



## Exhibition

# New Landscapes, New Territories

From July 16<sup>th</sup> to October 5<sup>th</sup>, 1997

The Museu d'Art Contemporani de Barcelona is presenting an exhibition entitled **New Landscapes, New Territories**, which consists of a selection of 25 architecture and town planning projects, all manifestations of the new relationships between built spaces and their natural or urban environments. Eduard Bru, the exhibition curator and designer, conceived the project when invited by the MACBA to take a fresh, critical look at the meaning of territory, landscape and architecture today.

The relations between architecture (artificial) and landscape (natural) are no longer the ones agreed centuries ago: it is no longer a question of placing the objects constructed by men against the background supplied by the territory. The size of our cities, the possibilities for fast travel, our learning — in the cinema and the media — to read reality in fragments and sequences which are neither spatially nor temporally linear, have made city, territory and landscape increasingly interdependent and interwoven.

The exhibition approaches this subject by showing architectures of different sizes, origins and intentions, which reflect awareness of the fundamental change that is taking place in our way of looking at the environment. The exhibition is organised in four sections, according to the way in which that relationship between architecture and place occurs:

- The Infiltrations deal with penetrations of "open" or natural space in the heart of the city, as in the future Paris beyond La Défense, or, on a tiny scale, a house by the Americans Diller and Scofidio whose cameras scan the territory outside to provide views for the enclosed interior.
- The Landmarks use their vantage point or sheer scale to become common references for a city or a geography. An example is the new Guggenheim Museum on the riverside in Bilbao.
- The constructions known as Frontiers are located along lines of change (where there are any) between two places or two geographies. Kazuyo Sejima, for example, patiently hunts out these borders inside Japanese cities and then allows them to determine the form of his buildings.
- In their interiors the buildings are conceived from sensory and perceptive experiences drawn from life in the new urban and territorial environments. Buildings, then, as episodes in a landscape — a forest of columns with trees whose sap is information flow (Toyo Ito), a museum which is a Paris garden precariously enclosed to be hermetic (Jean Nouvel) which in the exhibition are called Interior Landscapes.

- There is a special section devoted to Barcelona. The not so recent urban experiment in the city was a success, but it must also be admitted that the present response to new problems is a feeble one. The rivers, hills and sea front are being occupied with insufficient reflection on the landscape.

**New Landscapes, New Territories** is mounted in an area of over 900 square metres and the works will be in cases specially designed for the occasion to display original documents and drawings as well as photographs, models and videos. The assembly refers directly to the architecture of Richard Meier where it is housed. The author and exhibition curator Eduard Bru has picked up on themes proposed by Meier's project so as to take full advantage of the qualities of the Museu d'Art Contemporani de Barcelona building.

The exhibition catalogue — published jointly by the MACBA and the publishers ACTAR — documents the projects on show and contains essays by Eduard Bru, Mirko Zardini, Yorgos Simeforidis, Florian Beigel, Jochem Schneider and German Adell.

---

## **NEW LANDSCAPES, NEW TERRITORIES**

From 16 July to 19 October 1997

Production: Museu d'Art Contemporani de Barcelona

Curator: Eduard Bru

---

### **SUMMER 1997 - MUSEUM HOURS:**

10:30 a.m. to 8 p.m. daily

10:30 a.m. to 10 p.m. Thursday

11 a.m. to 7 p.m. Sunday and holidays

Live music at the atrium: 8:30 p.m. to 9:30 p.m. Thursday



## **Infiltracions Infiltrations**

Projecte project:

**MuBE, Museu Brasileiro d'Escultura  
Brazilian Sculpture Museum**

Arquitecte architect:

PAULO MENDES DA ROCHA

Col·laboradors collaborators:

Alexandre Delijaicov, Carlos Dias,

Geni Sugai, Jose de Brito Cruz,

Pedro Mendes da Rocha,

Rogéiro Machado, Vera Domshke

Data date: 1986-1995

Localització location: São Paulo, Brasil

Projecte project:

**Velòdrom i piscina de Berlín  
Berlin Velodrome**

and Swimming Hall

Arquitecte architect:

DOMINIQUE PERRAULT

Col·laboradors/collaborators:

Rolf Reichert (Arquitecte Architect

R.P.M.), Hans-Jürgen Schmidt-

Schicketanz (Enginyer-Arquitecte

Engineer-Architect S.S.P.), Ove Arup

and Partner London Berlin

Data, date:

1992-1997 Velòdrom Velodrome,

1992-1998 Piscina Swimming Hall

Localització location:

Berlín, Alemanya Berlin, Germany

Projecte/project:

**Centre de Producció Buenos  
Aires, Argentina Televisa Color  
Buenos Aires Production Center,  
Argentina Televisa Color**

Arquitectes architects:

MANTEOLA, SÁNCHEZ GÓMEZ.

SANTOS, SOLSONA, VIÑOLY

Col·laboradors collaborators: Carlos

Alberto Sallabery, Felipe Tarsitano

Data/date: 1976-1978

Localització location:

Buenos Aires, Argentina

Projecte project:

**Els jardins del Grand Axe  
The Grand Axe Gardens**

Arquitectes architects:

PAUL CHEMETOV, BORJA HUIDOBBRO

Col·laboradors collaborators:

Guy Henri, Marc Augé,

Gilles Clément, Françoise Divorne,

Jean-Louis Husson,

Jean-Pierre Vincent,

Serge Sobczynski, Jens Metz,

Florence Ecart, Rüdiger Hoffmann,

Helmut Hutter, Thierry Jourdeuil,

Franck Neau, Frabrizio Piccoli

Data date: 1991

Localització location:

París, França Paris, France

Projecte/project:

**Canalització del riu Guadalhorce  
Canalization  
of the Guadalhorce river**

Arquitectes architects:

JUAN HERREROS, INAKI ÁBALOS

Col·laboradors collaborators:

Ángel Borrigo, Rajad Hernández,

Javier Herrerros, Javier Fresneda

Data date: 1993-1994

Localització location:

Málaga, Espanya Spain

Projecte project:

**Reutilització de la Witznitz  
Brikettfabrik  
Post-use of the Witznitz  
Brikettfabrik**

Arquitectes architects: FLORIAN BEIGEL

+ ARCHITECTURE RESEARCH UNIT

Col·laboradors/collaborators:

Architecture Research Unit (University

of North London), Metropolitan

Architecture Research Unit (Seoul),

Ove Arup & Partners Engineers,

Suresh A'Raj, José Aguilar García,

Philip Cristou, Eamon Cushnahan,

Jonathan Hendry, Rex Henry,

Dan Jones, Oh Soo In,

Kim Yong Kyu, Constantino Meucci,

Philip Misselwitz, Ellen Monchen,

Susanne Müller, Georgios Vavelos,

Yong Ho Shin, Chris Snow,

Taro Tsuruta, Sylvia Ullmayer.

Data date: 1996

Localització location:

Borna, Alemanya Germany

Projecte project:

**Carrer amb sis paisatges  
Street with six landscapes**

Despacho office: Formalhaut

Arquitectes architects:

OTTMAR HÖRL, GABRIELA SEIFERT,

Götz Stöckmann

Col·laboradors collaborators:

Edmun Klimeck (dibuixos/drawings)

Data date: 1993

Localització location:

Espai públic del ZKM

Public space of the ZKM, Karlsruhe,

Alemanya Germany

Projecte project: **Cinéma Bleu**

Despacho office: Formalhaut

Arquitectes architects:

OTTMAR HÖRL, GABRIELA SEIFERT,

Götz Stöckmann

Data date: 1991

Localització location:

Niort, França France

Projecte project: **Slow House**

Arquitectes architects:

ELLIZABETH DILLER.

RICARDO SCOFIDIO

Data date: 1989

Localització location:

Long Island, Nova York, EUA

New York, USA

## **Fites Landmarks**

Projecte project:

**Villa Dall'Ava**

Despacho office: OMA

Arquitecte architect:

REM KOOLHAAS

Data date: 1985-1991

Localització location:

Saint Cloud,

París, França Paris, France

Projecte project:

**Casa unifamiliar**

Single family house

Arquitecte architect:

VICENTE GUALLART

Data date: 1995-1996

Localització location: Liria,

València, Espanya Spain

Projecte project

**Centre de Cultura**

**Contemporània de Barcelona**

Arquitectes architects:

ALBERT VIAPLANA,

HELIO PIÑÓN

Col·laboradors collaborators:

Aurora Fernández Grané,

David Viaplana Canudas

Data date: 1991-1994

Localització location:

Barcelona, Espanya Spain

Projecte project:

**Arche de La Défense**

Arquitecte architect:

JOHAN-OTTO VON

SPRECKELSEN

Col·laborador collaborator:

Paul Andreu

Data date:

1982-1989

Localització location:

París, França

Paris France

Projecte project:

**Museu Guggenheim  
Guggenheim Museum**

Arquitecte architect:

FRANK GEHRY

Col·laboradors collaborators:

Randy Jefferson, Vano Haritunians,  
Douglas Hanson, Edwin Chan,  
Bob Hale

Data date: 1993-1997

Localització location:

Bilbao, Espanya Spain

Projecte project:

**Palau de l'Òpera  
i Centre de Congressos  
Opera House  
and Congress Centre**

Arquitectes architects:

FEDERICO SORIANO.

DOLORES PALACIOS

Col·laboradors collaborators:

Carlos Arroyo, Alberto Nicolau,  
Àngel Verdasco, José María Fanlo,  
Miguel Jareño, Higiní Arau.

Data date:

1992 (Concurs/Competition)

1995-1998 (Construcció/Construction)

Localització location:

Bilbao, Espanya Spain

Projecte project:

**Ordenació de l'Àrea  
Abandoibarra  
Abandoibarra Area**

Arquitectes architects

JUAN HERREROS.

IÑAKI ÁBALOS.

FRANCISCO MANGADO.

CÉSAR MANRIQUE

Col·laboradors collaborators:

Eva Gómez, Juan Lahuerta,  
David Torres, Carlos Urtailquil

Data date: 1993-1994

Localització location:

Bilbao, Espanya Spain

Projecte project:

**Bibliothèque Nationale**

Arquitectes architects:

DOMINIQUE PERRAULT.

AUDE PERRAULT.

GAËLLE LAURIOT-DIT-PRÉVOST

Col·laboradors collaborators:

D. Allaire, G. Choukroun,  
Y. Conan, C. Coursaris,  
M. Gasperini, P. Gil,  
G. Morrisseau

Data/date: 1989-1995

Localització location:

París, França  
París, France

**Fronteres Borders**

Projecte project:

**Terminal Internacional  
del transbordador de passatgers  
de Yokohama  
Yokohama International Port  
Terminal**

Arquitectes architects:

FLORIAN BEIGEL AND THE  
ARCHITECTURE RESEARCH UNIT  
IN COLLABORATION WITH KISA  
KAWAKAMI

Col·laboradors collaborators:

Suresh A'Raj, Ada Yvars Bravo,  
Philip Cristou, Rex Henry,  
Kisa Kawakami, Martin Manning,  
Ove Arup & Partners Engineers.

Data date 1995

Localització location

Yokohama, Japó/Japan

Projecte project:

**Terminal Internacional  
del transbordador de passatgers  
de Yokohama  
Yokohama International Port  
Terminal**

Despacho office

Foreign Office Architects Ltd.

Arquitectes architects: FARSHID

MOUSSAVI. ALEJANDRO ZAERA-POLO

Col·laboradors/collaborators:

Jung-Hyun Hwang, Michael Cosmas,  
Yoon King Chow, Kazuyo Ninomiya,  
Ivan Asciano, Guy Westbrook,  
Kenichi Matsuzawa

Data date: 1995-

Localització location:

Yokohama, Japó/Japan

Projecte project:

**Centre Multimèdia  
Multi-Media Studio**

Arquitectes architects:

KAZUYO SEJIMA. RYUE NISHIZAWA

Col·laboradors collaborators:

Saski Structural Consultants

Data date: 1995-1996

Localització location:

Oogaki, Japó/Japan

Projecte project:

**Carrasco Square**

Despacho office:

West 8 Landscape Architects

Arquitectes architects:

ADRIAN GEUZE. HUUB JUURLINK.

Erwin Bot, Inge Breugem,

Dirry de Bruin, Katrien Prak,

Jorn Schiemann

Data date: 1992-1997

Localització location:

Amsterdam, Països baixos

The Netherlands

Projecte project:

**Cabina de Policia Police Box**

Arquitecte architect: KAZUYO SEJIMA

Col·laboradors collaborators:

Matsui Gengo + O.R.S.

(Engineers/Engineers)

Data date: 1993-1994

Localització location:

Chofu, Tòquio, Japó/Japan

Projecte project:

**Viviendas per a gent gran  
Houses for elderly people**

Despacho office: MVRDV

Arquitectes architects:

WINY MAAS. JACOB VAN RIJS.

Nathalie de Vries

Col·laboradors collaborators:

Willem Timmer, Arjan Mulder,

Frans de Witte

Data date: 1994-1995

Localització location:

Amsterdam-Osdorp,

Països baixos The Netherlands

**Paisajes interiores**  
**Interior landscapes**

Projecte project:  
**Edge of a city, Barres**  
**de retenció espacial Spacial**  
**retaining bars**  
Arquitectes architects:  
STEVEN HOLL, PETER LYNCH  
Col·laboradors collaborators:  
P. Copet, B. Frombgen, J. Cross  
Data date: 1990  
Localització location:  
Phoenix, Arizona, EUA USA

Projecte project:  
**Edge of a city, Gratacels**  
**paral·làctics**  
**Parallax skyscrapers**  
Arquitectes architects:  
STEVEN HOLL, PETER LYNCH,  
R. RUTHER  
Data date: 1990  
Localització location:  
Penn Yard, Manhattan,  
EUA USA

Projecte project:  
**Barrera contra el vent**  
**Wind barrier**  
Despacho office:  
Public Works, Architectural Division  
Arquitecte architect:  
MAARTEN STRUIJS  
Col·laboradors collaborators:  
Joop Schilperoord, Frans de Wit  
Data date:  
1983-1985  
Localització location:  
Caland Canal, Rotterdam,  
Països baixos The Netherlands

Projecte project:  
**Fondation Cartier**  
Arquitectes architects:  
JEAN NOUVEL, EMMANUEL CATTANI  
Col·laboradors collaborators:  
Didier Brault, Pierre André Bohnet,  
Laurence Iniguez, Philippe Mathieu,  
Viviane Morteau, Guillaume Polet,  
Steeve Ray, Arnaud Villard,  
Stéphane Robert, Massimo Quendolo  
Data date: 1994  
Localització location:  
París, França/Paris France

Projecte project:  
**Mediateca Mediatheque**  
Arquitecte architect: TOYO ITO  
Col·laboradors collaborators:  
Sasaki Structural Consultants,  
ES Associates  
and Sogo Consultants  
Data date: 1995-  
Localització location:  
Sendai, Miyagi, Japó Japan

Projecte project:  
**Hospital de Mar**  
Arquitectes architects:  
MANUEL BRULLET,  
ALBERT DE PINEDA  
Col·laboradors collaborators:  
Manuel Arguijo,  
Xavier Llambrich, Jordi Barba,  
Mateu Barba,  
Francesc Pernas  
Data date: 1989-1992  
Localització location:  
Barcelona, Espanya Spain

Projecte project:  
**Biblioteca Pública**  
**de Múrcia**  
**Murcia Public Library**  
Arquitecte architect:  
JOSÉ MARÍA TORRES NADAL  
Col·laboradors collaborators:  
Eugenia Rodríguez, Enric Serra,  
Xavier Rovira, Josep Carreté,  
Julio Martínez, Luis Fernando Perona,  
Julio M. Calzón  
Data date: 1988-  
Localització location:  
Murcia, Espanya Spain

Projecte project:  
**Habitatges Residential housing**  
Arquitecte architect:  
JOSEP LLINÁS  
Col·laboradors collaborators:  
Robert Brufau  
Data date: 1992-1995  
Localització location:  
Barcelona, Espanya Spain

Projecte project:  
**Dos habitatges sota un sostre**  
**Two houses under one roof**  
Despacho office: MVRDV  
Arquitecte architect:  
WINY MAAS, JACOB VAN RIJS,  
Nathalie de Vries  
Col·laboradors collaborators:  
B. Mastenbroek  
Data date: 1996-1997  
Localització location:  
Utrecht,  
Països Baixos The Netherlands



## The Long-Distance Gaze

Eduard Bru

"There are no more streets in which to see ourselves, there are people everywhere and there is no-one, there are no more villages, just agglomerations; there are no more streets, there are motorways, cities are being wiped off the map... There are few things left, very few, the rarefaction of the present moment, of the simultaneity of oneself and the world, is making its presence felt more and more... And what can you do? Everything is different but that's the whole point; everything, you alone have to look, do you follow? Come with me, let's go together this springtime afternoon, come with me and stroll around the city;... let's watch the movement of the city through the panes of glass,... the shouts, the roar, the river, the sweetness that is spoken,... yes, listen to the trains, they're crossing Europe,... yes, listen to the void that's coming,... there is no more work, nor workers, come let us talk, even now, of life, it is the joy of life, of this ocean city, it will emerge there from the waters;... listen, look at her, she's coming, it is she who is coming, the ruin of the world, look, there she is, you know her, she's our sister, our twin, she's coming, hello, we, so young, smile at her, so beautiful, dressed in white leather, with her green eyes."

*Marguerite Duras, Les yeux verts*

Decisive changes come about when we change the way we look at things.

This is precisely what is happening now in what we could, for the moment, call the relations between architecture and landscape.

It is no longer a case of defending, and presenting here, architectures which pay heed to landscape, in a kind of exaltation of those forms which are committed to context and have been so numerous in recent decades.

It is becoming increasingly obvious that the division of roles to the artificial, that which is built — houses, cities—, and its hypothetical framework what is given, natural—, has lost its supposed stability. There are several reasons for this:

— the increasing artificiality of the entire physical environment, from urban to rural (practically all virgin territory included), trivializes the differentiation between the natural (by which we understand that which has not been manipulated) and the artificial, a common phenomenon in ancient cultures and settlements, such as those in the Mediterranean.

— given the transmutation of viewpoint, fast means of physical transport trivialize the notions of interiority and exteriority of a place, be it city or territory. Fast road transport by motorway and the subsequent generalization of flight have changed the idea of time in our interpretation of the environment, and will continue to do so. Different interpretations of reality coexist, viewpoints multiply, giving rise to a progressive capacity for simultaneous interpretation of various planes of reality.

— New guidelines for interpreting reality are appearing at the same time, influenced by the new transportation and information systems. The cinema showed us how to manipulate the time of interpretation, proposing alternative sequences to those strung together by the accepted notions of movement and time. Now, new means of representing reality are adding and increasing remoteness to all this, changing the stability of appearance regardless of its nature and using the possibilities of this manipulation to show any form of reality as construction.



— Finally, the extension of our conurbations has by far exceeded the placental basis of their origins, which sought their justification in a specific conception of the relationship between architecture, settlement and place. Cities have swamped their original geographical frameworks, and almost all are witnessing very different moments in their architecture-site relationships. Differing moments within the same city and similar ones in cities of extraordinarily distant origins and latitudes.

This new state of affairs not only invalidates the old conception of the built object as a figure against a background, it also brings a dose of relativity to bear in more up-to-date conceptions, such as proposals for the joint formalization of construction and landscape by traditional architecture alone.

The architecture of the Modern Movement also, with very few exceptions, took as its background things which were not of human construction. Backgrounds of differing qualities and expectations, of course, usually imbued with English “naturalism”.

Vittorio Gregotti deals with this situation in *Territorio de la arquitectura*, setting forward the place as an active part of the project. Yet the basis for such activity is always the subordination of the place—a beautiful though inert body—to the built object, which is conveniently arranged so as to structure, explain, organize, possess the site on which it is set.

Given the vastness of Gregotti’s undertaking, it is no wonder his works tend increasingly to the size and vain pretensions of the Great Wall of China. In an unpublished text, Josepa Bru writes that “...Ballard (Crash) explains how the writer used to feel and declare himself to be someone who was capable of imposing order on reality, dissecting it and making it poetic—in short, explaining it, always claiming power over it.

These days, conversely, his attitude has more and more in common with that of the scientist who, in the face of what he knows to be inapprehensible, can only try out experiments which merely account for tiny fragments, to serve as a makeshift basis for interpretations of contemporary reality...”. Today, there are inverse trends which exist alongside pride in the object: trends which do not feel authorized to construct, to impose artifice, to break into the natural state of things, interventions which understand that attention to site requires disguise as that place, camouflage, disappearance.

Without going to either of these extremes, the fact is that it is now, when we no longer have pre-established scenarios or relationships of subordination between construction and place, object and background, that these categories, as I explained at the outset, have disappeared. This state of affairs has seen the emergence of different attitudes which I would classify into four main groups:

### **Infiltrations**

These days we can understand the city by interpreting space and scale, as the experience of landscape and territory has taught us. Cities open up to the territory, the city is landscape in its own right.

The space shared by city and territory is not necessarily adjacent. Diller & Scofidio (p 50) summon it up virtually inside the closed object of their project, turning their backs on the real context to opt for the one they choose as their site.

In Chemetov’s project, the idea of void and the interpretation of the geography on which the city is set are the ordering principle for the new Paris, extending the traditional L’Étoile-La Défense (p 70) axis beyond the “Arche”.

In São Paulo, “void” is an extremely scarce commodity and one which Paulo Mendes da Rocha (p 28) offers his city by shrinking and submerging the volume of his museum. In this way he transmutes the fate of the assignment—an object, an opacity—into an empty (urban) space.



As far back as post-war Berlin, the Smithsons set forward a new interpretation of the city on the basis of relations of dimension and scale in which the form of the open space played a determinant role. Such hopes were conclusively dashed by the pessimism and nostalgia of the reconstructivist solution which has now been adopted. There is no reason why infiltrations should take place at the "planning" stage. Recent constructions have called on areas which are quite remote from the urban environment for even the most domestic and city settings.

### **Landmarks**

In almost completely opposite strategies to the latter examples, theoretically urban forms of architecture are referred to territorial-scale phenomena, taking the urban beyond what we traditionally understand by city.

In Bilbao, the operations currently under way around the estuary aim to be both urban and territorial references at the same time.

Le Corbusier proposed the same height for his skyscrapers on Barcelona's sea front as Montjuïc, Barcelona's hill that descends into the sea: 160 metres —or 50 floors. This image, along with Rubió i Tudurí's practically contemporary reflections and Hans Kollhoff's project for the continuation of Barcelona's Diagonal, (p 94) is one of the few examples in Barcelona of large-scale strategies which explicitly take into account.

Recent interventions in Paris return to an old, long-lasting dialogue between the city and its territory which Starck-Nouvel managed to export to the Opera House in Tokyo.

But the built object does not necessarily require large scale to define it and give it a point of reference in relation to its territory.

The Beistegui penthouse apartment is one example; using its periscope and the height of its selective balustrade, it takes as reference its preferred Parisian objects. On a smaller scale, this is exactly the same operation as the Plan Voisin; it eliminates any built objects which are of no interest to it, setting its sights on the territory and its singular architecture as a whole. The ground floor of the Ville Savoie takes its form from the turning circle of the cars which turned round there to speed back to Paris after visiting it. It is also Beistegui's Paris that we now see when swimming obsessive lengths of the pool on the roof of Koolhaas' villa Dall'Ava, (p 60) which picks up as yet incomplete proposals of what some hasty commentators would call the worn-out Modern Movement. The nature of landmark is also a recurrent strategy for giving form to the public constructions emerging beyond the city, fed by the great communication infrastructures.

### **Borders**

In the case of other forms of architecture, the aim is precisely to lay down the borders in what some see as the inevitable permeability between city and territory, architectures which set themselves up against the exaltation of dispersion and the urban and territorial continuum. These borders often take the form of natural leitmotifs: along the fracture, or contrast, between two geographies; between two natural elements, water and earth.

If the first two options on our list can be seen as two ways of giving form to an overall sense of territorial development, two strategies for formalizing the global city, this response comes to affirm the local city (self-reliant, città de vilaggi), to possibly achieve a more contrasted globality or to shut itself away in the village. It is not just the natural/artificial, built/empty, city/territory tensions which produce borders. In the patchwork so often found in today's cities, we can also discover borders between various types of occupation, activity or formalization. Kazuyo Sejima's work on the Japanese city stresses patient work on detecting these points to determine city form.



## **Interior landscapes**

We can now see the building, as an interior space, from the viewpoint of what we apprehend in other fields, rather than being bound by mere sterile "disciplinary autonomy". From what we have learnt, for example, about forms of communication unconnected to architecture. And what we have learnt about the "exterior": about the relationship between the place and the landscape and its relations with objects and things. These are buildings, then, which are set forward as episodes of landscape, with the vociferous precedents of Scharoun's Library in Berlin and Le Corbusier's capitol in Chandigarh. Walls which mark out a place where the incidents of the ground plan are accidents of that landscape.

A forest of columns with trees in which information flows are the sap (Ito); a Parisian garden precariously closed in to be air-conditioned (Nouvel); common spaces for libraries, for politics, for entertainment (Torres Nadal, Koolhaas, Zenghelis and Gigantes) in the form of covered streets where buildings form the furnishings.

Constructions which can abound, as Jochem Schneider says right here, in the tyranny of intimacy, with the disappearance of the public realm. But maybe, as Schneider also says, in other forms of survival of the public realm, in a potential conception of the private as part of a more general scope, as an explicit part of the city, as an actual part of the territory.

## **Barcelona**

The traditional, physical space of Barcelona, its sloping coastal plain, has come to an end with the latest medium-scale operations.

The model for city transformation between the late seventies and the eighties progressed along the same lines as the dimensions of assignments: from lesser to greater.

The key option was to keep close to reality, setting up right next to problems and opportunities, with neither the time nor the confidence to take a "long-distance gaze". The overall problem would be solved by mastering its particular manifestations. "Metastasis" —a bold metaphor, liberally brandished by those responsible for the operation— is not known for its premeditation.

For its speed and efficiency, yes.

Yet those public squares in places which the city had always avoided, those streets on the disorganized outskirts —undoubtedly contributing to a substantial improvement in urban tone— had to earn their own place in the order of things.

In a problematic environment with no precise overall brief, the usual response took the form of ornament and decoration. Projects relied heavily on design and furnishings to draw out the limits of the oasis and stand up to the city around them: idyllic parks amidst motorways and electricity pylons; romantic bowers in "squares" made up of party walls and remnants of city. Few took the option of looking from the project at the inextricable appearance of reality. Less with a view to short-term embellishment as to understanding and explaining the situation so as to invite action and thereby make it possible.

Metastasis is possible when there is a body which provides a basic structure, no matter how damaged it is.

This was the case as long as we were faced with the old Barcelona scenario, which we have since filled. It is not the case of the new territories which the city is now occupying.

It is important that we relinquish the guerrilla tactics we have fallen into. The new Barcelona has no pre-existing order to complete, embellish or negate. There is no body to undergo metastasis and the only paralysed State to upset is the one that we are under the obligation of organizing ourselves. Sometimes surreptitiously, sometimes ringing with applause, the new communications infrastructure —with its stations and major service apparatus— is applying its self-centred, partial logic to these guidelines. Meanwhile —now in the absence of the political context which made room for coordinated reflection and action which were mindful of scale—,



every intervention, every public square, every rambla, every facility, is decided on according to particular administrative divisions.

But it is a new place, a new landscape, common to everyone, that we are occupying: the rivers, what remains of the sea front, the other side of Collserola, El Vallès.

We have situations which are comparable to all those dealt with by the projects, ideas and constructions discussed here. Today, there is no call for our individual responses.

## Conclusion

"Public space has changed and landscape is a kind of annotation". Jochem Schneider

What better way to sum up the question?

We could say that annotation emerged in the sixties, using supposedly immanent, exclusive elements of language of and for architecture. These then existed alongside two forms of annotation, one decidedly neo-classic, the other supposedly comprising elements of everything that is common, everyday and trivial. Finally, they tell us that annotation is impossible and that architecture has to go back to basics in attesting to the unfeasibility of language.

Nonetheless, I believe that much of the potential of annotation and language which was implicit in the Modern Movement has yet to be developed. I also believe that the new relations of use, scale and environment to place will encourage the development and growth of that potential, and create more. These two expectations are the justification for this exhibition.

We attempt to codify this situation using different means: "empty spaces" (Herzog, R. Koolhaas, E. Bru), "containers and flows" (I. de Solà-Morales), "bigness" (R. Koolhaas), "Citylandscapes and Cityscapes" (Biegel), the "Grossstadt" (M. Zardini), the "hyperville"

(A. Corboz), "the arrogant overview" (S. Boeri)... There is no objection to these useful attempts on a rational plot to reveal what is really going on. But there is nothing more specific in the present situation than its openness, nothing more productive —and difficult— than the impossibility of determining it.

Landscaping —by which we understand "landscape architecture"— should be a new way of looking at things. Architects, do not despair. This is no new "discipline" —quite the opposite: it is strictly architecture. Just architecture. So the debate between partisans of the "right to self-determination" of the landscape and those who consider it a colony of architecture is shown to be false.

Landscape, as we interpret it, has nothing to do with scale, it is not necessarily the architecture of large, or empty, or open, or green spaces, neither is it scientific control of the possible damage which can be caused by large constructions. It may originally have been defined more or less as such, but it has crystallized into architecture. Architecture which is characterized by:

— attending as much to what there is between things as to things themselves: as a result, public space —your living room at home, a public square, a terrace— is frequently its object.

— highlighting variability and change —learnt during large-scale experiences but applicable to many others—, thus pointing up the overall design of objects rather than creating mere items of curiosity.

— facilitating the action of the project as a commitment between scales, the awareness that the project is resolved and influences so many fields beyond those which are available to it by simple physical proximity. It turns the action of the designer into an ability to move, to travel between scales.

We have called this exhibition New landscapes, new territories. We are, now, capable of understanding and sensing very different scales and fields of perception and action at the same time. Yet the things I touch, the obstacles I avoid, the paths I select, are still those which my body and senses, as yet unchanged, allow me to choose. Acting on what is close at hand, immediate and tactile, at the same time understanding many other containers and dimensions which we also alter with our actions, provides us with a good working brief for the coming years.