

CURRENTS OF CONTEMPORANEITY:
ARCHITECTURE IN THE AFTERMATH

TERRY SMITH

If one were to slow down a videotape of the first plane approaching then hitting the north tower of World Trade Center, New York, at 8:46 am on September 11, 2001, and then zoom in to the instants of impact, one would see the word “American” slide, letter by letter, into oblivion. In Kelly Geunther’s *New York Times* photograph of the second plane as it hurtled through the skyscrapers of the Financial District towards the south tower, the blue and gray colours made it, unmistakably, a United Airlines flight. As images that draw us to imagine the deaths of actual human beings, these pictures were, and remain, deeply affecting. They record, among much else, an act of spectacular terrorism—an action of one group of humans against another within a war that is conducted at both symbolic and literal levels—a raid that was, and remains, profoundly disturbing. The profundity it disturbed was expressed, through perversely exact metaphor, in the violent obliteration of the word “UNITED.”

These are the opening words of my book, *The Architecture of Aftermath*.¹ They spell out the big picture message sent by that attack: that the disposition of power in the world had just changed, perhaps irredeemably and forever, from one in which Western-style modernity set the global agenda.² Yet this should not have been the surprise that it was. For a number of years there had been indications of profound realignments between the great formations of modernity, and of the emergence of distinctively contemporary currents—certainly of a (dis)order riven by differences, but also, perhaps, carrying signs of the emergence of new formations. The 9/11 moment was a recent flashpoint of both civilizational and region-to-region conflict, and it continues to be used as a justification for governments of all stripes to declare open-ended states of emergency, and as an umbrella for the imposition of repressive agendas in many countries, not least the United States. Intractable, irresolvable “events” of this kind have come to seem almost normal in

the state of aftermath: the wars in Afghanistan and Iraq; the uncertain prospect of a US Emperium; the question of European polity, internally and externally; the implosive fallout of the Second World and the re-emergence of authoritarianism and “democracy” within it; on the ex-Soviet peripheries, the suddenness of unReal states, and of the apparent extension of Europe; continuing conflicts in the Middle East, Central Europe, Africa, and the Pacific; the deadly inadequacy of both tribalism and modernisation as models for decolonisation in Africa; the crisis of post-WWII international institutions as political and economic mediators (UN, IMF, World Bank); the revival of leftist governments in South America; the accelerating concentration of wealth in few countries, and within those countries its concentration in the few; ecological time-bombs everywhere, and the looming threat of societal collapse; the ubiquity and diversification of specular culture; the concentration and narrowing of media, in contrast to the spread of internet; contradictions within and between regulated and coercive economies and deregulated and criminal ones; the coexistence of multiple economies and cultures within singular state formations (most prominently, now, China); the proliferation of protest movements and alternative networks; the retreat towards bunker architecture at the centres of swelling cosmopoli matched by a proliferation of ingenious, adaptive architecture in their borderzones; and the emergence of distinctively different models of appropriate artistic practice, as manifested in major survey exhibitions, such as *Documenta 11* of 2002 and the *50th Venice Biennale* in 2003, along with the retreat into compromise that has marked much artistic practice and curatorial planning since then—with some exceptions, such as the 2006 *Sydney Biennale*. 3

How might we make sense of this multiplicity? Taking the various roles of architecture in the 9/11 moment as a starting point, I will, in the main body of this article, argue for the importance of rethinking the concept of the “contemporary” if we are to grasp the complexities of the present. I will then pursue some of the implications for architecture in the conditions of contemporaneity, and attempt a sketch of the main currents now present and emergent.

From Beirut to Manhattan

The 9/11 attacks were directed, Osama bin Laden told us in an interview published in the *Guardian Weekly* November 12-15, 2001, towards “America’s icons of military and economic power.” In his October 29, 2004 videotape intervention into the US Presidential election, he detailed his source of inspiration:

The events that made a direct impression on me were during and after 1982, when America allowed the Israelis to invade Lebanon with the help of its third fleet. They started bombing, killing, and wounding many, while others fled in terror. I still remember those distressing scenes: blood, torn, limbs, women and children massacred. All over the place, homes were being destroyed and tower blocks collapsing, while bombs rained down mercilessly on their homes...As I looked on those destroyed towers in Lebanon, it occurred to me to punish the oppressor in kind by destroying towers in America, so that it would have taste of its own medicine and would be prevented from killing our women and children. On that day I became sure that oppression and intentional murder of innocent women and children is a deliberate American policy. It seemed then that “freedom” and “democracy” are actually just terror, just as resistance is labelled “terrorism” and “reaction.” 4

He goes on to mention the impact of US sanctions against Iraq imposed by “Bush Sr,” and the vast bombing campaign launched by “Bush Jr” in order, as he puts it “to remove a former collaborator, and install a new one who will help steal Iraq’s oil, as well as commit other atrocities.” There is no denying the facts here, however different might be one’s conclusions as to how to act in their light. Nor the power and impact of bin Laden’s rhetoric, timing and media savvy with regard to his intended audiences. Since 9.11.01, at least, it has matched in its effectiveness that which the Bush administration—massively more resource rich—has mustered in defence of its own policies and actions. Indeed, it looks as if the former may outlast the desperate incoherence and waning effectiveness of the latter. Thus *Time Magazine*, on 26 May, 2003, devoted its cover to an image of serried ranks of people in Middle Eastern dress holding bin Laden masks before their faces. The caption: *Why the War on Terror will Never End*. And US Defence Secretary

Donald Rumsfeld, in a 17th February 2006 speech to the US Senate Council on Foreign Relations, wined: “Our federal government is really only beginning to adapt its operations to the 21st century. Today we’re engaged in the first war in history—unconventional and irregular as it may be—in an era of e-mails, blogs, cell phones, Blackberrys, Instant Messaging, digital cameras, a global Internet with no inhibitions, hand-held video cameras, talk radio, 24-hour news broadcasts, satellite television. There’s never been a war in this environment before.” 5

The fallout from these actions continues: in July 2006, Israel responded to a Hezbollah rocket attack with a full-scale invasion of Lebanon. Among the many anticipations of the resultant destruction is the work of artist New York-based Lebanese artist Walid Raad, who has since 1999 exposed the insanities of political violence in his home country through a series of projects undertaken by a fictive artists’ cooperative, The Atlas group—for example, his video *We Can Make Rain But No One Came to Ask*, 2005. 6

Architecture in the image wars

As an event, that which occurred on September 11, 2001, has been much inflated, its impacts exaggerated, its real effects smothered in hyperbole. But the deeper shifts of which it indeed one of many morbid symptoms cannot be denied. Responding to questions from Hal Foster of *October* magazine, the San Francisco-based group Retort get closest to the most acute formulation that I know of the general issues at stake:

Everything about the basic furnishing of human oppression and misery has remained unchanged in the last 150 years—except that the machinery has been speeded up, and various ameliorations painted in on top...Nevertheless we do think that there is something distinctive about the Old New of the past four years. *Afflicted Powers* is an attempt to describe it. Very roughly, what seems to us unprecedented is the starkness—the extremity—of the confrontation between New Oldness and Old Newness. No one, surely, came close to anticipating that the opening of the 21st century would be structured around a battle between two such virulently reactionary forms of world power (or will to world power), and

that both sides would see so clearly that the battle is now to be fought by both bombs (crude attempts at recolonization, old-time resistance struggles, crowds waving the latest version of the Little Red Book) and images. 7

To this list of what constitute bombs we can add airplanes, explosives wrapped around a suicide, videotapes of all sorts, etc.—a list of denotations that will soon merge into visual images of many sorts, as they call up settings in which images of the work of bombs—instantly and globally disseminated—become vital to their effectivity.

Retort remobilises Guy Debord's famous analysis of spectacle society, his condemnation of capital's commodification of all relations, its colonization of everyday life through saturation with the imagery of unfulfillable desire. 8 Retort is rightly sceptical of generalization and imprecision, but we might ask: does Debord's conception of the spectacle encompass everything we need to know about the image in the present situation, especially that of the past four years? Might not those of us with some sense of how visual images work find ways to add something to what Retort rightly poses as "the political question of the years to come"? Against the fundamentalists, against the supine compromise all around, they ask "what *other* imagery, what other rhetoric, what other set of descriptions might be possible—ones that find form for the horror and emptiness of the modern, but *hold out no promise of Going Back?*" 9

There are many artworks being made now, many actions undertaken, and a few structures being conceived that do propose such *other* imagery. I want to suggest that, in the case of architecture, iconic spectacle and its spectres have reached their historical apogee; structures of this type are imploding still, becoming shining, heavy, instantly sterile monuments to an age that has past—signposts, perhaps, along the road of an endless aftermath. In contrast, a different architecture—a diverse architecture of difference—struggles into being. (These remarks position this text, and *The Architecture of Aftermath*, as reports from an inquiry that is parallel to, but ultimately distinct in its ambitions, from the focus on style, the "enigmatic signifier" and the cosmogenetic in Charles Jenck's *The Iconic Building: The Power of Enigma*.) 10

Contemporaneity

What's in a word? The standard definition of "contemporaneity" is "a contemporaneous condition or state." This is, I suggest, the best name for the situation I am describing, because all of its qualities are inherent in the concept of the contemporary. The word "contemporary" has always meant more than just the plain and passing present. Its etymology is as rich as that of "modern." *Con tempus* has within its very source the duality of being and time; it was coined, surely, in response to this deep disjunction. In usage, it calibrates a number of distinct but related ways of being *in* or *with* time, even of being *in* and *out* of time at the same time. Indeed, for a while, during the seventeenth century in England, it seemed that the contraction "cotemporary" might overtake it to express this strange currency. Current editions of the *Oxford English Dictionary* give four major meanings. They are all relational, turning on prepositions, on being placed "to," "from," "at," or "during" time. There is the strong sense of "Belonging *to* the same time, age, or period" (1.a.), the coincidental "Having existed or lived *from* the same date, equal in age, coeval" (2), and the adventitious "Occurring *at* the same moment of time, or *during* the same period; occupying the same definite period, contemporaneous, simultaneous" (3). In each of these three meanings there is a distinctive sense of presentness, of being in the present, of beings that are present to each other, and to the time they happen to be in. Of course, these kinds of relationship have occurred at all times in the historical past, do so now, and will do so in the future. The second and third meanings make this clear, whereas the first points to the phenomenon of two or more people, events, ideas or things, "belonging" to the same historical time. Yet, even here, while the connectedness is stronger, while the phenomena may have some sense of being joined by their contemporaneousness, they may equally well do so, as it were, separately, standing alongside yet apart from each other, existing in simple simultaneity. They may also subsist in a complex awareness that, given human difference, their contemporaries may not stand in the same, or even a similar, relation to time as they do, yet we are all, at the same time, touched by what is now global time—a new phase, perhaps, in what Fernand Braudel named "world time." 11 Given the diversity of present experiences of temporality, and our increased awareness of this diversity, it is becoming more and more

common to feel oneself as standing, in important senses, at once *within* and *against* the times.

It is the OED's fourth definition of "contemporary" that brings persons, things, ideas and time together under a one directional banner: "Modern; of or characteristic of the present period; especially up-to-date, ultra-modern; specifically designating art of a markedly *avant-garde* quality, or furniture, building, decoration, etc. having modern characteristics." In this definition, the two words have finally exchanged their core meaning: the contemporary has become the new modern. Since the decline of modernism in the 1970s, and with the emergence of "postmodern" as a sign of crisis, the term "contemporary" has taken over institutional naming—of galleries, museums, academic courses and textbook titles. A real change in broad scale, ordinary usage has occurred: in English, and in some but not all other European languages, in Europe itself and South America, in China and much of Asia—"modern" has surrendered currency to the term "contemporary" and its cognates. The latter is, now, no longer a desultory, fallback non-word. Nor is it a devious cover for other intentions, a "weasel word." 12 Rather, we are experiencing, I believe, an alignment of the term with its historical moment. In the currents of contemporary art and architecture, we see the presence of a number of the qualities of contemporaneity: primacy, instanteity, currency, criticality, immediacy and potentiality. This alerts us to the larger setting: has its nature changed as well?

A proposition about the present.

Contemporaneity is the most evident attribute of the current world picture—encompassing its most distinctive qualities, from the ideoscape of global politics to the interiority of individual being. This picture can no longer be adequately characterized by terms such as "modernity" and "postmodernity," not least because it is shaped by friction between antinomies so intense that it resists universal generalization. It is, nonetheless, far from shapeless. Within contemporaneity, at least three sets of forces contend, turning each other incessantly:

- (i) globalisation's thirst for ideological hegemony in the face of increasing cultural differentiation (the multitude that was freed by decolonisation), for control of time in the face of the proliferation of asynchronous temporalities, and for continuing exploitation of natural resources against increasing evidence of the inability of those resources to sustain that exploitation—for these reasons, globalisation is destined to fail, and capitalism may be reaching the limits of its mutability;
- (ii) the accelerating inequity between peoples, classes and individuals that threatens both desires for domination and persistent dreams of liberation, thus hitting hard against the current limits of political imagination and ethical possibility; and
- (iii) an infoscape—or, better, a spectacle, an image economy or “iconomy,” a regime of representation—capable of the potentially instant yet always thoroughly mediated communication of all information and any image anywhere, yet which it, at the same time, fissured and limited by the uneasy coexistence of highly specialist, closed knowledge communities, open, volatile subjects and rampant popular fundamentalisms.

These developments have long prehistories within modernity: their contemporary configuration was signalled in the 1950s (not least in art that prioritised various kinds of immediacy), burst out during the 1960s, has been evident to most since 1989, and unmistakable to all since 2001. “Contemporaneity” is, I submit, the best name for this situation. I have shown that all of these qualities are inherent in the concept of the contemporary. Far from being singular and simple—a default for the modern—the contemporary signifies multiple ways of being with, in, and out of time, separately and at once. Of course, these possibilities have always been there—the difference, now, is that they predominate over the kinds of generative powers named by any other comparable terms (for example, the modern and its derivatives). They may be all that there is, and they point to a state beyond periodicity, with all that that entails. They also cry out for the forging of fresh modes of economic, political and ethical exchange—an ontology of the present, and, perhaps, a contemporary cosmopolitanism. ¹³ How much these ideas bear on architecture, building, dwelling today?

The Last of the Late Moderns

The icons that were the subject of attack on September 11, 2001 happen to be—or used to be—buildings. A fatal convergence of architecture and terrorism occurred on that day. All buildings, built and unbuilt, suddenly attracted a shadow play of darting forces, chimera of the possibility that they could come under attack, could become target architecture. Yet the buildings under attack on September 11, 2001, were well entrenched within the iconomy. Having become key symbols within the later twentieth century society of the spectacle, icons with the capacity to stand for crucial values, they were actively traded within it. Each of them iconized entire sectors of US society, great formations of US nationality. But they were more than symbols, and the attacks were not (as some commentators rushed to say) a spectacular confirmation of popular postmodern analyses of our times as one in which appearances had triumphed over reality. Rather, the actual buildings were central, tangible embodiments of the complex functions that they housed, the most visible point of concentration of the complex array of powers associated with them. They were literal and figurative portals—gateways to, in turn, the US economy, the US military and US governance. The degree to which symbol and reality are embedded in each other is evident in the seismographic impact of the attacks on each of these sectors, and in the differences of register between these impacts—differences that seem related to the degree of effectiveness of each attack. The special—indeed, spectacular, but also specular—role of architecture in the iconomy of later modernity is what is exposed in modernity's aftermath.

Architecture is also of relevance here because the conjunction of architecture and symbolism had become, during the 1990s, indicative of both the flashiest surfaces and the deepest currents of contemporaneity. Architecture had become, of all the arts, the most socially prominent, the best looking, a hot story in the media—in a word, the buzz. Frank Gehry's Guggenheim Museum, Bilbao, 1997, was the apogee of this quality: a building defined above all by its striking and infinitely repeated image as an iconotype of high culture. The final ascendancy of the image in architecture can be understood as a deep reversal of the early modernist premise, as the prioritising of form over function. Exciting clusters of shapes, seemingly arbitrary conjunctions, a vast variety of materials, hidden

structures, wild plans, multiple historical allusions, manifest technological symbolism—all this amounted to a much more complex array of form, but it is form nonetheless.

I distinguish four other currents within what was called, at the time, “Late Modern” architecture: all of them prioritise form—in the complex sense just indicated—over function. Equally spectacular as Gehry’s triumphs, but a cul-de-sac, was the Past Modernism of Richard Meier at, for example, the Getty Center, Los Angeles, 1997. Other current, the technological featurism practiced most dramatically by Santiago Calatrava—in structures such as the Quadracci Entrance Pavilion to the Milwaukee Art Museum, 1997-2001 and the Tenerife Auditorium, Santa Cruz, Canary Islands, 1997-2003—is a reprise of the achievement of the early twentieth century engineer architects and of the quasi-organic imagery and symbolic flourishes of the 1950s (the outstanding instance being the Sydney Opera House). This third approach makes a structure’s engineering into the primary point of the spectacle. Paralleling these other late modern currents were the “tiger towers” in Kuala Lumpur, Shenzhen, Pudong, Tapei, Dubai and elsewhere: structures such as Cesar Pelli’s Petronas Towers, Kuala Lumpur, are inflections of the Western skyscraper with local filigrees, produced by both Western and local architects, that serve as the command centres of “Asian values” capitalism.

These, then, were the primary, and most highly resolved, resources available to contemporary architecture when faced with the irruption of contemporaneity on 9.11.2001. Plus one other: a current represented by Libeskind’s Jewish Museum Berlin, 1989-1999, outstanding among those few efforts by contemporary architects to cope with the modernity’s deepest contradictions—in this case, the fact that the city of Berlin was able, in 1942, to imagine itself without its Jews. 14 A similar depth of critique was rare: it is also evident in the symbolic war architectures of Lebbeus Woods, for example, his Berlin Free Zone Project, 1990, Zagreb Free Zone, 1991, and his Terrain Project of 1998-2000. 15

Spectres in Architecture’s Imaginary

The reaction of architects to 9/11 was the same as for most other people; shock, horror, mourn, then, slowly, rebuild. But “rebuild” will not capture the depth of the challenge. It went to the question of building at all, to the unconscious of architecture, to the nether regions of any kind of construction, to some strange, spectral shadows, well away from the glare of spectacle.

On December 18, 2002, the Lower Manhattan Development Authority unveiled the “land use designs” of the groups of architects, planners, artists, etc. that it had chosen to rethink Ground Zero. They constituted most of the outstanding firms of the moment, so their efforts were a profile of both impact and possibility. The five currents of Late Modern spectacle architecture identified above were very much in evidence. Extraordinary technology dominated most submissions. Without exception, each design attempted to generate an instant iconotype. The twin towers appeared in most of the proposals, as spectres. Yet a number of recent innovations and speculations as to how to live differently in dense conurbations were also advanced, albeit figuratively—skycities, interstitial parks, roaming ecologies, free-form communities. All of these are key ideas for the building of future dwelling.

In the event, however, Gehry-style complexity infused the United Architects proposal (perhaps due to the input of Greg Lynn FORM), and it pervaded the organic, staged “vertical city” of the group led by Skidmore, Owings and Merrill. The assertive geometry of the Meier group’s design would have imposed on New York a Modernism more implacable than it has ever absorbed. The thought of its grided gates marching through the rest of Manhattan is a neo-Corbusian nightmare. Recycling the past was even more specific in Peterson/Littenberg’s Garden for New York, a quiet place of recreation surrounded by buildings that repeat the comforting ordinariness of Deco period Manhattan. Foster and Associates’ project was two criss-crossed, “kissing” parallelepipeds: the lost Twin Towers imagined as benign, gently related forms, as extruded glass Brancusi, as the towers so fondly misremembered by so many after their disappearance. Yet their economic efficiency was well disguised with ecological inclusions. Small wonder that this design received, by far, the most votes in public polling. Yet the

computer graphic of this building pasted in to the existing skyline shows it, instantly, to be a ghost of the original WTC, albeit crystal-prismed for the New Age, and to be as out of place as its predecessor.

Among the three ideas advanced by Think was a pair of open steel frame towers, with various functions strung within them, such as a World Cultural Center, a performing arts space, a conference centre and a 9.11.01 museum. The last took the form of a white shape twisted against itself. Inserted into the towers, and strung between them, it looked for all the world like the wreckage of an airplane: indeed, it was positioned in the skeletons at the points and angles of impact of the attacking planes. The net result was a curious picturing of 9.11.01 part-way through its cinematic unfolding, as if the event were freeze-framed at a moment when the anti-modernist attackers could be seen to have dashed themselves fruitlessly against the might of modernist structure and flexibility, that impossible moment—so deeply desired ever since by the attacked—before time resumed its rush and drew the towers down into the self-destruction that now seems natural to them. Libeskind Studio, building on the Jewish Museum experience, began from a set of anti-spectacular premises (the slurry wall inspiration), and yet did not avoid spectacle in its proposed design, however much it dispersed and diverted its elements. Libeskind worked against iconotypy for most of his design, but succumbed to the pull of Manhattanist literalism by inserting a “vertical world garden” that would jut from the skyline, a sword-like echo of the Statue of Liberty, and reach up 1776 feet. 16

In September 2006, just before the fifth anniversary of the 9/11 attacks, designs were released for three further tower blocks on the edges of the site. Norman Foster, Richard Rogers and Fumihiko Maki have each produced variations on a very conventional theme. In contrast to the challenges taken up by many of the 2002 designs, they are, in the view of *New York Times* critic Nicolai Ouroussoff, about “forgetting.” He elaborates: “Conservative and coolly corporate, they could be imagined in just about any Western capital, paralleling the effacement of history in the remade, blatantly commercial Potsdamer Platz in Berlin or La Défense, the incongruous office-tower district just outside Paris.” 17 Calatrava’s transport hub squats like an albino hedgehog at the feet of

these mild-mannered, glassy, wall-eyed monsters. In these proposals for the Ground Zero mini-city, we can see that the only cluster of structures in this style that might have matched the precedent set by the Rockefeller Centre has now arrived, belatedly...only to stop abruptly, to be frozen in anachronism, years before being built.

The capitalist fantasia of the “Asian tiger” towers is now finding loud echoes back in the centres of Western commerce—for example, in the work of David Childs for Skidmore Owings and Merrill, above all in the dully compromised design of the Freedom Tower for the World Trade Center site. Armour-plated on its lower floors, a slab of Yamasaki’s WTC quoted just above, then a rising rectangle floor after floor, shaved at its sides, and capped with a stripped down monument to nothing in particular. Libeskind’s highly connotative imagery has evaporated entirely. Meanwhile, in parts of Asia and the Middle East, new varieties of World of Tomorrow Jetsonlands continue to spring up, sustained by the enormous wealth that continues to flow to the oil-based economies and is being newly generated by the hubs of global outsourcing.

Despite these bets on the longevity of spectacle, bunker architecture has become another norm throughout the main citadels of the West and East, although there is a great—yet too often specious—effort being made to make many of these structures into “green towers.”¹⁸ And to pursue at least some ecological principles: in, for example, the proposal by UN Studios for a Library for New Orleans following the disastrous flood caused by hurricane Katrina in April 2006. The absurd heights to which this clash of values has led is, perhaps, nowhere more evident than in the US \$145 million Private Residential Tower on the hills outside Mumbai, India, designed in 2004 by SITE (Sculpture in the Environment). A palatial residence, 4000 square metres including helipad, is located atop a huge column that also supports six subsidiary levels, each of which is devoted to a distinct compound (hangar, film studio, forest, amphitheatre, acropolis, temple). All are, the architects claim, “ecologically sound.” Bollywood meets the Hanging Gardens of Babylon. Intended for “a well-known personality,” the entire structure is isolated, guarded, protected, and solid enough at its base to “withstand possible bombs.”¹⁹ This is a parody of the gated community, stacked up into a tower,

maximizing its views, and exposed for all to see its magnificence—a more blatant example of hubris parading itself as a target is difficult to image.

Beyond Form and Function; Dwelling, difference

Against the widespread drift back to late modernist, corporatist values in institutional and domestic architecture, other currents are emergent within what is, now, widely recognized and named as “contemporary architecture.” They are grounded in both critique and hope, because their architectural outcomes evolve from a detailed process of contextual questioning. These currents differ mostly in scale, in the degree of their usage of symbolic language, in their closeness to or distance from the demands of “late capital,” and in the specificity of their connection with the conditions of contemporaneity. Overall there is a shift from design thinking bound by the binaries of form vis-à-vis function, to more open plays between multiplicities of need, constraint, and possibility. Within this work, there is, as we might expect, an enormous variety. Without any pretence at a complete survey, I will sketch a range of projects that seem to exemplify these currents, from those that operate in symbolic registers to those that are focused on immediate practicalities.

Exodus, or the Voluntary Prisoners of Architecture, devised by Rem Koolhaas, Elia Zenghelis, Madelon Vrisendorp and Zoe Zenghelis in 1971, was an extraordinary fantasy of modernity gone seductively dystopic. The architects imagine north central London slashed by a zone of architectural forms so beguiling that the city’s inhabitants clamour to enter it, leaving the old city a distant spectacle, lapsing slowly into ruination, while inside the zone creative architectural forms are generated daily. Within the zone there is an area of respite, one that looks uncannily like the garden-style plots that some Londoners (among others) still maintain. The brilliant text that accompanies each frame ends as follows: “Time has been suppressed. Nothing ever happens here, yet the air is heavy with exhilaration.” 20 Contemporaneity to a t.

This interrogatory spirit appeared amongst the first responses to 9.11.01, for example, in the proposal that the abandoned New York Stock Exchange building be transformed into

a set of spaces for information gathering and public discussion devoted above all to arriving at recognition of the root causes of such events, and of equitable ways of addressing them. 21 For a few years, this spirit continued to inform plans for a Cultural Center on the Ground Zero site, as it did the programming of the Drawing Center, a contemporary art museum that it be located there. After relatives of the victims and others expressed concern that such places might countenance viewpoints other than outright condemnation of terrorism, and as the influence of Libeskind (nominally the master planner) waned during 2005-6, Governor Pataki pulled the Cultural Center, and the director of the Drawing Center resigned.

A draw towards questioning architecture's limits, in pursuit of the strangenesses within its history, continues to surface in some of the projects of OMA-Rem Koolhaas, and some of those of Jean Nouvel, Zaha Hadid and Daniel Libeskind. It is a more central focus in the work of the Acconci Studio, such as the Mur Island Project, Graz, 2003, as well as in the speculative environments of Diller + Scofidio, notably the latter's Blur Building for Expo.02, Yverdon-les-Bains, Lake Lucerne, 2000-2002. 22 The Serpentine Gallery, London, has been sponsoring reflexive architecture in a very direct way by commissioning a number of outstanding architects (Zaha Hadid, Daniel Libeskind, Toyo Ito, Oscar Niemeyer, Siza/Souto de Moura, Rem Koolhaas) to work with Arup on a series of pavilions, each of which stand for three months at a time in the grounds of Kensington Gardens. 23

An Un-volumetric Architecture?

Are these developments consonant with what has recently been theorized as "Un-volumetric Architecture"? 24 Aymonio and Mosco note that, in the one hundred and sixteen years since the erection of "the Un-vol celibate machine *par excellence*: the Eiffel Tower," architecture as a discipline has shifted its attention from "the urban form, increasingly dominated by vertical layers, by sequences of billboards and decorated sheds that determine the way entire swathes of territory are perceived, and has shifted from the architectural elements to the route and the relations between them (with the road seen as a metaphor of understanding, and therefore of complexity and the opportunity to choose),

conceptually transforming static/processional space into the dynamic space of narration, in which the void takes pre-eminence over the solid.” 25 They note that the architecture of volume and controlled places is fighting back: “The metal detector is now a planetwide threshold and barbed wire is used as portable fencing.” Identifying the landscape as the dominant theme in experimental architecture today, they ask the very good question, is it “really capable of responding with the necessary precision to the demands coming from a society that does not seem to speak with one, collective voice? Or is it about to become a generic field of application for multiple lines of research, disconnected from one another in their methods and aims?” 26

Their answer, “a cheerful modernism,” is somewhat disappointing. Perhaps this is a mistranslation for “felicitous,” which would be a partial improvement. But they have not followed through the implications of their argument: any retention of modernism, and of postmodernism, has to be what they elsewhere identify (correctly) as a “regressive refounding.” What, then, is Un-vol? One near definition is this: “a heterogeneous theme which brings together different disciplines and anthropic conditions and conceptual scale intermediate between (or different from) the City Plan and the architectural object.” 27 More constructively, the authors call for thorough investigations of “the real possibilities of interference and cohesion between sectors of the discipline that are contiguous but now separate (technique, street furniture, restoration, environment, landscape, etc.), and almost always trying to be systemic, rather than to produce objects of mere design.” 28 As to form, their preference is for “The variable structure of Un-vol, the metaphoric identity obtained through its hybrid configurations (collapsible, semi-closed, semi-open, mobile, repeatable, self-built, temporary, etc.).” This is a post modernism at best, a parasitical modernism at worst, and whatever is formalist, despite its language. On a more promising note, they conclude that “in the era of the crowd,” it is important “to work by intensity rather than density, by continuity rather than permanence,” to never be “univocal or prescriptive,” but, rather, to seek “a playful everydayness that proposes to act as a cultural mediator between an erudite and a popular architecture.” 29

The examples of Un-vol chosen for illustration are all structures with much less density and mass than the icons of Late Modern architecture. SITE President James Wines lists their types in an essay at the end of the book: “signage, territorial markers, bridges, canopies, public spaces, lighting elements and temporary interventions,” then goes on to express disappointment that the concept of “un-volume” was not pushed further, towards architecture appropriate for what he sees as “The present Age of Information and Ecology.”³⁰ Not that his Tower in Mumbai is a shining example of what he professes. Nevertheless, we share this disappointment, and feel a further sadness that the cheerful authors seem unaware of the dimension of “unbuilding” that attends all architecture in the Age of Aftermath.

Architecture after art

It is no accident that, in the case of the Serpentine Gallery, a contemporary art centre is taking the lead in sponsoring radical architectural experimentality. Now that the idea of architecture as sculpture has reached its spectacular apogee—two generations after contemporary artists moved beyond the constraints and concerns of traditional mediums—architects are increasingly drawn to the “post-medium condition” of current art. What is at stake in this interchange? This is a large subject, one that I will treat in more detail elsewhere. I draw attention now to a few entry-points into this question. The most obvious is the placemaking, and place changing, of those artists whose vision as painters, sculptors, or collagists has spread from their studios to their house, even to neighbourhoods: Hundertwasser in a suburb of Vienna, Tyree Guyton in Detroit, or artist-mayor Edi Rama’s ongoing transformation of Tirana, Albania, by splashing great swathes of colour across its facades. Less obvious connections would also be worth pursuing. For example, the impact of the cinematic on all of the other visual arts is strikingly evident, not only on video art and big scale photography but also in some architectural thinking: literally, in the case of Diller + Scofidio’s Slow House, a 1991 design for a vacation house which brilliantly juxtaposed automobile windshield, picture window and video screen; even more so in the case of Michael Jantzen’s 2002 Malibu Video Beach House.³¹ Less directly, cinematic imagining of lifestyle echoes in the work of the Italian collective Stalker—named after Andrei Tarkowsky’s famous film—as they seek out

tangential, interstitial, non-invasive ways of experiencing cities, to enable as many people as possible to experience the psychogeographies celebrated by Situationist Guy Debord. 32 Artists from all over the world are highlighting the terrors and the delights of life in cities undergoing constant deformation in the fall out from decolonisation and globalisation. These changes in Africa have inspired a number of outstanding artists working in a variety of media, from photography, animation, installation to digital projection: for example, David Goldblatt, William Kentridge, Bodys Isek Kingelez, Antonio Ole, Allan deSouza and Jean-Michel Bruyère. 33

Installation is an equally powerful a current in all the visual arts nowadays. As a new kind of medium, it has evolved into a practice of gathering objects, items, elements from any source, then arranging them in a space that is designated as, at once, provisional, temporary and meaningful. This particular aesthetic multivalence echoes in much recent architecture, not least high style hotels that seek to brand themselves by association with spectacular architecture and design: Ian Schrader's hotels in the US, and some of those of the Silken Group in Spain, for example, the Hotel Puerta América, Madrid, 2002-5, which features the ingenuity of Various Architects. 34 It may be too soon to plausibly identify an "installation architecture." Few architects have met the challenges coming from the work of the most radical installation artists. Such as those of Swiss artist Thomas Hirschhorn, whose installations show globalisation as a kind of war machine bent on creating nightmare scenarios, caves of banality and standardisation, revelations of what the world would look like if the desires precipitated by globalisation were actually realized. Fittingly, he concentrates on this topic in his installations at US galleries, notably those at Barbara Gladstone in 2003 (*Cavemanman*) and the ICA, Boston in 2005 (*Utopia, Utopia=One World, One War, One Army, One Dress*). In another stream of his work, he draws attention to the revolutionary potential of the thinking of certain philosophers and political theorists by establishing temporary memorials to them in the streets of poor neighbourhoods: anti-monuments in the form of community centres, cafés, temporary libraries, reading rooms, internet access sites. A controversial example was his *Monument to Georges Bataille*, situated in a Turkish guestworkers neighbourhood in Kassell during the exhibition Documenta 11 in 2002. 35

Responding directly to the emergent conditions of contemporaneity, a number of artists have, for some years, been experimenting with modes of alternative, nomad, survivalist architecture. In 1988-89 Krzysztof Wodiczko and David Laurie addressed the threat to homeless people on the streets of New York by providing a number of Homeless Vehicles, ingeniously designed carts that provided shelter, storage and relative protection while asleep. 36 In 2000, Ilona Németh designed a fixed structure that, when located near bus depots in Budapest, allowed single or many homeless to sleep in safe and clean circumstances. 37 Lucy Orta has devised a variety of forms of “wearable architecture,” and Andrea Zittel has taken herself as the subject of a series of experiments in the redesign of living spaces, clothing, settings, etc., amounting to the A-Z Enterprise, “an institute of investigative living.” 38 These are just some examples. One of the first exhibitions at the Tate Modern, London, was a wide-scale exploration of the changing nature of world cities entitled *Century City: Art and Culture in the Modern Metropolis*. 39 In 2006, the Havana Biennale devoted itself to this theme from a Third World perspective, attracting hundreds of artists and cultural collectives from all over the South whose work is committed to not only to drawing attention to the complexities of living in the burgeoning cosmopoli but also to quite specific applications of art practices to the creation of place and community. 40 Among the most effective have been Ala Plástica (Buenos Aires) Park Fiction (Hamburg), Wochenklausur (Vienna), and Huit Facettes (Dakar, Senegal). 41

Challenges from the cosmopoli

Architects everywhere are returning to problems posed by the need to house increasing populations in the growing cosmopoli (and their corollary, the shrinking city). Vicente Guallart proposes a Sharing Tower for Valencia, within a Sociopolis, a campus of 2,500 residential units on an 11-acre area on the edge of the city. The key principle is that by sharing a range of resources between 2 to 8 people, greater useful surface area is released for private use, achieving ratios of 45 square meters individual space, if 75 are shared, enabling thus the enjoyment of 120 for each. 42 Another interesting tendency is the proposal of add-on structures, small-scale additions to large buildings, transportable

attachments: Werner Asslinger's Loftcube, Berlin, 2003, and Stefan Eberstadt's Rucksack House, Leipzig and Cologne, 2004-5. 43 Related to these are such temporary structures as Shigeru Ban's Banimale Nomadic Museum, erected on a Hudson River pier for four months in 2005. A massive edifice, 205 metres long, its columns were large paper tubes, its walls shipping containers stacked four stories high in alternating solids and voids. In the latter, and for roofing, stretched membranes were used, and the whole coated with waterproofed sealant. Commissioned to display a set of egregious photographs unlikely to be shown in a conventional museum, and tied to their travelling display, it was less valuable in itself, more so for its suggestiveness as to similar structures for a variety of purposes relevant to shifting populations. 44

Green architecture is a requirement in a world seemingly destined for ecological crisis and collapse if current practices continue. Again, there is a range of solutions currently on offer (and many precedents, at least on the symbolic level, not least the Houses of Parliament, Canberra, 1984-8, and the Fukuoka Prefectural International Hall, 1990). At one end of the spectrum might be placed Greg Lynn Form's design for the Ark of the World Museum, being erected in San Jose, Costa Rica, since 2002, as a storage, research, exhibition and education facility for the world's biodiversity. The literalism with which its structure embodies an image of its content has generated an effect bordering on the bizarre. 45 More concrete response have been achieved by artists working directly with communities, from the poor ones served by artists such as Navot Altaf (Central India) and Rodriguez (Havana), and by such groups as those mentioned earlier—Ala Plástica, Park Fiction, Wochenklausur, and Huit Facettes—through the revivification of a community via a regular art event devoted to ecological works (such as the Echigo-Tsumari Triennale, Japan, which in 2006 involved 330 artists from 47 countries) or by artists forming temporary groups to address a critical issue (for example, the Agua-Wasser project, Mexico City, 2005), to, at a different register, the \$US 18 million credited by the US Senate to *The High Line*, a project led by architects Diller + Scofidio + Renfro to create a park along a 2.5 km abandoned railway line elevated above the streets of Manhattan's Lower West Side. 46

Expanded Mediums

Since the early 1990s NOX/Lars Spuybroek has explored computer generated architectural imagery and interactive electronic artworks, bringing them together in projects such as the Son-O-House, at Son en Breugel, the Netherlands, 2000-3. Its forms are derived from the movements of bodies through space that are rendered by strips cut (in the manner of the aleatory elements in Marcel Duchamp's *The Large Glass* 1923); the structure is then wired such that the sounds it produces are modified by its users moving through it. 47 Using the Xfrog software program, that consists of “botanic, L-system algorithms used in computational biological simulations to grow plants and landscapes for laboratory tests,” Dennis Dollens designed a Digitally-Grown Tower on the Lower East Side, Manhattan. 48 Marcos Novak has developed a series of structures, commissioned by a Spanish hotel group, derived from scans of his own brain, entitled AlloCortex/AlloNeuro. 49 This is a fast-growing current, still far from finding its distinctive voice—if, indeed, that this still a legitimate demand.

Topological design might be seen as a variant of this current. French architects Jakob and MacFarlane designed the H House in Propriano, Corsica, in 2003, by deriving its forms from the hilly topography of its site. An interlocked set of cellular rooms flowed and spread down a series of stepped levels, generating a variegated exterior of walls, windows and entrances. 50 François Roche evolved the Green Gorgon design for a proposed museum of modern art in Lausanne by deriving the essential flow of forms, and an extraordinary vegetal cladding, from the water and vegetation at the lakeside site. 51

The extended sense of medium so evident in recent contemporary art—the mixing of media, the sense that anything that connects is a medium, and that everything that does so is the warp and weft of our worlds—seems rare in current architecture. The e-House designed by Michael McDonough between 2000 and 2005 for the Hudson Valley, New York, might be an exception. Looking like a randomly thrown together tract house, it in fact uses local craftsmen, is carefully calibrated to the needs of its users, each element draws maximal benefit from its orientation, and it deploys over 100 new and traditional

alternative technologies to maximize its sustainability, including software that enables it to adjust itself to changing temperatures and conditions. 52

Practical reasoning

Increasingly, individual architects are responding to the chaos of contemporaneity, and offering practical remedies to the marginalized, the migrant, the endlessly mobile, and the homeless. After the 1995 earthquake in Kobe, Japan, Ban offered ingenious designs for temporary houses and a community centre, using cardboard tubes. His Paper Log House design was adapted successfully in Turkey and India after earthquakes struck those countries in 1999 and 2001, respectively. Images of Rwandan refugees struggling to survive with little more than plastic sheeting inspired him to devise a framework of cardboard tubes to turn sheeting into tents, which the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees supplied to the refugees. Ban continued as a consultant to the UNHCR until 1999. Parallel efforts are occurring elsewhere. Designed in 2000 as a prototype for use in the Australian outback by Aboriginal people, Peter Myers's Knockabout Walkabout house is transportable on a truck anywhere, may be entirely assembled with a power drill, and is liveable on or off the grid. 53 A similar spirit is evident in the Portable House proposed by the Los Angeles-based Office of Mobile Design in 2003, an "eco-sensitive and economic" alternative to available housing stock and trailer homes, which could be combined to form Ecovilles. 54 Since 2001, Estudio Teddy Cruz has worked with a number of local organizations in San Diego and Tijuana to create frameworks that enable local residents to create living places, often by occupying public spaces and by recycling building materials from over-provisioned sectors. Cross-border art and architecture is an important way of registering place in the new conditions of transience, exclusion and surveillance. 55 Since 1992, Nader Khalili, founder of the Cal-Earth Institute in Hesperia, California, has developed a number of Sandbag Shelter Prototypes. Stability is secured by layers of sandbags stacked in various circular or elliptical shapes, with barbed wire in between to prevent movement. Prototypes have been built in Iran, Mexico, Thailand, Siberia and Chile, and they have been used by the UNHCR since 1995 for temporary shelters. 56

Of parallel importance is the work of globally networked people's organizations such as Shack/Slumdweller's International. 57 Global Studio, an affiliation of architects from Sydney and elsewhere, who bring a range of skills from a variety of distant sources to bear on specific, extreme problems of housing. 58 For similar reasons, Shigeru Ban established the Voluntary Architects' Network, a nongovernmental organization focusing on shelter needs in poor countries. Architects Without Frontiers, based in Melbourne, is devoted to offering direct assistance with shelter and planning needs in crisis situations. 59 The needs of peoples subject to the disorders of contemporary life are great. One particular area crying out for commitment is that of indigeneity: architecture by and for indigenous peoples may be the exchange that brings out architecture's latent indigeneity.

There are, of course, many unusual challenges that arise as increasing numbers of architects and artists gravitate to these kinds of service roles. Needs must be established, values discovered and solutions found in new ways. An architectural profession suffused by the values of spectacle capitalism has a long journey to undertake before it can be of real service. But we have been listing just some of the thousands of initiatives. One evident limitation in some current thinking is that those in need are often conceived of as a mass, and thus as subject to one-size-fits-all prototypes, rather than as individuals or associations active within a multiplicity, each of whom seek outcomes specific to their place and time—that is, a contemporaneous architecture. On the other hand, there may be limits to the ability of groups to see clearly the range of ways their needs might be met architecturally. Outcomes such as the poetic landscape of the Cuidad abierta—a 270-hectare seaside park built since 1969 by a group of non-professionals, the Cooperativa Amereida, in Valparaiso, Chile—are exceptional. 60 Consensus within groups can crimp their wisdom, while many factors can compromise their ability to decide. This debate is just about to boil. 61

My conclusion—as provisional as anything about the present must be—is this. From Valparaiso to Manhattan to the Australian outback, an increasing number of artists and architects are reacting against the violence that is the spectral underside of the spectacular surfaces of the iconomy; they reject the exploitation, inequity and instantaneity that

characterizes the overreach of globalisation and the failing politics of Empire; and they seek acute and accurate insights into the conditions of contemporaneity. Although there is, at present, a lag—hopefully, a short-lived one—between the imaginative interventions of artists and those of architects, and despite the regressions that attend any professional practice, many are joining the growing number of other cosmopolitans who seek truly contemporary ways of being in time, of dwelling in location, of shaping self, and of conveying these insights effectively to others. In contemporaneity, everything is always beginning.

Note: This paper develops from my Inaugural Lecture, given on August 17, 2006, as Visiting Professor of Architecture, Faculty of Architecture, University of Sydney. I wish to thank Tom Kvan for his invitation to take up this post, Tom Heneghan for his introduction, and the staff and students for their warm welcome. Its origins go back to September 10, 2001, and of course further. Thanks to the encouragement of Anna Rubbo, Glenn Hill and Gevork Hartoonian, these ideas took their first published form in “The Political Economy of Iconotypes and the Architecture of Destination,” *Architecture Theory Review*, vol.7, no.2 (2002), 1-44.

1. *The Architecture of Aftermath* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2006), 1. Kelly Geunther’s photograph was published in the front page of the *New York Times*, September 12, 2001.

2. On the imagery of the attack see David Friend, *Watching the World Change: The Stories Behind the Images of 9/11* (New York: Farrar, Straus & Giroux, 2006).

3. On the last, see Charles Merewether, *2006 Sydney Biennale: Zones of Contact* (Sydney: Biennale of Sydney, 2006).

4. Osama bin Laden, *Messages to the World, The Statements of Osama bin Laden*, ed. Bruce Lawrence (London: Verso, 2005), 239-40.

5. Cited Retort, "All Quiet on the Eastern Front," electronic broadsheet, August 3, 2006, at retort@sonic.net.

6. For The Atlas Group archive see <http://www.theatlasgroup.org>. These include the *Sweet Talk: Photographic Documents of Beirut*, an on-going project initiated in 1973 in which "the foundation recruited dozens of men and women to photograph every street, storefront, building, and other spaces of national, technological, architectural, cultural, political, and economic significance in Beirut," and *My Neck is Thinner than a Hair: A History of Car Bombs in the Lebanese War 1975-1991*.

7. Retort (Iain Boal, T.J. Clark, Joseph Matthews, Michael Watts), *Afflicted Powers, Capital and Spectacle in a New Age of War* (London: Verso: 2005, 2nd ed. 2006), 198-9.

8. Guy Debord, *The Society of the Spectacle* 1967 (New York: Zone, 1994).

9. Retort, *Afflicted Powers*, 210.

10. Charles Jencks, *The Iconic Building: The Power of Enigma* (New York: Rizzoli, 2006).

11. Fernand Braudel, *Civilization and Capitalism: The Fifteenth to the Eighteenth Century, vol. 3, The Perspective of the World* (New York: Harper and Row, 1984), 19-20.

12. Don Watson, *Watson's Dictionary of Weasel Words, Contemporary Clichés, Cant and Management Jargon* (Milsons Point, N.S.W.: Knopf, 2004).

13. The allusion in the last is to Fredric Jameson, *A Singular Modernity, An Essay in the Ontology of the Present* (London: Verso, 2002), to Jacques Derrida's later work, for example, *Specters of Marx: The State of the Debt, the Work of Mourning and the New International* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1994), the interview following 9/11 in Giovanna Borradori, ed., *Philosophy in a Time of Terror: Dialogues with Jürgen*

Habermas and Jacques Derrida (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2003), and his *Cosmopolitanism and Forgiveness* (London: Routledge, 2001), as well as to Kwame Anthony Appiah, *Cosmopolitanism: Ethics in a World of Strangers* (New York: Norton, 2006). I elaborate the ideas in this section in the introduction to *The Architecture of Aftermath*, and in “Contemporary Art and Contemporaneity,” *Critical Inquiry*, vol. 32, no. 4 (Summer 2006), 681-707. See also the introduction to Terry Smith, Nancy Condee and Okwui Enwezor, *Antinomies of Art and Culture: Modernity, Postmodernity and Contemporaneity* (Durham, N.C.: Duke University Press, forthcoming).

14. Discussed in detail in my “Daniel Among the Philosophers: The Jewish Museum Berlin and Architecture After Auschwitz,” *Architectural Theory Review*, vol. 10, no. 1 (2005): 105-125.

15. See Tracy Myers, Lebbeus Woods, Karsten Harries, *Lebbeus Woods, Experimental Architecture* (Pittsburgh: Carnegie Museum of Art, 2004).

16. The projects are illustrated in Suzanne Stephens et al., *Imagining Ground Zero: Official and Unofficial Proposals for the World Trade Center Site* (New York: Rizzoli, 2004).

17. Nicolai Ouroussoff, “At Ground Zero, Towers of Forgetting,” *New York Times*, September 11, 2006, B1.

18. See, for example, Ashok Rapji, *Big and Green: Towards a Sustainable Architecture in the 21st Century* (Princeton: Princeton Architectural Press, 2002).

19. Philip Jodidio, *Architecture Now! #4* (Köln: Taschen, 2006), 494-7.

20. In the collection of the Museum of Modern Art, New York.

21. "Thinking Big: A Plan for ground Zero and Beyond," *New York Times Magazine*, September 8, 2002, 48-58.
22. The Acconci project is profiled in Philip Jodidio, *Architecture Now! #3* (Köln: Taschen, 2004), 56-65; the Diller + Scofidio one in Jodidio, *Architecture Now! #3*, 170-77.
23. These projects are profiled in the Taschen *Architecture Now!* series. I will, as far as possible, choose illustrations from these and other readily available volumes to exemplify my argument. It should be noted, however, that these books are limited in their scope and outlook.
24. Aldo Aymonio and Valerio Paolo Mosco, *Contemporary Public Space: Un-volumetric Architecture* (Milan: Skira, 2006).
25. Aymonio and Mosco, *Contemporary Public Space: Un-volumetric Architecture*, 17.
26. Aymonio and Mosco, *Contemporary Public Space: Un-volumetric Architecture*, 20.
27. Aymonio and Mosco, *Contemporary Public Space: Un-volumetric Architecture*, 20.
28. Aymonio and Mosco, *Contemporary Public Space: Un-volumetric Architecture*, 21.
29. Aymonio and Mosco, *Contemporary Public Space: Un-volumetric Architecture*, 23.
30. Aymonio and Mosco, *Contemporary Public Space: Un-volumetric Architecture*, 391-2.
31. Jodidio, *Architecture Now! #3*, 334-9.
32. See www.stalkerlab.it.

33. To confine myself to artists shown in Simon Njami, *Africa Remix: Contemporary Art of a Continent* (London: Hayward Gallery, 2005). On Bruyère, see www.epidemic.net/geo/art/jmb/index.html.

34. Jodidio, *Architecture Now! #4*, 536-43.

35. See Thomas Hirschhorn et al., *Thomas Hirschhorn* (London: Phaidon, 2004). Discussed in Benjamin H.D. Buchloh, "An Interview with Thomas Hirschhorn," *October*, no. 113 (Summer 2005), 77-100.

36. Krzysztof Wodiczko, *Critical Vehicles, Writings, Projects, Interviews* (Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press, 1999).

37. Gábor Hushegyi, *Ilona Németh* (Bratislava: Kalligram, 2001).

38. Lucy Orta and Courtenay Smith eds., *Lucy Orta: Body Architecture* (Paris: Verlag Silkie Schreiber, 2003); Andrea Zittel, *Critical Space* (New York: New Museum of Contemporary Art, 2006) and www.zittel.org.

39. *Century City: Art and Culture in the Modern Metropolis* (London: Tate Publications, 2001). Different curators explored the art cultures of these cities in relation to these dates: Bombay/Mumbai 1992-2001, Lagos 1955-70, London 1990-2001, Moscow 1916-30, New York 1969-74, Paris 1905-15, Rio de Janeiro 1955-69, Tokyo 1969-73 and Vienna 1908-18.

40. Centro de Arte Contemporáneo Wilfredo Lam, *Novena Bienal de La Habana 2006* (Havana: Centro de Arte Contemporáneo Wilfredo Lam, 2006.)

41. Profiles in *Groundworks: Environmental Collaboration in Contemporary Art* (Pittsburgh: Regina Gouger Miller Gallery, Carnegie Mellon University, 2005).

42. See Terence Riley ed., *On-Site: New Architecture from Spain* (New York: Museum of Modern Art, 2006).

43. Respectively, Jodidio, *Architecture Now!* #3 75-9, and Jodidio, *Architecture Now!* #4, 154-7.

44. Jodidio, *Architecture Now!* #4, 72-79.

45. Jodidio, *Architecture Now!* #3, 390-5.

46. Respectively, *Groundworks*, passim; www.echigo-tsumari.org; www.agua-wasser.unam.mx/vflash.htm; Jodidio, *Architecture Now!* #4, 138-9.

47. Jodidio, *Architecture Now!* #3, 446-9.

48. Jodidio, *Architecture Now!* #4, 140-3.

49. Jodidio, *Architecture Now!* #4, 416-421.

50. Jodidio, *Architecture Now!* #4, 276-7.

51. Jodidio, *Architecture Now!* #4, 444-9.

52. Jodidio, *Architecture Now!* #4, 396-9.

53. The details are specified in Peter Myers, “Knockabout Walkabout,” *Architecture Australia* (March/April 2000), 72-75.

54. Jodidio, *Architecture Now!* #3, 454-7.

55. Teddy Cruz, "Border Postcards: Chronicles from the Edge," James Stirling Memorial Lectures on the City, Canadian Centre for Architecture, Montréal, and London School of Economics, Cities Program in collaboration with the Van Alen Institute, 2005. At <http://cca.qc.ca/pages/Niveau3.asp?page=StirlingLectures&lang=eng>.

56. Jodidio, *Architecture Now!* #4, 296-301.

57. See www.sdinet.org/index.htm.

58. See www.faculty.arch.usyd.edu.au/web/future/globalstudio.

59. See www.architectswithoutfrontiers.com.au.

60. Illustrated and explained in Aymonio and Mosco, *Contemporary Public Space: Unvolumetric Architecture*, 238-251.

61. For the debate in art contexts, compare Grant Kestler, "Theories and Methods of Collaborative Art Practice," in *Groundworks: Environmental Collaboration in Contemporary Art* (Pittsburgh: Regina Gouger Miller Gallery, Carnegie Mellon University, 2005), to Claire Bishop, "The Social Turn: Collaboration and its Discontents," *Artforum* (February 2006), 178-183.