.

Contrary to the autocratic, hierarchical, ideological systems that governed them, the old cities were heterarchies. Made up of complex layers of buildings and open spaces, of uses and reuses, woven over centuries and generations into a living tissue of meanings, old cities absorbed into their complexity the hierarchies that governed them, that attempted to force them into rigid structures they had never been, nor could ever become. The traditional hierarchies eventually came and went, but the cities remained, growing stronger and more complex in human terms. Only with the advent of modern mass technological culture did the hierarchies manage to absorb the cities' complexity—at first by intimidation through mass-media, and then by the sacrificial punishments of war. I refer here to warfare in the traditional sense, as in Sarajevo, as well as the warfare of restricting capital, as in Havana, and the warfare

of building against natural forces, as in San Francisco.

War leveled old cities in much more than a physical sense. It reduced their multi-layered complexity of meanings to one-layered tableaux embodying the monologic, monomaniac structure of hierarchy at its most logical and terrible extreme: the all-or-nothing polarity imposed by radical ideology and its rational overdeterminations. Old cities continue to be reduced by the same violence, and for the same old reasons. They will become new cities. When they are rebuilt, on what form of knowledge will it be, and to what—and whose—ends?

It is natural to want to replace something important lost to the destruction of war. Ideologies count on this desire among people, and thus make restoration (or the promise of it) their first principle of reconstruction. They believe that the phoenix can rise again from its own ashes. Important civic and cultural monuments no doubt should be restored to their undamaged condition, as tokens of past coherence that might serve as models of civilized thought and activity. However, such restorations inevitably reaffirms a past social order that ended in war. The attempt to restore the fabric of old cities to their former conditions is, therefore, a folly that not only denies postwar conditions, but impedes the emergence of an urban fabric and way of life based upon them. Wherever the restoration of war-devastated urban fabric has occurred in the form of replacing what has been damaged or destroyed, it ends as parody, worthy only of the admiration of tourists.

The instinct to recapture something irretrievably lost exists in the decadent, fin-de-siècle mood of a sensibility that defines itself as following an implicitly more potent and vivid epoch. But the complexity of buildings, streets, and cities, built up over time and across the span of innumerable lives, can never be replaced. The attempt at replacement serves, in the end, only the interests of the decrepit hierarchies, struggling to legitimize themselves finally through sentimentality and nostalgia, a demagoguery that is all too comforting and appealing to people struggling to recover from the tragedy of profound personal and cultural losses.

At such a moment of recovery, it is crucial that new directions and new choices are articulated. Because governments and corporations cannot be expected to take the initiative in establishing new and multilayered societies, the impetus for their creation must come from below, from people who begin to build directly, without the sanction of any institutionalized authority. These people include those from every socially defined group whose energies, once released, flow readily into a turbulent and newly complex human stream, one composed of distinct atoms of existence, and not melded into an indiscriminate flood.

It is natural to want not only to *restore* whatever is valuable that has been lost, but also—and at the same time—to *erase* the memories of tragedy and loss by substituting for the fabric of the city that has been degraded by violence an entirely new tissue, and a better one. This is the ideologies' second principle of reconstruction, the one that enables it to lay claim on the future, just as the principle of

restoration allows them to claim the past. The early twentieth-century modernist architects, who were aligned with the ideologies of industrialization, faced the task of rebuilding an intellectually bankrupt and war-devastated culture following the war that presumably ended all wars. These avant-gardists embarked on a war of their own, employing the violence of what would later be called "urban renewal" against the presumed chaos of old cities (actually, against their nonconformance to patterns of industrialization), proposing to erase the most conceptually corrupt parts in order to build more humane cities.[1] Their war was successful, especially after WWII, when some cities were already partially cleared by massive aerial bombardment, and others, though not bombed, begged for grand plans.

But their goal of "better" was never reached. Modernist architecture, just as the positivism that formed its foundations, was as single layered and hierarchical as the damaged cultural tissue it claimed to erase. Modernist architecture was too classical in its knowledge, too tied to cause-and-effect conceptions of process, too slavish in its worship of the machine (and its deterministic processes) to embody the chaotic spirit of the new age. Architecture, tied then and now to hierarchies of authority of both the left and the right, to modernist and postmodernist doctrines, has missed out on the revolution in knowledge that occurred in the first three decades of the twentieth century, and that continues today.

The erasure of old cities in order to build a better and more humane world is by now a widely discredited concept, yet it lives on wherever a totalizing system of space and of thinking is imposed in the name of a common cause. This applies especially to the crisis of postwar reformations, when cities or parts of them are conceived as a *tabula rasa* on which to inscribe new plans. Surely it is possible, even necessary, that after a century of the failure of grand designs new principles for the reconstruction of damaged buildings and cities can be devised. Such principles, it would seem, cannot emerge from conceptions of either pasts or futures, but rather from the present, from conditions existing in the experiential now.

Wherever buildings are broken by the explosion of bombs or artillery shells, by lack of maintenance or repair, by fire or structural collapse, their form must be respected in its integrity, embodying a history that must not be denied. In their damaged state they suggest new forms of thought and comprehension, and new conceptions of space that confirm the potential of the human to integrate with the building, to be whole and free outside of any pre-determined, totalizing system. The new spaces of habitation constructed on the existential remnants of war and natural disaster do not celebrate the destruction of an established order, nor do they symbolize or commemorate it. Rather they accept with a certain pride what has been suffered and lost, but also what has been gained. They build upon the shattered form of the old order a new category of order inherent only in present conditions, within which existence feels its strengths, acknowledges its vulnerabilities and failures, and faces up to the need to invent itself as though for the first time, thus

seizing the means to continuously refresh and revitalize itself. There is an ethical and moral commitment in such an existence, and therefore a basis for community.

The destruction of old cities has shattered their overlaid patterns of spatial and conceptual order. Once the existing patterns have been reduced by violence to a single, degraded pattern, they cannot be restored or replaced in any single step. However, there exists within this degraded layer of urban fabric another, more intimate scale of complexity that can serve as the point of origin for a new urban fabric. Ragged tears in walls, roofs and floor structures created by explosions and fires are unique and complex forms and figurations, unique in their history and meaning. No two are alike, yet they all share a common aspect: they have resulted from the unpredictable effects of forces released in the calculated risks of war. They are the beginnings of new ways of thinking, living, and shaping space, arising from individuality and invention. From them a heterarchical community can be formed, one that precludes the hierarchical basis for organized violence and war.

In the spaces voided by destruction, new structures can be *injected*. Complete in themselves, they do not fit exactly into the voids, but exist as spaces within spaces, making no attempt to reconcile the gaps between what is new and old, between two radically different systems of spatial order and of thought. These gaps can only be filled in time. The new structures contain freespaces, the forms of which do not invite occupation with the old paraphernalia of living, the old ways of living and thinking. They are, in fact, difficult to occupy, and require inventiveness in order to become habitable. They are not predesigned, predetermined, predictable, or predictive. They assert no control over the thoughts and behavior of people by conforming to typologies and coercive programs of use, to preestablished ideologies and their plans to predominate in human activities under the name of an enforced unity of meaning and material. Rather they offer a dense matrix of new conditions as an armature for living as fully as possible in the present, for living experimentally. The freespaces are, at their inception, useless and meaningless spaces. They become useful and acquire meaning only as they are inhabited. They disrupt traditional links with centralized authority, with deterministic and coercive systems. Within them, people assume the benefits and burdens of self-organization. Existence continuously begins again, by the reinvention of itself.

The *scab* is a first layer of reconstruction, shielding an exposed interior space or void, protecting it during its transformation. Scab is an ugly word. It would be comforting to find pleasant metaphors to describe the processes of building on the remnants of war, but they would betray the character of the work to be done, and the reasons for doing it. The natural stages of healing may not be pretty, judged by conventional aesthetic standards, but they are beautiful in the existential sense. As art and life become one, the need to disguise the actual diminishes, until the actual not only appears beautiful, but is. This is not only because whatever exists acquires new meaning and value, but also because whatever exists suffers an actual trans-

formation, because it becomes the subject of the most concentrated human effort. Architecture, the very model of precision and self-exalting intelligence, should not fear its union with what has been the lowest form of human manifestation, the ugly evidence of violence. Architecture must learn to transform the violence, even as violence has transformed architecture.

The *scar* is a deeper level of reconstruction that fuses the new and the old, reconciling, coalescing them, without compromising either one in the name of some contextual form of unity. The scar is a mark of pride and of honor, both for what has been lost and what has been gained. It cannot be erased, except by the most cosmetic means. It cannot be elevated beyond what it is, a mutant tissue, the precursor of unpredictable regenerations.

To accept the scar is to accept existence. Healing is not an illusory, cosmetic process, but something that—by articulating differences—both deeply divides and joins together. New forms of knowledge, those that give greatest weight to individual cognition rather than to abstractions representing an authority external to experience, mandate a society founded on differences between people and things rather than similarities. The city of self-responsible people, of individuals—each of whom tells a personal (even private) story—exhibits its unique scars, its transformations in solitude, which are a new kind of history. Increasingly, these will be stories of resourcefulness and invention, more and more distant from conditions created by conformity to social norms.

Who inhabits freespaces? People from every social class—whoever has the desire or necessity to transform their everyday patterns of life from the fixed to the fluid, from the deterministic to the existential. For the most part, it will be people who find the old, hierarchical orders too uncomfortable, too oppressive, too unworkable to stay within their dictates of custom or law, and are driven—from within or without—to take their lives more fully into their own hands. They will be the people of crisis: the crisis of knowledge, the crisis of geography, the crisis of conscience. They are the people who must perpetually begin again.

Who owns freespaces? Those who make them their own. Those whose lives, day to day, consecrate space with their own densities of meaning. This should not be mistaken for an ethic of "survival of the fittest," but understood as a form of comradeship or compassion. Those who can conceive or construct space place it freely in the common domain. They themselves may occupy free spaces or leave them to others—their reward is in the making. For those who occupy freespaces, actions transform spaces over time. A space that has been abandoned, for whatever reason, reverts to the common domain. There is justice in this, and the reality of an ever-renewable beginning.

Who pays for the construction of freespaces? Certainly not banks, corporations, governments, or any cultural institutions under whose authority the spaces of human habitation have everywhere been coerced into a convenient conformity and

reduced by the degradation of violence in the name of false unity and illusory security. Freespaces are financed from below, by those whose knowledge and ingenuity, energy and inventiveness have always fueled the engines of civilization, but who do so now, directly and resolutely, for themselves. Money will not pay for freespaces, because it is not available to those who by necessity are independent of its sources. The barter system must, in the beginning, suffice. The use of salvage provokes a new ingenuity; the idiosyncratic shaping of new materials, the same. Eventually it may be possible to create a new form of currency: information. Exchanged in bytes or bits, it will become more valuable than gold.

The new, reconstructed cities demand an architecture that arises from and sinks back into fluidity, into the turbulence of a continually changing matrix of conditions, into an eternal, ceaseless flux—architecture drawing its sinews from webbings of shifting forces, from patterns of unpredictable movement, from changes of mind, alterations of positions, spontaneous disintegrations and syntheses—architecture resisting change, even as it flows from it, struggling to crystallize and be eternal, even as it is broken and scattered—architecture seeking nobility of presence, yet possessed of the knowledge that only the incomplete can claim nobility in a world of the gratuitous, the packaged, the promoted, and the already sold—architecture seeking nobility of persistence in a world of the eternally perishing, itself giving way to the necessity of its moment—architecture writhing, twisting, rising, and pinioned to the unpredictable moment, but not martyred, or sentimental, or pathetic, the coldness of its surfaces resisting all comfort and warmth—architecture that moves, slowly or quickly, delicately or violently, resisting the false assurance of stability and its death—architecture that comforts, but only those who do not ask for comfort—architecture of gypsies who are hounded from place to place because they have no home—architecture of circuses, transient and unknown, but for the day and the night of their departure—architecture of migrants, fleeing the advent of night's bitter hunger—architecture of a philosophy of interference, the forms of which are infinitely varied, a vocabulary of words spoken only once, then forgotten—architecture bending and twisting, in continual struggle against gravity, against time, against, against, against—barbaric architecture, rough and insolent in its vitality and pride—sinuous architecture, winding endlessly on and through a scaffolding of reasons—architecture caught in sudden light, then broken in the continuum of darknesses—architecture embracing the sudden shifts of its too-delicate forms, therefore indifferent to its own destruction—architecture that destroys, but only with the coldness of profound respect—neglected architecture, insisting that its own beauty is deeper yet—abandoned architecture, not waiting to be filled, but serene in its transcendence—architecture that transmits the feeling of movements and shifts, resonating with every force applied to it, because it both resists and gives way—architecture that moves, the better to gain its poise—architecture that insults politicians, because they cannot claim it as their own—architecture whose forms and spaces are the causes of rebellion, against them, against the world that brought them into being—architecture drawn as though it were already built—architecture built as though it had never been drawn—

Sarajevo

Every age has its own face; the face of ours is a savage one; delicate spirits cannot confront it; they swerve their eyes in terror; they invoke the noble and ancient prototypes; they cannot look directly at the contemporary, prodigious, and dreadful spectacle of a world in painful birth. They want an artwork cut in the pattern of their desires and fears. They watch contemporary life exploding before them every minute with a world-destroying demonic power, and yet they do not see it; if they had seen it, indeed, they would have sought its reflection, its mirror-image, in contemporary art.—Nikos Kazantzakis

Sarajevo is the first city of the twenty-first century. The message we send back to you is not a happy one. But we are still alive.—Haris Pasovic

The towers are burned now in Sarajevo. The steel and glass monuments to enlightened progress in an age of industrial society are gutted hulks, and with them the ideologies and values they embodied. Sarajevo's skyscrapers were prime targets of gunners in the hills, together with minarets and domed mosques, the great library, the post office, the university buildings, and all others that symbolized reason and its promise of humane civil life. Once set afire by the incendiary shells, there was no way to save them. Not only had the infrastructure with which to do so been destroyed, but also the delicate tissue of reasons to do so. The burning towers of Sarajevo are markers at the end of an age of reasons, if not of reason itself, beyond which lies a domain of almost incomprehensible darkness.

But war is not confined to this city, nor to the culturally complex Balkan Peninsula for which Sarajevo was a symbol of tolerance and hope, and is now a signal of despair, and a warning. Armed conflict in one form or another continues to rage around the world, in Azerbaijan, Moldavia and Georgia, in Afghanistan, Kashmir, Sri Lanka, and Chechnya, in Israel and Lebanon, in Burundi and half a dozen other African states, in Northern Ireland, Peru, and Chiapas. In 1992 South Central Los Angeles was the zone of a civil insurrection that passed through it like a sudden and virulent storm, leaving behind not only massive destruction to property, but also to illusions of America's immunity to the violent forces of change affecting others. In Germany, the firebombing of buildings housing guest-workers led to riots that exposed once again the fragility of civilization in even the most orderly of societies.

Though no one in their right mind would wish it, there is certainly more to come, as the human world continues to fragment in the thaw following the cold

war, cracking like a great monolithic ice sheet along new and sometimes unexpected lines. It is a depressing and frightening picture to draw, especially at the end of a century in which hot wars have taught unforgettable lessons about the madness of organized violence. But it is a picture that emerges of its own cruel strength, its disturbing but potentially healing necessity. Only in confronting it can there be any hope of changing its tragic content. Only by facing the insanity of willful destruction can reason begin to believe again in itself.

As a result of the long siege of Sarajevo, many culturally significant buildings have been damaged or destroyed. This is a great loss, but that caused by the destruction of ordinary buildings is even greater. Just as the most terrible damage from the siege has been to the people of Sarajevo and to the fabric of their everyday life, so the worst architectural damage has been to the ordinary buildings comprising the everyday fabric of the city. Many shops, schools, hospitals, and apartment and office buildings have become uninhabitable. Their walls have been penetrated by artillery shells, their windows shattered by blasts, and their interiors gutted and burned. The majority of buildings damaged by shelling are still habitable, once repairs have been made, but often only partly so. In the cold weather, only one room in a flat may have heat from a gas or wood stove, and this is where people live. Also, some rooms are more dangerous than others because their windows and walls are exposed to sniper fire or to the shrapnel of artillery shells exploding nearby, and cannot be used.

These and other forced revisions to the planned use of spaces present a serious challenge to the idea of planning itself. In a field dominated by uncertainties, it is not possible to design according to predetermined programs of use, even those that claim to be multifunctional, flexible, or hybrid. Sarajevo, if it is in fact the "first city of the twenty-first century," presents architecture with new and fundamental questions, for which the answers of the twentieth century are clearly inadequate.

No other condition in Sarajevo demonstrates this as well as the fate of the city's many modern high-rise buildings, which can no longer be inhabited, at least above the first few floors. Not only are they the most exposed targets in the city, but also the most difficult for people to climb with the large plastic containers of water that must be drawn and carried by hand from the city's few public sources. This is less a matter of functional inconvenience than of the relationship of architecture to centralized structures of authority. These buildings were designed not for their inhabitants as much as for the social order that sponsored them, an order based on predictability and central planning. Now that this order has collapsed, the buildings are useless, except as monuments to the death not only of certainty, but of its enforcement through the promulgation of large-scale plans.

The outbreak of war in the former Yugoslavia in 1991 coincided with the development of my projects for Berlin and Zagreb which introduced the "freespace" and "free-zone." These concepts challenge canons based on building types and the methods of prescriptive design, and replace them with an architecture fully conceived in plastic terms by the architect, but evolved through successive interpretations by builders and inhabitants. The war's violence compelled a deeper examination of these concepts based on the relationships and interdependencies existing between violence and creativity, destruction and construction. The War and Architecture series consists of drawings that are meditations on this seldom-considered subject, and designs proposing a critical approach to the reconstruction of "volatile," war-damaged sites. The proposed "injection," "scab," "scar," and "new tissue" concepts of reconstruction are based on the principle of building on the existential remnants of war as a way to transform and transcend violent change.

As a result of several trips to Sarajevo made at the invitation of architects there both before and during the period of the siege, I came to work on specific reconstruction projects. Two such projects were the Elektroprivreda Building and the UNIS Towers (both corporate headquarters), designed by Sarajevo architect Ivan Straus. These buildings were seriously damaged by shelling and fire, though they largely maintained their structural integrity. In 1993, even though the continuing siege was making any construction impossible, Straus was making designs for rebuilding, and requested a collaboration. Together with proposals for damaged apartment blocks made during 1994, these projects extend the earlier research in the design of atypical spaces and programs of use (freespaces), and of spaces at the peripheries of existing buildings (walls).

The High Houses designed in 1994 for Sarajevo reclaim not only a site (a former tobacco factory near the center) destroyed by the siege of the city, but also the space above, invisibly scored for three years by the arcs of shells, bullets, and grenades. These houses respond to people's powerful need to achieve freedom of movement in space through a fuller plasticity of experience, and to exist in the full dimensionality of space—to fly and yet, paradoxically, to be rooted, to belong to a particular place and time.

The war of aggression and attrition waged against Sarajevo aimed to destroy not only its defenses, but also its cosmopolitan nature. The Parliament Buildings in the Marijin dvor sector near the city center, strong symbols of Sarajevo's urbanity, were especially targeted, and as a result were damaged so severely that they are today abandoned. The reconstruction of these buildings, when it comes, cannot simply restore the former bureaucratic forms, either of space or of governance. The war has changed everything, and most critically the structure of society itself. The design for a new Parliament (1994) projects a new type of institution, consisting of a network of freespaces woven in and through the surviving, homogenous Cartesian framework. Leaving behind the principle of hierarchy and using in its place that of heterarchy, the new place of government will concern itself with its own reformation in relation to the inevitability of permanent social, economic and political change.

In its extremity and grandiose absurdity of scale, the Bosnia Free-State is a literal wall that "defends itself"—survives, even flourishes—by absorbing all that attacks it. This may be digitized propaganda or "information" or an invading army, whose artillery has little effect on its discontinuous and mathematically indeterminate structure, and whose soldiers lose their way in the seemingly disorderly sequence of spaces, settle in, and in so doing begin to invent an order.

Cities have always needed to accept the new, the strange, the unexpected, the upsetting, the disturbing. Today they need to engage the conflicts at their core at a higher pitch of intensity, a more rapid tempo than ever, and at an unprecedented scale, but can only do this by engaging the crisis at their edges. The new walls to be built there must, paradoxically, not only separate, but connect.

Havana

Havana, Cuba may seem a long way from Sarajevo, but in many ways it is not. The subject of a social and political revolution thirty-five years ago, and since then the object of a trade embargo by the United States government because this revolution became communist, Havana is a highly cultured, multiethnic city struggling to survive a willfully destructive economic and political siege. It is a city in decay, if not in ruins, and of people who attempt to live with dignity in spite of the indignities forced upon them. Another similarity with Sarajevo is its approach to urban planning and architecture. During the past thirty-five years, the Cuban government turned to the former East Germany and other countries of the Eastern bloc, including the former Yugoslavia, for economic and technical assistance in building social housing, schools, and hospitals. Entire apartment blocks were prefabricated in Yugoslavia and shipped to Havana for assembly. Eastern European building types and construction methods, and also the centralized planning approach to urban planning, became the models for Cuba.

The results in parts of Havana built since 1961 are much the same as in the cities of Eastern Europe: a drab conformity (there is not so much difference, after all, between the consumer and the proletarian), only in Havana it is worse. The intense contrapuntal rhythms of life that mark Cuban culture as unique are mocked by the gray sterility of this imported architecture, yet in a way not so different from Sarajevo, where a rich mix of "East" and "West" produced an equally unique and subtle culture. After the "collapse" of the Eastern bloc, all contact with the formerly communist countries of Europe has lapsed, and Havana exists now in a state of suspension, and suspense, between ideologies, histories, and futures. It shares with Sarajevo the difficult fate of being in crisis, and also of being at a critical edge that is of importance far beyond its geographical limits.

I do not want to see the Cuban revolution end. I want to see it succeed, even more so than it has been able to under the pressure of economic siege from without and oppressive, totalitarian governance from with. Because of these two sources of

pressure, which are closely linked, the revolution has not yet found its architecture.

I have thought for a very long time that architecture can be a rallying point in a culture. It can be one of the things that pulls people together, which is formative of a community, of its continual making. The projects I have proposed for Havana seem on one hand purely fantastical, but on another propose civic cooperation as the basis for reconstruction. They are projects for and projections of participation. No levels of social stratification are needed here, no more mediation of ideas through bureaucracy. One way to save the revolution is to generate the energy for reconstruction from within the community. Architects, in this case, do not dictate a final product, but provide precise models and clear principles that the community can interpret and develop in built form with great subtlety.[2]

True, at the present time in Havana, there is a feeling of giving up. The same feeling of resignation, of incapacity to think, is the link that is too easily made, namely that the logic of living and creating one's environment has to do exclusively with the abundance of capital. Spaces anywhere are not made of titanium, glass, and steel—those are not prerequisites or limits of thinking, and thus their absence can be no excuse.

Having said that, I would also argue that the surplus economy as a basis of architecture should be reconsidered, not only because the architectural product of such a condition is itself a surplus architecture—which means that we can do without it—but because there are other ideas. New patterns and systems of organization, new geometries, new types of space—I find those concepts more useful in considering radical reconstruction.

What is a radical architecture? I have only one answer: the one in which you do not already know how to behave. In relation to the social condition in Havana, that certainly can and should be explored. Not only that. It can be an extension of revolution, rather than a passive reliance on old definitions—even if those definitions have to do with revolution itself.

I proposed three projects as a result of visiting Havana early in 1995 to attend a conference on architecture and urbanism organized at the request of Cuban architects by the MAK—Austria Museum of Applied Arts, Vienna. They, like the Sarajevo projects, are conceived as labor intensive rather than capital intensive, producing an architecture corresponding to actual economic conditions, but also to an idea of the activity necessary in a zone of crisis, as opposed to the passivity of zones of the "norm." Here, new ideas and inventiveness are not an option to be taken up by a creative few, but a necessity for everyone.

The first project is a new urban edge proposed for the Malecón, the wide, six-kilometer-long boulevard forming Havana's sharp northern edge with the Caribbean. An artificial terrace/seawall is constructed for recreational use, improving substantially on the narrow sidewalk and low seawall that now exists. This construction also protects against the high tides caused by tropical storms and

hurricanes that flood large portions of the city every three or four years. By using the force of the flood tide itself, the terrace tilts upright to form a high and effective seawall.

The second project is proposed for the old city, the former Spanish colonial city founded in the sixteenth century that adjoins Havana's large and protected harbor. At present it is in full decay, as there are no funds to restore the historical buildings, nor to maintain the many built during the period after Cuba's first revolution, which freed it from the colonial domination of Spain in 1902. With this in mind, a new urban wall is proposed along the approximate line of the old city wall of the colonial period in order to concentrate the energies in Habana Vieja, intensifying processes both of decay and of growth. The wall is a massive construction of masonry and concrete, containing utilities and serving as both a limit to and armature for the construction of new types of spaces for habitation within the old city. Constructed spontaneously of inexpensive, lightweight, and versatile materials, the wall's function is determined not in advance but only by the idiosyncratic and always-changing ways it is inhabited.

Because of its vibrant culture and volatile political history, Havana is an ideal site for the establishment of an institution for the study of the idea and practice of institutions themselves. The aim of such a Meta-Institute is, as always, to devise principles, practices, and "rules" by which institutions (social, political, cultural) can continually revise and reform themselves. But the institute proposed for Havana (explored in two versions) is devoted to the analysis and heuristic modeling of both stable and fluid urban terrains, the paradoxical landscapes of the contemporary city that embody both human and natural forces of change.

San Francisco

The impetus for developing the ideas and projects for San Francisco came in the form of a comment from Toshio Nakamura in Japan following the disastrous Kobe earthquake in March 1995. "It's just like 'war and architecture,'" he said, referring to my work of the previous two years on new tactics and principles for the reconstruction of war-damaged buildings and towns. I replied that the situations were not similar, because the Kobe destruction was not a result of any human intention to transform a city or its way of life, as is the case in war. But after more thought, I realized that there was, after all, a human intention contributing to the destructiveness of the Kobe earthquake, and that it should be critically examined, together with its implications for architecture. The San Francisco projects explore the possibilities for an architecture that in its conception, construction, and inhabitation comes into new and potentially creative relationships not only with the effects of earthquakes, but more critically, with the wider nature of which they are a part.

The great majority of buildings constructed in earthquake zones have an inherent weakness that no amount of structural reinforcement can entirely over-

come: they are composed of orthogonal frames that have a tendency to flatten when subjected to the earth-rending shocks of oscillating lateral forces produced by earthquakes. When this happens, buildings become killers. The large numbers of people who die in urban earthquakes are almost entirely due to the collapse of buildings, which are, by default, designed to do so. Their threat is well known, and long proven, yet they continue to be designed, built, and occupied. At the very least, this seems an irrational situation, if not an immoral one, especially in the aftermath of destructive quakes. Why does this situation exist? And why, once its existence is known, is it tolerated?

The reasons for the persistent use of orthogonal forms in active earthquake zones are several, including those that can only be assigned to the realms of psychopathology, especially that concerned with the psychodynamics of denial. While examination of the psychological dimensions of these reasons are unnecessary for present purposes, they should be understood as the deep motivation underlying those rationales most commonly argued for carrying on existing practices.

Cities are formed building by building. They are agglomerations of buildings assembled over relatively long periods of time and, therefore, products of the different individuals who commission and design buildings, and also of differing cultural conditions. Any city's growth (and decay) is governed by legal instruments, building codes, and zoning ordinances, which guide and constrain the ideas and ambitions of individuals and smooth out all but the most jarring cultural changes. Codes and ordinances inevitably find the acceptable zone of compromise between extremes, insuring that old mistakes are not entirely eliminated. Revisions over time to the rules of building will never strike at the essence of a prevailing status quo, but will only modify the rules that enforce it. Thus, even though quadrilaterally formed buildings tend to fall down in earthquakes, the desired solution will always be to reinforce them by various means, but never to reject them altogether as an appropriate way to design and build.

Of course, the arguments for continuing to build inappropriately are never made in such terms. As in many other arguments for maintaining of even a problematic status quo, economics is advanced as a leading issue. In this case the economic argument is simply stated: the construction industry has standards of materials and methods developed over long periods of time, and they are based on quadrilateral, orthogonal forms. Any deviation from these standards becomes prohibitively expensive for all but the most extravagantly funded, therefore extremely rare, projects. Certainly, this is true, but only as long as those who comprise this industry, and especially architects, the supposed "masters" of building who by definition are presumed to have a broader view of the construction of space for human use, do not explore and develop other ideas of the manufacture of building materials or methods of their use in construction. However, the effects of earthquakes are so radical that—expedient, economic, and social factors notwithstanding—it seems

necessary in earthquake zones to consider radical alternatives to both orthogonal architectural forms and traditional methods of building construction.

Of course, it is not that simple. Even if reasonable, economically viable alternatives were created, their application to new building projects would be hindered by ways of thinking so deeply rooted that they are not only unquestioned, but virtually unquestionable. Orthogonal architectural forms are applications of a dominant system of reasoning that rejects deviations as irrational in principle. In present society, Cartesian logic and its mathematical apotheosis, the orthogonal "grid" of x, y, and z coordinates (the orthographic foundation of architecture and engineering), are the common denominators by which differences, contrasts, and conflicts of every kind are reconciled. Reconciliation is achieved by reducing presumably unmanageable complexities into more manageable simplicities of a universally applied mathematical system. The overarching purpose of the prevailing system of reasoning is to control and direct all human activities. By applying an abstract and universal system of form making and space shaping, a universal system of human thought and behavior can be simultaneously established and enforced.

The most intractable problem in applying radically inventive architectural thinking comes not so much from the invincibility of the prevailing system of reasoning as from an intrinsic flaw in that system's structure. Cartesian logic posits the existence of fundamental dualities that can never, by its own rules, be entirely rationalized, just as the orthogonal frame can never be completely stabilized. Thus, presumed opposites remain unreconciled. So it is with the "man versus nature" paradigm. From this follows the belief that it is rational to tame or defeat nature— including "human nature," the source of all uncivilized, unsocialized behavior—by insisting on applying an abstract spatial system even when it has been proven inadequate in coping with particular conditions.

The prevailing attitude is that deviations in the construction of space are not to be allowed, let alone forced on society by unpredictable and uncontrolled geological forces, any more than by unpredictable and uncontrolled—so called "anarchistic"— social and political forces, or even by less explosive intellectual and artistic deviations from the self-consistent norm. If uncontrolled deviations in form are allowed, then the universal validity of the entire system is called into question. Fear of an erosion of belief in the Cartesian system of rationality is the "reason" that people stubbornly stay in earthquake zones, rebuilding after each earthquake in essentially the same way and form as they did before, attempting only corrections that, after the next earthquake, are inevitably proven inadequate. It would be more rational to put aside doctrinaire ways of thinking and their inherently vulnerable systems, and to create new systems of shaping space, new types of behavior and patterns of thinking and living that incorporate earthquakes as an essential aspect of reality.

What is an architecture that accepts earthquakes, resonating with their matrix of seismic waves—an architecture that needs earthquakes, and is constructed,

transformed, or completed by their effects—an architecture that uses earthquakes, converting to a human purpose the energies they release, or the topographical transformations they bring about—an architecture that causes earthquakes, triggering microquakes in order that "the big one" is defused—an architecture that inhabits earthquakes, existing in *their* space and time?

Seismicity—There is no frame of reference for the urban fabric, no edge except that chosen arbitrarily, a limit of thought and of thinking. Its density exists in layers of diverse and similar elements, yet its coherence is not achieved by the juxtaposition of disparate elements. Instead there is evidence of a conscious weaving of disparate elements into a single deep and complex layer. Within this layer, the quake effaces the edges of self-consciousness, even as the addition of new elements resists the collapse into entropy and its impetus towards uniformity. Seismicity is both a condition and a quality, both cause and effect.

Shard Houses—On the stable pilings of piers that once served the shipping industry on the west side of San Francisco Bay, the Shard Houses are built of scavenged shards of the industrial wasteland, but are also shards themselves, of a now-scattered cultural whole. The physical isolation of the houses speaks of a more stubborn, existential isolation. Their community comes together, if at all, almost by chance. When the quake comes, the landfill known as Bay Mud, on which the houses rest, liquefies, floating the houses closer together or farther apart.

Slip House—Sitting on a nearly frictionless silicon surface, inertia keeps Slip House immobile even as the quake laterally, violently oscillates the earth beneath it. The earth moves, the house does not. It is at once within the quake and serenely outside it.

Wave House—Its ball-jointed flames flex and re-flex in the quake; supple metal stems and leaves move in the seismic winds.

Quake City—There is no point of origin for the urban structure, no ground zero. It has always existed, in one form or another. Its history is recorded in its form, yet is discerned only by the closest readings. Successive quakes have shifted its fragmented, irregular mass, reshuffling the plates that once might have been called floors, walls, and ceilings. Now they are the decisive edges of spaces without names, rooms and zones of rooms, sites for a clarity of action that needs no enforcement. Those who live here know what to do only by doing, and ask only for a certain resistance of space to the gratuitous, the already known in advance.

Fault Houses—After the most recent quake, a resident of the Bay Area was quoted as saying, "It's our fault." This, it turns out, was not a *mea culpa* acknowledging the sad history of prior reconstructions, but a laying claim to the Hayward Fault, which had released the destructive forces. For some this spoke of a certain neurotic manifestation. However, it was more likely an identification not with destructiveness per se, but with an important geological condition, an aspect of nature unique to the region. To inhabit the fault, the Fault Houses cut precisely

into it, turning within the new space to carve in geometric progressions, releasing energy that may trigger microquakes that effectively unlock the fault.

Horizon Houses—Gravity and its resulting horizon are the only constants. The houses turn, reorienting their forms and fixed interior spaces relative to the horizon, hence "changing" them, in the experiential sense. The spaces between the turned houses, unlike the spaces within them, are dimensionally variable, almost infinitely so. This corresponds to the fluid state of their community, its inherent spontaneity and unpredictability, but also its continually shifting spatial potentials.

Of Peace and Pieces

> Progress becomes quantitative and tends to delay indefinitely the turn from quantity to quality—that is, the emergence of new modes of existence with new modes of reason and freedom.—Herbert Marcuse

It is the aim of the essays and projects in this book to sketch a theoretical construct of architecture derived from consideration of the conditions of existence brought about by willful destruction, both human and natural in origin. This construct is intended not as an end in itself, but as a basis for action that is primarily architectural. This has been done in the belief that the nature of architecture is such that it must embrace not only the so-called normal conditions of living but also its extremes if it is to fulfill its comprehensive mission.

This is not to suggest that war or natural disasters will inevitably be visited upon cities now enjoying a peaceful and productive stability, but rather that stability shares certain elements of its structure with instability, and in particular, those transformations that are driven by rapid, radical, or even violent forces of change, coming from within and from without. Willful destruction exposes for all to see the nature and effects of these forces in a way that peace often disguises, or attempts to disguise, through its maintenance of the appearance of normalcy, which architects are trained to exalt. By confronting the extreme conditions brought about by willful destruction, particularly as it affects urban life and its structures, architects will learn much about the practice of architecture within stable conditions, which they will never learn by unquestioningly accepting the often illusory appearances and assumptions of stability.

This work attempts to make clear that the war that is destroying a city somewhere else is destroying a part of civilization, and therefore is an attack on cities everywhere. The most significant contemporary case in point is Sarajevo.[3] The destruction of that city and culture by despisers of the complexity and diversity of human possibilities happened not only to "them," but also to "you." Putting all questions of altruism aside, you have good reason to make every contribution possible to the defeat of the enemies of urban civilization, wherever they appear. Exactly what is "possible" depends on your level of comprehension and capabilities, but the minimum is to

acknowledge the existence of yourself in the "others," and the "otherness" in yourself. If you are an architect, it is to develop a personal understanding of how the dynamics of violent change relate to your field of work and thought. For a few, this may mean becoming more directly involved in the city under attack. For most, it will mean looking at their own cities in more critical ways, and acting accordingly.

This work also attempts to indicate specific design solutions to the problems raised by destruction's causes and effects. This does not mean to establish a new architectural style, or to aestheticize violence, and even less to suggest a single way of approaching the problems at hand, but rather to link the highest level of formal concerns in architecture with the most difficult social conditions. Too often in the past, political concerns have been used by architects and others as substitutions for aesthetic ones, or vice versa. Only through aesthetic evocations of the paradoxical—in other words, through the poetic—can such contraries as war and peace, construction and destruction, suffering and pleasure be resolved without a loss of creative tension. In this sense, if in no other, Friedrich Nietzsche was right when he said that "the world can only be justified as an aesthetic phenomenon."[4] And it is true for societies at least as much as for individuals. This is what is meant finally by the term "culture," the highest pinnacle of which is invariably occupied in any society by conscious manifestations of the poetic.

This work also examines the practice of architecture, insisting that willful destruction necessarily changes its ethical precepts as well as its techniques. By inference, it is deeply critical of architecture as practiced generally, insofar as this practice fails to engage the processes of political/social change, revealed most nakedly by war, that are affecting urban life everywhere. Part of this failure is reflected in architects' indifference to the implications of social upheavals and change for their field. While it is true that they are often willing, and in some cases eager, to employ high technology, such as computer-aided design and virtual-reality systems, in the conception and production of their designs, they do not take into account the imperatives of social transformations for developing the "low technology" of architectural materials that is the most critical dimension of architecture. Building and urban design are still for the most part being cast in the molds of an architectural history long overtaken by contemporary events, while experiments in the shaping of space, the new use of materials, or experimental programs for the inhabitation of space are characterized by many architects as mere novelties. This book attempts to show that war exposes the universal need to revolutionize conceptions of the materials of architecture (most especially the conception of space) and not only to import products of the revolutions created in other fields and layer them onto existing architectural norms. Hence, architectural practice itself must change, placing far greater emphasis on architecture's responsibility for and role in political and social changes, and therefore on the architect's personal reflectivity, research, and responsibility.

Architecture has always been concerned with imbuing the ordinary with something of the extraordinary. It is concerned, as a practice, with enhancing the normative, with giving routine behavior and cultural conventions aesthetic qualities that elevate them beyond the power of their own monotony. Architecture exalts the everyday activities of people and the social institutions that direct them not only to make them more palatable (though that is a major reason) but also to dignify them and to suggest that life, even at its most ordinary, is worth living, because it is part of a much larger world whose beauty taken as a whole is inaccessible, yet can still be glimpsed in moments of "good design."

But what happens when the normative is disrupted, as in war (Sarajevo), economic strangulation (Havana), or earthquake (San Francisco), or as a result of the equally radical but largely hidden transformations created by rapid political, social, or technological changes? And what if this disruption reveals the normative as a comforting illusion, nothing more than a ritual of conventions repeated mantra-like in order to shield people from a horrible truth: that life is without universal or even a common meaning? How, then, could life redeem itself in the face of such a truth? And what would there be, then, for architecture to "express?"

In such cases, it would follow that life cannot be taken as a whole, but only as a collection of the idiosyncratic, the fragmentary, the ephemeral, the isolated, the unique. Routines, customs, and conventions would lose their meaning because they could no longer refer to a unity that must by definition be consistent and continuous. Beauty could no longer be found in "meaning," then, but only in the qualities of each fragmentary element of experience, and, more precisely, in an intimate knowledge of these qualities.

If all these conditions should occur, there would then be a need to invent a new way of conceiving space, consequently, a new way of constructing it, and, even more necessarily, a new way of inhabiting space. Architecture, in such a case, would no longer be an expression of something preexisting, but an instrument for the invention, in Marcuse's words, of "new modes of existence with new modes of reason and freedom."

The Question of Space

In the realm of the social sciences, space is usually discussed in terms of the human presence within it. In the field of architecture, however, it is the abstract qualities of space that are stressed, for an understandable if not altogether forgivable reason— architects are specialists in the formation of these qualities. One of the clichés derived from this approach is that space is designed to be functional, which means, in the jargon of the architect, that each designed space has been shaped to follow a "program" for human use.

This, of course, is nonsense. Architects usually design rectilinear volumes of space following Cartesian rules of geometry, and such spaces are no better suited to

being used for office work than as a bedroom or a butcher shop. All designed space is in fact pure abstraction, truer to a mathematical system than to any human "function." While architects speak of designing space that satisfies human needs, human needs are actually being shaped to satisfy designed space, and the abstract systems of thought and organization on which design is based. In the case of Cartesian space, these systems include not only Descartes's mind-and-body duality, but also Newton's cause-and-effect determinism, Aristotle's laws of logic and other theoretical constructs that the prevailing political and social powers that be require.

Design can be a means of controlling human behavior, and of maintaining this control into the future. The architect is a functionary in a chain of command whose most important task (from the standpoint of social institutions) is to label otherwise abstract and "meaningless" spaces with "functions" that are actually instructions to people as to how they must behave at a particular place and time.[5] The network of designed spaces, the city, is an intricate behavioral plan prescribing social interactions of every kind, prescribing therefore the thoughts and, if possible, the feelings of individuals.

A rectilinear volume of space labeled "lecture hall" requires that people who occupy this space behave either as a lecturer or as a listener. If anyone violates this order of behavior, say, by deciding to sing during the prescribed lecturing/listening event, then pressure to silence the violator will be brought to bear by the audience of obedient listeners, or the lecturer, or, if the violator persists, by the police. Or, to take a less blatant example, if one of the listeners asks (during the usual prescribed question/answer period following the lecture) too long a question, the audience of obedient questioners will try to heckle the violator of the space's proscribed behavior into silence. In certain cases, asking a question with a "wrong," proscribed, uncontrolled ideological slant will bring the same result. In extreme cases, it will bring the police.

The justification for the suppression of violators is clear enough. Social order must be maintained so that individual freedom (which is largely the freedom to conform to social norms) can be maintained. Think of the poor lecturer, who no doubt has something important to say, interrupted by the spontaneous singer, the too-long questioner who is usurping the lecturer's role, or the thinker whose heretical views upset the carefully controlled balance of the lecture and the listening. If, or so the argument goes, the "function of the space" is violated, and this violation is tolerated, it may set a precedent, become more widespread, threaten the whole mechanism of society. Anarchy. Chaos. It cannot be allowed.[6]

Of all these conditions, of course, the hapless architects are hardly aware. Isolated in a specialized task, praised by higher authorities (clients, awards' panels, social agencies of one sort or another) for their excellence in manipulating the abstract qualities of space and its defining forms, and at the same time for fulfilling

the needs of people (enforcing the prescribed behavior), architects can live under the illusion that they are first and foremost artists who shape space and its qualities for an appreciative (obedient) audience of users. Consequently, in the thinking and discourse of architects, formal qualities of space take precedence over its human content, which is merely assumed. In the case of the lecture hall, architects will discuss the subtleties of the space's proportions, its lighting, use of materials, the sight lines from audience to stage, its use of color, or a dozen other almost entirely visual qualities. They may refer to its acoustical characteristics by way of alluding to its "function," but they will never question the premises of the "program" for the space, the concept of "lecture."

A great architect, such as Mies van der Rohe, is able to elevate this precedence to a plane of philosophical principles. Mies was fond of saying that the greatest historical works of architecture were the temples of the ancient world, the interior spaces of which had little or no human function at all. They were pure architecture, architecture as religion. His concept of "universal space," which led to some of the best modern buildings (by him) and the worst (by his imitators), also had religious overtones. Architecture was something above life, or at least beyond the messiness of lives lived within it[7] People come and go, ways of living change, but architecture endures as an idealization of living. Architectural thinking in the past twenty years, even though it has paid much lip service to cultural context, including history, local conditions and the like, has changed the discourse of architecture very little. Even an architecture that plays with changes of fashion and fashions of change still places the medium over the message.

On the other hand, one cannot complain too loudly. It would only be repeating certain historical disasters to subjugate architecture to social conditions as they are or, even worse, to social theories, of whatever kind. Anyone who visits modern cities that were transformed by architectural and urban planning dictated by a particular ideology will understand how one-dimensional such landscapes can be. Architects who recall the "design methodology"[8] and "advocacy planning"[9] movements that dominated architectural education in the late sixties and early seventies will also understand how the best of social intentions can go terribly wrong. In the name of egalitarian principles, sociological techniques such as statistical analysis were made to directly apply to the process of architectural design, but with results that rival the most pedestrian socialist architecture of the Eastern bloc countries in mind-grinding blandness. Architecture, in the end, is not a branch of the social sciences any more than a mere instrument of a particular public policy or only an aesthetic manifestation. At the same time it is also not merely a combination of these admittedly important aspects of practice and production. The question of space raised by the design of architecture leads in a very different direction, one that could, until the present period, remain safely concealed behind historically sanctioned appeals to science and to art.

When Nietzsche wrote that people would rather have meaning in the void than a void of meaning, he made an almost painfully apt critique of the present, postmodern situation, and in perfectly postmodern, concretely spatial terms. For in fact space *is* a void, an emptiness which people have a powerful need to fill with the content of their own presence. This filling can be mental or physical or both, but if a space exists in consciousness that cannot be filled (or, more simply, *is* not filled) it represents an "unknown." In other words, it represents something intolerable. In earlier epochs these unknowns were usually geographical, and existed as continuously receding frontiers that had to be crossed, settled, or inhabited, if, for no other reason, so that new frontiers might be revealed. Yet even those dominions inaccessible to a physical human presence, the ones that appeared in dreams or the imagination, were populated by gods and angels.

For most of human history, there was meaning in the void. But then something began to happen. Nietzsche commented on that, as well. Decrying the devaluation of those primordial sites that gave rise to the rituals and myths that "help the man to interpret his life and struggles," he inveighed against modern "abstract man" and a modern culture that "is doomed to exhaust all possibilities and to nourish itself wretchedly on all other cultures." They are the products of "Socratism" and its incessant questioning of everything that inevitably destroys myths. "Only a horizon defined by myths completes and unifies a whole cultural movement," and imparts, therefore, to shared experiences mutually held values and meanings. "And now," he concludes with desperate sincerity,

> The mythless man stands eternally hungry, surrounded by all past ages, and digs and grubs for roots, even if he has to dig for them among the remotest antiquities. Let us ask ourselves whether the feverish and uncanny excitement of this culture is anything but the greedy seizing and snatching at food of a hungry man—and who would care to contribute anything at all to a culture that cannot be satisfied no matter how much it consumes, and at whose contact the most vigorous and wholesome nourishment is changed into "history and criticism?"[10]

This is not the place to discuss Nietzsche's prophetic powers, the extent to which he anticipated the disintegrating character of the twentieth century, the coming preeminence of psychology and anthropology in his own field of philosophy, the radical changes in the deterministic character of the hard sciences,[11] and technologies that have had the effect of turning whole populations into voyeurs and tourists grubbing for roots, even though their city is among the remotest antiquities, and who are never satisfied, no matter how much they consume. Nevertheless, we can read today what he called his "revaluation of all values" as the first wave of what has essentially been a full-scale "devaluation of all values" that has continued non-stop since his death. Now people find themselves with an infinitude of space—from the atom to the cosmos, from cyberspace to outer space,

from suburban living rooms to the vacant acres of the South Bronx—that cannot be filled with meaning by the traditional productions or contemporary products of science or art. No matter how much is pumped in, through mass media or consumer culture, through academic discourse or political peroration, it seems to fill the space less and less. It is fair to say that there is a growing skepticism among people, an erosion of their belief, not simply in the productions of culture, which are understood as transitory, but in belief itself, which—like Mies's temples—has always transcended the processes of change and lent coherence to them. The "devaluation of all values" is today eroding the concept of value itself.

Open war is the most dramatic and terrible instrument of the devaluation of values, because it demonstrates so vividly how contingent and expendable values are under life-and-death conditions. What is most important in war is not victory, but survival. One wins in the broad sense if one survives. Certainly one cannot win even in the narrow sense if one does not.[12] However, war is considered by most people an exception to civilized behavior, even though it is actually only an extension of it, carried to extremes. Nevertheless, the lessons of war seem to most people irrelevant to times of seeming peace. War is then only something to be avoided.

Actually, war is carried on all the time, though it is usually disguised by the conventional masks of normalcy, or sanctioned by institutions with "pragmatic" credos.[13] Whenever established ideas are under attack by new ones, there is war. Whenever people are displaced by "progress" or caused to suffer because of what they know or believe, there is war. Wherever landscapes are rapidly transformed by new technologies or ideologies, there is war. And let no one forget the eternal war of "man against nature." The destruction during times of peace, in terms of lives, property, and "values," is no less than during war, but only less acknowledged.

In so-called peaceful societies today, the chief agents of the process of the "war" upon values are the mass media.[14] Dominated by television and made global in scope by satellite technology, these media owe their existence to fundamental epistemological changes that made their first appearance in physics. Particle-wave duality begot the uncertainty principle, which begot quantum theory, which begot solid-state physics, which begot the transistor, digital computation, the microchip, the credit card. These developments have resulted in a communications revolution that has flooded space not with human presence so much as raw data that is, phenomenologically speaking, indiscriminate and undifferentiated. The effect of this flood is a chaotic one, in the presently understood sense of the term. That is, a landscape of psychological dimensions is created in which it becomes increasingly difficult to make distinctions between discrete things and events (they are homogenized in the "mass"), and in which flows, tendencies, trends, and fashions are the primary features. The very lack of discreteness in these features and the indeterminacy and lack of predictability of their structures have within a single generation

deprived the term "meaning" of its former meaning. Meaning itself is no longer something inherent in things and events, much less placed in them by its authors, but something open to personal interpretation or, in mass cultural terms, something pliable and subject to endless manipulation, in other words, "history and criticism."

There is, for the first time in history and criticism, the prospect of a general void of meaning. This is not only because "meaning" itself no longer has a common meaning, but also because the means of its codification—art and science, religion and philosophy—have themselves become voids. It is they that are the unknown spaces whose emptiness is intolerable and beg to be filled with human presence. Yet, without meaning of the sort Nietzsche believed essential to interpretation, they will remain (ontologically speaking) empty. While the alienation of people within ambivalent data flows is manifest in existential angst or postmodern languor, fundamentalist revivals or knee-jerk nationalism, it is becoming clearer that the emptiness of space formerly filled with a certain kind of meaning cannot be filled today by anxiety or apathy or frenetic consumption or even by a determined nostalgia for values or ideologies that have been irredeemably lost. These are all "negatives," which can only expand the emptiness. The lack of new "positives" foments a cultural, perhaps a civilizational, crisis that is seen most clearly in the various struggles going on now not simply to occupy space, but to fill it, to complete it, and to be completed and made whole by it.

It is true that space of the more mundane sort, that which is designed by architects for everyday use, seems as full as ever of human presence, but it is so in precisely the same way that everyday life in its increasing consumption is more full than ever, yet at the same time more empty. Office buildings, hotels, condominiums, schools, airports, cinemas, spas, private houses, and shopping centers are bristling with human activity, but the purpose of this activity, its "meaning," is becoming less and less certain. Increasingly, the design of space is today spoken of in terms of "flexibility." Even spaces in existing buildings must be considered for their possible "adaptive re-use." The lecture space *might* become a space for song recitals, after all. But only "might." No one knows for sure.

Though few are willing to say it openly, it is clear that the most important program for the design of space today is not "flexibility" or "multifunctionalism," which still presuppose predictability, but actual uncertainty. To admit being uncertain, however, to be lacking in determination, is for most people, and especially architects, anathema. Even if they were willing to face this condition directly, architects are ill equipped to design for programs of uncertainty and emptiness. They are trained as positivists, and their entire education and practice has been aimed at affirming explicit cultural contents dictated by their clients, which they believe must be invested, as they always have been, in the discrete things that are both the subjects and objects of design. But as discreteness itself has dissolved in the turbulences of information exchange, architects have reacted much the same as

other people, that is, by clinging with greater or lesser desperation to the very conceptions of their activities that are slipping most quickly beneath the waves.

An obvious example is the postmodern movement in architecture of the past twenty-five years, which has reaffirmed the importance of architectural history and attempted to "reinterpret" the old, "classical" typologies, sometimes with ironical self-mockery, but most often not. The revivifying of various symbols and signs is somewhere a part of this "greedy seizing and snatching" at meaning in the void. However, in a landscape in which distinct features are effaced by the redundancy and repetition of mass consumption, attempts to resurrect the "thing-in-itself" at extremities of symbolic or typological representation are doomed.

Architects today display the least humor when iconic forms or spatial ideas from the "heroic" phase of early modernist architecture[15] are invoked. This particular history is resurrected in the hope that its credos still might have, as they once did, the potential for evoking a new set of canonical meanings, or that "the unfinished modern project" is not merely a pretentious disguise for nostalgia. High-tech architects fall into a similar trap, hoping that mechanistic analogies might still hold, that determinism, at least in the cultural sphere, is not dead, or at least that Marshall McLuhan was right when he said that a superseded technology is ripe for being transformed into art. Perhaps it is, but by being so today it can only slip into the flow, increasing the emptiness of culture, without in any way contributing to a culture of emptiness.

The time has come for architects to accept the essential emptiness of space, its voided meanings, its indeterminacy and uncertainty. This might not mean simply jumping into the wayward wagon of the mass media and their continuing devaluation of values and of value, and traveling further into the unchartable fluid-dynamic terrain of the Internet and virtual reality—though it might. Even a cathartic, Dionysian ecstasy in terms of the design of space today is preferable to the desperation of architects, especially young ones, grasping at the conceptual straws of the past. Far better that they simply play, without a conscious plan or preconception in their heads, with their pencils or computers, taking what comes. At least they will manifest the virtues of courage and candor, indispensable for confronting unknowns.

But perhaps there is another way. Perhaps the old logical chains can be dragged a bit further. Perhaps, as the sciences in this century of change have already shown, the foundations of the old systems of thought can be expanded and revised enough to make new virtues out of former sins. This will require embracing what was formerly considered paradoxical and self-contradictory, therefore illogical, even irrational. But if concepts such as self-referentiality and chaotic motion—which were, less than a century ago, outside the reach of respectable science[16]—have been successfully incorporated into traditional logical systems and have even yielded important practical results, then there is no reason why not only the recognition

but also the design of the paradoxical space of uncertainty cannot be dealt with "logically" as well.

I introduced the concept of "freespace" in the Berlin Free-Zone project in 1990.[17] At the outset this conception differed from the "universal space" posited by Mies van der Rohe in that the latter suggested a purely aesthetic raison d'être, albeit disguised as (multi)functionalism. Freespace has no function that can be identified in advance, but only a set of potentials for occupation arising from material conditions. Also, the freespaces proposed for the reunited Berlin (and particularly its center, formerly in East Berlin) were conceived outside of any known building typologies—historical monuments, museums, state buildings, among others—that the restoration of the symbolic center of modern German culture would inevitability bring. The creation of cultural theme parks—whose purpose is the codification of an older order of authority as well as a lure to the masses now liberated by technology and market capital to become eternal tourists, digging and grubbing for roots, even among the remotest antiquities, who are never satisfied no matter how much they consume—is anathema to present conditions and potentials.

The Berlin Free-Zone project proposes the construction of a hidden city within the one now being shaped. The hidden city is composed of a series of interior landscapes joined only by the electronic instrumentation of speed-of-light communications, in ever-changing interactions with one another, and of a community of inhabitants created only through the vagaries of dialogue. This hidden city is called a free-zone, because it provides unlimited free access to communications and other, more esoteric, networks at present reserved for the major institutions of government and commerce—but also because interaction and dialogue are unrestricted by conventions of behavior enforced by these institutions.

Within each freespace are located instrument stations. These are electronic nodes containing computers and telecommunications devices for interaction with other freespaces and various other locations, and with other inhabitants. At the same time, freespaces also include instrumentation for exploring the extra-human world at every scale, insuring that the tele-community encounters the elements and forces of a wider nature.

The spatial forms of freespaces render them unsuitable for the conventional, and demand instead the invention of new ways of occupying space, even new types of activities; hence they are free in a deeper sense, as well—free of predetermined meaning and purpose. A subtle and dynamic relationship between the material realm of architecture and the dematerialized realm of electronic instrumentation is in this way established. This relationship becomes cybernetic in the continuous act of inventing reality.[18]

Freespaces are not invested with prescriptions for behavior. Strictly speaking, they are useless and meaningless spaces. The physical difficulties of occupation resulting from the eccentricity and complexity of their spatial configurations (the

opposite of an easily assumed neutrality) requires occupation to be of a forceful, even adversarial kind. Freespaces create extreme conditions within which living and working are engaged with a disparate range of phenomena. Until now, the principal task of architecture has been to valorize social institutions by making them symbols of an urban hierarchy of authority. Today, even though hierarchies necessarily remain, the heterarchy, an order without symbols, is ascendant.

The Berlin Free-Zone presents a new matrix of potentialities and possibilities. Built on the free dialogue of self-inventing individuals, nurtured by their continual spontaneity and play, the Free-Zone is a culture by definition parallel to one of conformity and predictability. But it will be tolerated only so long as it can remain hidden. It will survive in the new, commercialized center of Berlin only so long as its inhabitants maintain their wit and quickness, so long as they are free performers in a self-organizing and secret circus, a cybernetic circus.[19]

The freespaces in Berlin are not overtly aggressive or subversive. Because they are hidden within existing buildings they are not imposed, but must be discovered by chance or deliberately searched for by people who want to find them. For those who make the choice, these spaces allow, encourage, enable, or demand a confrontation with "a void of meaning," the contemporary condition par excellence. They do this by establishing a *terra incognita*, or what is perhaps better called a *terra nova*, a new ground of experience that is not a priori encoded with meanings that, for those who can confront the implications of their own freedom, have ceased to have meaning and remain only signs of empty authority, which is the most desperate, the most dangerous kind.

In Sarajevo, freespaces have a degree of significance different from that of those proposed for Berlin. It is equivalent to the degree to which war is an extension of the processes of change operating during times of apparent peace, and to which the normative has been disrupted by open war. In Sarajevo, the construction of freespace signals more clearly than elsewhere the advent of new modes of existence, new modes of reason and freedom. Before war stripped away illusions of normalcy, Sarajevo was on the verge of a transition from a socialist society to one dominated by free-market capitalism. The essential elements of this transition[20] were already in place. However, because of the war, this expected, "normal" transition has not occurred. Sarajevo is, sociologically speaking, in a limbo, unsure of its future. In the meantime, a new way of living—a survivalist one—has been forced into existence. It was not be possible after the war to simply revert to the "normal" processes of change, even though many would wish it. War changed the physical and mental landscape too much for that. Something entirely new is struggling to emerge. It is in this context that freespace takes it place in Sarajevo as an instrument of critical transformation.

The idea of freespace is nothing new in itself. All designed space, as has already been noted, is abstract and self-referential, following rules that underpin particular systems of order. What is new in Berlin, and in the Zagreb Free-Zone[21] and Sarajevo projects, is the open declaration of this fact, and subsequently the establishment of a critical position regarding the design of space generally. What is new is its attempt to make a virtue out of the former sin of "emptiness," thereby provoking a human presence that may, in its paradoxical way, fill the void of value with the void of space. If this "filling" is not of the former kind, which is to say by a set of mutually held beliefs and commonly agreed upon meanings, then it is by their mutual loss, and the mutual responsibility their loss demands of those willing to confront it. The concept of freespace is an assertion that "emptiness" is just another word for "freedom." In freespace, what is lost is the familiarity of architectural and social norms, the reassurance of control by stable authority, and of predictability, certainty, and the routinization of behavior. What is gained is not an answer to the perpetual question of space, but simply a clear articulation of its potential for the liberation of the paradoxical and the poetic.

Tactics and Strategies[22]

The philosophers have only *interpreted* the world, in various ways; the point, however, is to *change* it.—Karl Marx

The destruction of buildings and cities has forced the issue. Whether by open war or a rationalized acceptance of violence, destruction has commanded into being, though it never intended to, the need for a radically reconstructed architecture and city. It did this by destroying the old ways, the old times, the old city and its fabric of civilized building and of civil life. It did this also by undermining the authority of institutions responsible for protecting the life of the city. They either failed, or contributed directly to the destruction, betraying their own purposes. Now there is no choice but to invent something new, which nevertheless must begin with the damaged old, a new that neither mimics what has been lost nor forgets the losing, a new that begins today, in the moment of loss's most acute self-reflection.

A new architecture cannot be created by one person, nor can a new city, yet their coming into being relies almost entirely on individuals who are willing to act as though they were personally responsible for them. Only in this way can a shattered community without credible institutions reform itself on radically new terms. The architect who proposes to build the new with the old formulas and solutions (that can only mock the losses suffered in their name), who enacts the old professionalism (buttressed by solemn principles too often betrayed), who mouths the old platitudes and optimism (convenient for those who can afford their luxury) only perpetrates a depressing cynicism. The only way the new can be created is from deep within precise conditions existing in the present. The architect must become, more than ever before, a creature of the present, fusing all that is remembered and all that is dreamt within it, as though existence itself were hanging in the balance.

The cornerstone of the old practice of architecture was service: to the city, to society, and—by that process of transference common to anyone that presumes to speak and act for many—to humanity itself. In the turbulence of war, the nature of this humanity has changed, and the practice of architecture necessarily changes as well, if service remains its purpose and goal. Practice frees itself from the stasis of its own history and that of a narrowly canonized past. Architects are no longer able— nor do they want—to view the city from high above, as though it were an object to be manipulated and dominated. They are no longer separated from the city by the distance that professionalism places between humanity and human beings. In the war-damaged city, architects must struggle on the same level as others in order to reconstruct their lives. Cut off from the certifying authority of the old institutions, they must prove by their thoughts and actions alone that such a thing as architecture still exists, and that it has any meaning at all for others.

A new practice of architecture will be as different from the old as the devastated city of today is from what it once was. The old standards of practice have been decisively critiqued by willful destruction, the old goals and aims challenged by the horror of goals and aims gone terribly wrong. In order to participate in the building of the reconstructed city, the practice of architecture itself becomes as radically reconstructed as the architecture required by the changed conditions of living. New principles must be articulated by the architect, and new tactics invented and adopted. In places where destruction has and is still forcing the issue, the time to do so is short. The forces of reaction, as cynical and self-serving as ever, are eager to fill the void left by a destruction that they themselves to a large degree have caused.

Twenty Tactics of a New Practice

Initiate projects. War has frightened away the clients, the investors, the entrepreneurs, the banks, and with them the projects devised to serve their interests. The responsibility for reconstructing the city has shifted to its people, one of whom is the architect. Because the architect has a more intimate knowledge than others of the city's physical structures and their processes of coming into being, it falls to the architect to act in the void left by the disruption or collapse of institutional authority. The architect of the city's reconstruction initiates new building projects by putting proposals before the others in the city. Out of the dialogue and public debate provoked by them will come reconstructions that serve the public's interests, and those of the architect as well.

Instigate change. Destruction has set in motion a reformation of the city that is both radical and irreversible. This is a difficult and often bitter reality, which crushes the easy optimism of more stable times when change could be more easily resisted or controlled. It is true that people desire stability in their lives first and foremost, with only enough change to relieve the sameness of daily routine. Destruction, however, insists on a new form of stability, much more dynamic than before, a

survival stability, based on the ability to respond quickly and inventively to unpredictable events. This new form of stability needs now to be activated fully, extended beyond reaction to a form and method of action. In this sense, the damaged city can be a model for all cities suffering the unpredictable and sometimes violent changes brought about by continuous technological innovation and the rapid social and political changes it causes. Because it brings together in a single action so many diverse energies and people, so much of the mental and material that are otherwise understood as antipathetic and sometimes violently opposed to one another, the making of architecture is an ideal occasion for the realization of this new, dynamic stability.

Engage paradox. Dynamism in any form inevitably produces paradox. Heraclitus and other pre-Socratic philosophers celebrated this fact as an organizing principle. Aristotle's *Logic*, as Zeno proved, essentially banished dynamics and its paradox from Western thought and language.[23] However, the acceleration of change in contemporary life required their return in the epistemological revolution first carried out within physics. Spread now to other sciences and arts, it informs the mechanics and meanings of everyday life, and nowhere more so than in the city caught up in the frantic cadences of destruction. The dynamics of contemporary urban life have shown the inadequacy of existing languages in dealing with rapid and continuous change, except by producing self-contradictory—paradoxical—constructions. The failure of existing languages to represent more complex conditions of life than they were designed to describe is best seen in the various forms of self-reference resulting from individuals' reflections on their own autonomy—a condition raised to the level of crisis by destruction.[24] The conventional language (or languages, if one can really believe in today's often-cited pluralism) of contemporary architecture deals with change only in terms of the disturbance of stasis. In spite of attempts to design for "flexibility of use," the statically deterministic, Aristotelian nature of building concepts and systems effectively dooms these attempts in advance. Building types, for example, are as antipathetic to contemporary life as racial, gender, or nationalistic stereotypes, as anachronistic as other forms of determinism that enforce a status quo, yet they are so imbedded in the way architects describe and design that they are hardly ever questioned. However, by insisting on the manifestation of paradox in architecture, architecture's language can be expanded to include the unpredictable arising from a dynamism that has become the essence of modern existence. The simultaneous realization of contradictory or mutually exclusive qualities and ideas leads to a transcending of former categories of knowledge and types of experience, to a next higher level of understanding and work, where what was formerly considered paradox is revealed as a more developed, more complex form of order.

Make second-order designs. Before the destruction, the architect was called on only to make first-order designs, that is, designs that followed established

professional procedures, existing standards, and rules. Destruction and the accelerated personal and social changes it brings (the change of change) require a change in procedures, standards, and rules, the ways they are established, codified, and changed again. The architect must now design the rules of the rules, therefore the languages for comprehending and describing the space of a new dynamic stability. The task of the architect in the reconstruction of the damaged city is to make "second-order" designs, that is, to design the architecture of architecture.

Be alone, be together. Mass cultures continue to exist, as they always have. It is comforting to become lost in them, to be anonymous, and therefore free of the responsibilities with which identifiable individuals—who make decisions for themselves and accept the consequences—are always burdened. But war in its various forms destroys mass culture and all its superstructures, leaving only individuals who must first look after themselves, then join once again with others. Their joining cannot be based on anonymity, because there is no longer "someone else"—a leader—to represent them, to make decisions and accept responsibility for the results. Rather, it is based on the integrity of individuals whose trust of each other is based on honesty, competence, autonomy. Only by each person being individual can a community be formed within and after destruction. The architect becomes individual not only by initiating proposals for projects, but by initiating concepts, and then living them. These emerge from the unique point of view of the world inherent in any person's organic autonomy, manifested in architecture as a personal, idiosyncratic language of conceiving and inhabiting space.

Be human first. Titles and distinctions are tokens of authority that fade in the turbulence of war and its aftermath.[25] One does not become an individual in such a state by performing defunct rituals or by citing authority that no longer exists. In a city stripped down to human essentials, there are no longer roles behind which to hide. One becomes an architect only by initiating projects for construction that embody actualities in the damaged city. Everything must be proven from this beginning, the moral ground of a new, more public, and at the same time more personal intellectuality.

Fragment, then flow. Destruction puts an end to conformity, even as construction attempted to create it. Each person is thrown back onto his or her own resources. Bitter as the fact may be, people have been freed of their former unity, having been broken by violence, fear, and the conditions of survival into disparate fragments of uniquely personal experiences. But from this scattered and some would say anarchic state, a new kind of unity, a new community may be formed, one based on the commonality of separation, isolation, and alienation. This is a fluid-dynamic community, one that flows together of its own necessity, anarchic yet coherent, rational yet without a unifying form. Architects are the ones who will design the spaces for these new flows and floods, and they will do so by

understanding the architectural nuances resulting from the unpredictable forms of the city's dynamism.

Stay on the move. A moving target is harder to hit. The gypsy and the nomad already know that being a perpetual stranger can be a strength. The intellectual stranger, the city dweller, and the architect without an ideology (for destruction has rendered the authority of ideology moot) know that inventiveness, spontaneity, acuteness of perception, compassion, and competence in one's art are today the only possible critical features of life and work.

Let it go. The best part of history, Goethe said, is that it inspires. This is a maxim by which all creative people have lived and worked, including those who become creative because they have no choice. Willful destruction obviates the burdening weight of history, leaving only the liberating elixir of its inspiration. History is now. The accumulated remnants of the past are important elements in culture, and in the individual's existence, but exist only to be transformed into the material of the present. Willful destruction is an attack on history that at the same time drives its survivors to react by elevating history to a near-religious importance. Whenever this happens, history becomes pernicious, infecting the present with the odor of the dead. The architect must love history for the forms of hope it offers, but also must clear the air, even by the suspect means of transforming the sacred remnants of the past into disposable remnants for the future.

Challenge old ideas of shaping space, thus of living. After destruction, it is not possible to immediately resume the old, disrupted ways of living. Indeed, this can only be done by regressing to them, led by the resurgence of social, political, and professional institutions under whose authority they once existed. But too much has been suffered and lost, too much learned at too great a price to be quickly forgotten. The spirit of invention that makes survival possible under the extreme conditions created by destruction makes possible new ways of living in a city that will, in a sense, always remain in a paradoxical state of destruction and construction. That the dynamics of change, which are at the same time political, technological, epistemological and personal, are the ingredients of what may correctly be called a creative form of destruction does not eliminate the interplay of construction and destruction in the city's day-to-day existence. Rather, it elevates the "paradox" to a more complex plane of experience for everyone. The spaces of the old city were shaped to sponsor conventionality. In their damaged state, they offer an entirely new possibility for understanding the origins of both space and habitation. The architect leads the way by codifying this new understanding only in terms of space, without fixed reference to habitation, setting a clear example. The architect is a designer of space, not of living. The spirit of invention demanded by perpetual transformation thrives best in space itself shaped by invention.[26]

Recycle, re-form. The damaged city without building loans or bank credits, without government (or its aid), without the importation or manufacture of new

materials, is the city of recycled materials and means. But the same city, if it wants to reconstruct itself, cannot simply assemble the wasted and the ruined into an urban collage of things and events. Collage cannot rise today to its former levels of criticism.[27] Rather, the architect must find ways to transform, to metamorphose the material and intellectual detritus of destruction into the genuinely new. The technique most essential to this process is a conceptual one: see the old as if had never before been seen. From this, all technical means will follow.

Be political, not ideological. The architect sees that any building, any act of reconstruction, confirms, supports, and enables the politics of one group or another. This is valuable, so long as there are many architects, many groups, and many forms of spatial invention, because it serves to increase the choices for thinking, building, living. Ideology, which is first of all the essence of a politics of exclusion, has the effect of narrowing choice, of limiting interpretation and frustrating invention. Ideology, which led directly or indirectly to destruction, or fed its energies, can no longer find a place in the new, reconstructed city.

Design heterarchy of spaces, not hierarchy of space. The holy (*hieros*) has been broken to dust by the fury of destruction it so carelessly courted or greedily demanded. The other (*heteros*) has become the rule (*arche*), because each self has become an "other," strange even to itself. Imagine a city filled with the "chaos" of endless and aimless dialogue and debate, of formlessness that becomes a form, of meanings so private that they become the very basis of public life, of authority that resides in indifference (not resistance) to authority. Imagine patterns of space that have no pattern at all, but are only sequences in the unfolding of a nontemporal order that exists only for the precise moment of its presence. Imagine the "paradox" of precise mathematical order and rampant anarchy existing simultaneously within that moment not as opposites, but as shadows cast by shadows, as different as much as they are the same.

Speak and write. In order that dialogues can begin, new designs and new concepts of design demand their advocacy in a language common to everyone, accepting and at the same time challenging the limitations of that language. Architects must speak and write about their works, and the works of other architects, as clearly and simply as they can, putting aside doubts about compromising the superior communicative power of the spatial languages they may invent. The verbal and the visual can never be more than parallel actualities, describing not only in different ways, but different things. In their paradoxicality, they stimulate, provoke, expand.

Draw. Drawing is the tool of the architect on the move, on the run, the architect who is first of all a citizen of the stricken city and the new, dynamic stability. Pen, pencil, and paper are cheap, accessible. They can be used anywhere, and, if necessary, concealed. Drawings, too, can be easily hidden, or they can be exhibited, published, filmed, digitized, and therefore widely disseminated, when the architect is ready to place them in the public domain. Until that time, the architect is freed by drawing's inherent intimacy to explore the unfamiliar and the forbidden, to break the old rules and invent new ones. Drawings can be made anywhere there is light enough to see. They are instruments of spontaneous experimentation, fluidity of thought, mobility of invention. Unlike models, drawings can describe an immense range of scales with subtlety. And, most of all, drawings are fast. That is important because the architect's work should not, by virtue of too-arduous labor, become an end in itself. All effort in projection aims at realization in building, and thus in living. This aim cannot be compromised by the fact that not all of the architect's projections will, can, or should be built.

Seek plasticity. The building and the city can never be considered independent of one another, any more than the individual of society. Hence the building project must be conceived and described in relationship to a wider landscape. Perspective drawing constitutes a visual language that enables this conception and description, as well as emphasizes the architect's ethical position in relation to others. In the damaged city, the second-order designs of the architect establish new paradigms not only for building, but for the process of design itself. The comprehensiveness of perspective drawing is best-suited to designing a heuristic architecture, and offers the greatest possibilities for interpretation.

Draw architecture as though it were already built. In other words, imagine it has already been lived in many times, in many different ways. All that remains now is the ghost of its former incarnations. Imagine that it has in this way been freed of its original purposes, those that once justified its existence, but no longer can. Imagine that it has completed many cycles of its existence, and is only now beginning a new cycle that transcends the old ones. This, then, is the building to be built in the devastated city, the city that can only find new meaning within the void of meaning. In order to escape the crushing inertia of history, the weight of guilt for destroying that which has already been destroyed, in order to create that which will be created, imagine that what is made now has always been. It will be far from one truth, but close to what is—finally—another.

Build architecture as though it had never been drawn. In the damaged city, the architect understands that as design formerly attempted to control future events by the implementation of programs of use, it now intends to set in motion events that result in unpredictable forms of building and living. This is what is meant by the term experimental architecture. Invention is not limited to the initial act of designing, but exists at each stage of architecture's realization.

Create the vernacular, not monuments. Here, in the ruins, there is nothing left to symbolize, nothing left to express. Architecture, freed by destruction from its obligation to codify meaning and purpose becomes—like the individual within the city—only itself. Only as itself can it become something else. Only by neglecting purpose and meaning may it once again have them. The fabric of the city is a

seamless flow made up of innumerable, everyday events, whose names fade even as their presences are most profoundly felt and understood.

Make great plans, realize small ones. Comprehensive ideas nourish particular ones. By designing the city, the architect comprehends the building, the room, the chair. Each architect should design the whole city, and more than once. Then these designs should be put aside, and eventually forgotten.

Liberate choice. Destruction deprives the people of the city of many important choices, but liberates others. The products and services of a sophisticated social structure vanish. The illusion of their diversity vanishes with them, exposed by the appearance of choices that did not yet exist. Foremost among these are possibilities that lie beyond the limits prescribed by former institutions of authority, and of the languages by which these were codified and enforced. There is the choice now to create something new from the ruins of the old, to design for the first time the space of liberated choice. This cannot, however, be done in the conciliatory terms of choice itself, but only in the conflicting terms of space that is at once vividly present and unknown.