TRAVEL, SPACE, ARCHITECTURE

edited by Jilly Traganou & Miodrag Mitrašinović

TRAVEL, SPACE, ARCHITECTURE ·······································

edited by Jilly Traganou & Miodrag Mitrašinović

TRAVEL,
SPACE,
ARCHITECTURE

To Maya, our companion in this and all our travels.

Jilly Traganou

1

2

Table of Contents

3

I. PREFACE

Jilly Traganou

1 ···

Arjun Appadurai (1996) discusses the work of imagination as a 'constitutive feature of modern subjectivity' that offers 'new resources and new disciplines for the construction of imagined selves and imagined worlds' (1996: 3). In our contemporary times, 'electronic mediation and mass migration mark the world of the present … as … forces … that seem to impel … the work of the imagination … Today … persons and images often meet unpredictably, outside the certainties of home' (1996: 4).

This book aims to explore how conditions of physical and metaphorical dislocation affect spatio-architectural practices, and how these conditions redefine the parallel notions of place, culture and identity. It also claims the need to define a new theoretical territory in architectural scholarship that studies space and architecture through the notion of travel. We do so in order to reveal that spatio-architectural practices in their conceptual and material dimensions are and have been multisited and have to be examined through the prism of trajectories and networks rather than singular perceptions of place, or essentialist notions of identity and culture. Thus this book is set to examine the multiple relationships that emerge between the acts of traveling and the conceptualization, representation, and production of space in its various scales and modes – architectural, urban, geographic, social, cultural and political – and within various contexts of modernity in which the 'work of imagination,'[1] which is vitally connected with possibilities of travel, plays a central role (APPADURAI 1996: 31). The following chapters examine a spectrum of encounters in various cultural and historical contexts, from the eighteenth century to the present, that led to the production of diverse media and forms of spatial representation and inhabitation, from cartographies and travel diaries to interiors, buildings, landscapes and urban environments. The relationships we explore here are the effects of cross-cultural encounters that occurred in the context of a variety of travel modes, including exploratory, professional, or educational travel; tourism, colonization, immigration and refuge-seeking.

In the discipline of architecture, traveling does not hold the same critical position that it does in the fields of urban and cultural geography, anthropology and cultural studies. Recognizing a lack of comprehensive scholarly literature on the subject, we first introduced the theme in 2001 in a conference session titled 'Travel, Space, Architecture' at the 54th Annual Meeting of the Society of Architectural Historians in Toronto. The response to the call for papers was encouraging: 23 abstracts were submitted and six were presented

in the Toronto session.[2] Seven years in the making, this book consists of papers by some of the participants in the Toronto session, as well as several newly commissioned chapters and four interviews with architects who practice internationally. It brings together scholars of architecture, design and urban studies who have embarked on various transdisciplinary explorations, along with practitioners of architecture who find the subject of travel central to their work and itinerant paths.

The authors of the chapters in this volume ask the following questions: What (pre)conceptions shape the identities of architects, urbanists, and non-professional space-constituents and their approaches to places as they travel from one cultural context to the other? What ideas travel with them and become transplanted at the new places of inhabitation? What spatial elements or vocabularies do they choose to bring back home, and how do they interact with their new environments? How do visions of space through new travel apparatuses reshape broader spatial imaginations and practices? What happens in cases of lost homes, multiple attachments, or when 'networks' shaped by processes of mobility and distant communication replace 'communities'?

It is obvious that traveling operates not only as a real and important phenomenon in the world but also as a subject and even a theoretical tool of emerging scholarly discourses. With this volume we wish to demonstrate that the lens of travel can move architecture theory and practice beyond the centrality of static, place-bound principles into an understanding of more open-ended networks of relationships (of subjects and sites), as well as bring architecture scholarship to a more productive and engaging dialogue with other academic and professional fields, particularly those that began outlining a discursive, transdisciplinary space in relation to travel and beyond.

II. FOR A THEORY OF TRAVEL IN ARCHITECTURAL STUDIES[3]

Jilly Traganou

All travel is a form of gradual self-extinction.
–SHIVA NAIPAUL, *BEYOND THE DRAGON'S MOUTH* (1984)

It was when I stood inside the Parthenon in Rome that I first became aware of the real meaning of architectural space. What I experienced was not space in the conceptual sense – it was real – before my very eyes ... The 'force' of excitement I felt at that time is what I would like to call architecture.
–TADAO ANDO, PLACE – GEOMETRY – NATURE (1989)

We're in a good position where we don't have any ties at the moment. We don't have any children, we don't even own a house. And our ambitions are to go somewhere else and experience more.
–MALE ARCHITECT IN HIS MID-TWENTIES; QUOTED IN LARSEN ET AL. (2006)

Since the advent of modernity, and especially throughout the twentieth century, travel has become an important landmark in the careers of architects both world-renowned and anonymous. Such travel often occurred voluntarily, as in the case of young Le Corbusier's journey to the 'East' in the 1910s, or Tadao Ando's journey to the 'West' in the 1960s; but sometimes it was initiated as a matter of survival, as in the displacement of numerous European architects between the wars and during the World War II era.[4]

Generations of architects – following in the footsteps of the 'masters', seeking what they sought, or inventing entirely new itineraries of their own – have traveled to various destinations for work, education, and networking, occasionally creating their own architectural 'grand tour' and bringing home the evidence of travel (sketches, drawings, slides, and anecdotes) to be integrated with their architectural vocabulary. Within these contexts, however, there is no shortage of cases of lost or multiple homes, as architects sometimes

fluctuate between localities that render definitive, spatially constructed declarations of belonging impossible.

Architects, of course, do not travel simply in a professional capacity, just as they are not the only individuals who travel or participate in spatial production. Traveling populations such as tourists, expatriates, immigrants, and refugees also have a significant impact on spatial production in its material as well as imaginary dimensions. Specific building types (such as tourist resorts, railway stations, airports, or refugee camps) as well as overall urban planning projects (from tactical appropriations to historic preservation, place marketing, and gentrification) are realized for the benefit of travelers, or sometimes as a result of the very actions of travelers themselves. Yet, as the various types of encounters generated during travel facilitate the softening of boundaries among cultures and allow processes of alterity to occur, they sometimes also produce closures and mechanisms of exclusion that harden and segregate cultural boundaries.

This book argues for the significance of travel in the conceptualization, representation, production, and consumption of architectural, urban, and geographical space under various conditions of modernity. These processes have occurred during the transition from an imperial world order to one that is based on the distinct divisions of the nation-state and the rules of internationalism, and, more recently, to a world order that heralds the dissolution of national borders, thus initiating new transnational types of allegiances and citizens' affiliations.

The fascination with travel that we encounter in architecture is deeply rooted in an intellectual tradition that links traveling epistemologically to the production of knowledge. The belief in the capacity of travel to provide insight, facilitating an epistemological journey from habit to knowledge, can be found in systems of thought that are fundamentally different from one another – from Islam to the scientific reasoning of the Enlightenment and beyond – and is not confined to any particular cultural constellation or epoch (EUBEN 2006: 15).[5] Traveling as a means of providing perspective – the critical distance paramount to reflection, cross-cultural understanding, and intellectual stance – is an activity shared by architects among other intellectuals and professionals.[6] But travel is also a means of conquering space and time, and often is inseparable from territorial claims such as colonization or warfare; it also drives economic development, within which architecture and spatial production play a fundamental role. Within the modern era, developments in methods of management, as well as political and economic separations of labor and knowledge-based industries, have dispersed the process of architectural production to various sites across the globe. When a new structure is built today, the conceptualization and design, the harvesting and processing of materials, the manufacture of parts of the building and the final assembly often take place in different locations. As a consequence, people who are involved

4 ....

During this period, important European architects were displaced to non-European countries. Mies Van De Rohe (1886–1969), Walter Gropius (1883–1969) and Marcel Breuer (1920–81) moved to the US (Mies in 1938, Gropius and Breuer in 1937), Bruno Taut (1880–1938) to Japan in 1933–36 and Turkey in 1936–38. This was paralleled by the massive displacement of Jewish architects. Such were the cases of German-born Richard Kaufmann (1889–1954) or Ukraine-born Itzchak Rapoport (1901–89) who moved to Israel in 1920 and 1928 respectively, or German-born Erich Mendelsohn (1887-1953) who moved to the West Coast of the United States in 1941, after having lived in London since 1933.

5 ....

As early as in *The Epic of Gilgamesh* (transcribed 1900 BCE), and in Homer's *Odyssey* (800 BCE) the pursuit of knowledge and the attainment of wisdom has been linked to travel and the direct experience of the radically unfamiliar (EUBEN 2006: 20).

6 ....

Travel has also been viewed with skepticism as a dangerous endeavor which may be potentially intellectually harmful for the individual. Several advocates of the benefits of travel from Plato to Rousseau also warned about the dangers associated with it (SEE EUBEN 2002: 22; VAN DEN ABBEELE 1992: 91). Architects also expressed hesitations about travel. Le Corbusier in the 1920s stated that 'Rome is the damnation of the half-educated. To send architectural students to Rome is to cripple them for life' (LE CORBUSIER [1927] 1972: 161, CITED IN JONES 2001: 137).

in the building process originate from different parts of the world, and a significant amount of travel is required in order to merge these disparate processes. Finally, as immigration is increasing worldwide today, the cultural identity of the subjects who will inhabit, utilize, and be affected by architecture is unpredictable and constantly on the move.

This book claims the need to reconsider architecture and space through the notion of travel, in order to bring into light the 'multisitedness' of architecture as it occurs both as a conceptual and physical enterprise, and also the multiplicity of subjectivities that are involved in spatial operations exceeding fixed geocultural definitions.

MOBILITY AND ARCHITECTURE: A BRIEF OUTLINE

Even in eras when mobility was restricted for wider populations, architects – or more broadly speaking, architectural knowledge – always traveled. This occurred as dominant cultures sought to expand their architectural and social order from centers to peripheries; for instance, from the ancient Greek metropoles to their colonies, or from the centers of the Roman or Byzantine empires to their provinces. In addition, such cultures also promoted the exchange of architects, master builders and other constituents of spatial production, which produced a mutual historical indebtedness between cultures of different faiths, as in the Christian and Islamic worlds during the Renaissance,[7] (KOSTOF 1977: 61–62) or the Islamic, Hindi, and Buddhist populations in their transcontinental architectural practices in Eurasian and North African territories in premodern eras. Such exchanges are reminders of the fact that notions such as the 'West' or the 'East' are in fact amalgamations of multiple traditions and cultural lineages that are usually obscured by these labels.

Mobility and Modernity
The significantly higher level of mobility that characterizes modernity in comparison with premodern times is the effect of a broad epistemological shift that resulted from a synergy among new technologies, notions of natural space, and political ideas of democracy characteristic of the Enlightenment. Mobility was crucial to the rise and expansion of European hegemony that reversed a world economic system spanning Eurasia, Southeast Asia, and Eastern Africa, and which had peaked during the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries.[8] Nevertheless, the valorization of the notion of mobility-as-progress that was at the core of the Enlightenment narrative was soon transferred to various contexts beyond Europe.

Moving from the exclusive realm of the aristocrats, clergy, military officers, or building-related professionals who were mandated or privileged to form links across the world,

7 An important international architect of that era who traveled and built in several cities of the Ottoman Empire was Mimar Sinan (1492–1558). Broadly speaking, elements of Byzantine architecture were used as a base for the development of the Classical era of Ottoman architecture. In its later stages, Ottoman architecture cross-pollinated with Baroque and Rococo elements from Europe, due to frequent exchanges with France.

8 Under this system, trading and exchange between urban networks was flourishing, even though within conditions that would not fully qualify as modern. Various characteristics of modernity are to be found, of course, in various conditions of premodernity across the world, such as urbanization, social and physical mobility, media communication, expansion of trade networks, etc.

travel during the modern era gradually became available to a wider public. As this new traveling populace evolved into migrant workers and tourists, their new needs were facilitated by major architectural projects, from new affordable housing to luxurious hotels. Within this context, travel became viewed as a condition paramount to liberal ideas that encouraged processes of social mobility, escape, and exchange with distant others. Under conditions of global social and economic inequality, however, travel became the privilege of those who had the capacity to afford it and was accompanied by colonization that de-territorialized parts of the world only in order to re-territorialize and reorder them (HARVEY 1990: 264).

As capitalism fueled the expansion of mobility, spatial barriers were overcome and the pace of life increased, leading to what David Harvey calls the 'time–space compression'.[9] This sense of the world's inward collapse made the opposition between 'being' (sited in place) and 'becoming' (seeing place as subservient to spatial transformations) central to the history of Modernism (HARVEY 1990: 257, 283), and architecture played a pivotal role in it. Since the advent of modernity, architectural developments owe largely to innovative modes of travel. During the eighteenth century, the development of neoclassicism, the first truly international style in architecture, was inseparable from decisions by the movement's founders to expand the grand tour beyond the frontiers of Rome to include Greece.[10] The École des Beaux-Arts in Paris, which taught the language of neoclassicism (among others), attracted students of various nationalities.[11] Owen Jones' *Grammar of Ornament* (1856), which became an inspiration and a guide for architects from the Victorian to the modern eras,[12] was a result of the author's travels in the Near East and Spain; its polychromic patterns from Europe's 'others' were meant to also revitalize the architecture of the 'center'. At the same time numerous 'Orientalist' architects[13] cross-pollinated this style with architectural vernaculars and traditions from various locales around the world, often in the service of colonizing regimes. Some important examples of twentieth-century architects' work in the scale of the city were projects for the colonies, which exported but, most importantly, tested architectural knowledge in the new imperial territories.[14] Simultaneously, aspiring colonizers of non-Western countries, colonized subjects, and citizens of countries that remained uncolonized but were influenced by the overall nineteenth- and twentieth-century process of internationalism, embarked on their own itineraries in order to teach or learn from their respective 'others'.[15]

In the first decades of the twentieth century, the very development of the inherently cosmopolitan Modern Movement would have been almost unthinkable without frequent exchanges among architects, designers, and artists, during a period marked by wars, revolutions, and the slow dissolution of empires. From the early twentieth century, exploratory and educational travel[16] was vital to the development of the international language of mod-

9 ⋯⋯⋯⋯⋯⋯⋯⋯⋯⋯⋯⋯⋯⋯⋯⋯⋯⋯⋯
David Harvey has used the term 'time–space compression' to describe the sense of inward collapse of the world as spatial barriers are being overcome and the pace of life is speeding up (HARVEY 1990: 240–307).

10 ⋯⋯⋯⋯⋯⋯⋯⋯⋯⋯⋯⋯⋯⋯⋯⋯⋯⋯⋯
These included European architects such as Julien-David Le Roy (1724–1803), James Stuart (1713–88) and Nicholas Revett (1720–1804).

11 ⋯⋯⋯⋯⋯⋯⋯⋯⋯⋯⋯⋯⋯⋯⋯⋯⋯⋯⋯
École des Beaux-Arts students who came from abroad were the Americans Richard Morris Hunt (1828–95), Henry Hobson Richardson (1838–86), and Raymond Hood (1881–1934), or the Belgian Victor Horta (1861–1947), among numerous others.

12 ⋯⋯⋯⋯⋯⋯⋯⋯⋯⋯⋯⋯⋯⋯⋯⋯⋯⋯⋯
This book was particularly influential to Louis Sullivan (1856–1924) and Frank Lloyd Wright (1867–1959).

13 ⋯⋯⋯⋯⋯⋯⋯⋯⋯⋯⋯⋯⋯⋯⋯⋯⋯⋯⋯
Examples of Orientalist architecture are produced by Josiah Conder (1852–1920) who lived in Japan in the period 1877–1920, and who designed various buildings for the new Meiji government, such as the Tokyo Imperial Museum and the Rokumeikan, and Sir Edwin Lutyens (1869–1944) who practiced in India in the period 1912–29 and who designed New Delhi's Rashtrapati Bhavan (Presidential Palace) together with several other projects and the city's plan as replacement to the old capital Calcutta, based on his invention of the 'Delhi Order'.

14 ⋯⋯⋯⋯⋯⋯⋯⋯⋯⋯⋯⋯⋯⋯⋯⋯⋯⋯⋯
Ernest Hébrard's (1875–1933) urban plans and building designs in French Indochina after 1923, Le Corbusier's various Obus versions for the colonized by the French Algiers in the period 1931–42, and the radial town plan for Tat'ung in colonized by the Japanese Manchuria, spearheaded by Kishida Hideto, Maekawa Kunio and Tshuchiura Kameki in the 1930s, are products of architects'/urbanists' perceptions of colonized territories, as fluctuating between particularism and universality.

15 ·································
 Japanese architects Yamada Mamoru (1894–1966) and Horiguchi Sutemi (1895–1984), Turkish architect Sedad Eldem (1908–88), and Greek architect Aris Konstnatinidis (1913–93) are just a few such cases of architects who traveled to the West, struggling with a world order that positioned both historic and modern European architecture as superior from that of their native countries. These architects of the so-called 'periphery', but all paramount for the development of modern architecture in their countries, strove to find ways to position their native 'culture', and subsequently architectural production, within this new world system. For extended discussions on this matter, please see Chapters 3 and 4 in this book by Esra Akcan and Sarah Teasley respectively.

16 ·································
Examples of exploratory travel are Frank Lloyd Wright's early travels to Japan in 1905, El Lissitzky's to Germany and the rest of Europe in 1909, Le Corbusier's to the Balkans in 1911 and America in 1935, and Sedad Eldem to Europe in 1929.

17 ·································
For instance, Japan's Kunio Maekawa (1905–86), and the Spaniard José Louis Sert (1902–83) held temporary residence in Paris in the 1920s for working at Le Corbusier's atelier, while Frank Lloyd Wright traveled to Japan in the 1920s having committed to the building of the Imperial Hotel and private houses.

18 ·································
 It is interesting to note that in 1954 the Architecture Association launched a six-month graduate program in Tropical Architecture, which later changed its name to Tropical Studies and later to Development and Tropical Studies. The program was initially led by Maxwell Fry (1899–1987) an architect who had practiced extensively in tropical climates, and its aim was to train architects to practice in the South, including architects from Britain who worked in the Commonwealth, as well as architects from these countries.

ernism. Moreover, within this framework, travel was often necessary for apprenticeships or overseas architectural commissions.[17]

Landmark events in modern architecture, such as the Congrès International d'Architecture Moderne (CIAM) (1928–59) (the most heroic of which was the fourth CIAM in 1933, held on a cruise ship en route from Marseilles to Athens) or the Ekistics Symposium in Delos (1965), could not have taken place but by means of traveling. The epistemological apparatus of modern travel, and the new modes of visuality and subjectivity that it evoked, were crucial to the development of modern architecture that was prone to a belief in technological utopianism. Intellectuals of the modern era realized that the various aspects of motion (from the broad allure of tourism to the specifics of automotive mobility that shaped the modern metropolis) could change individual and group experiences. Georg Simmel's *blazé* and Walter Benjamin's *flâneur*, two dominant though substantially different modern urban subjectivities, emerged precisely out of such realizations, expanding on Baudelaire's notions of 'the transient, the fleeting, the contingent' as fundamental aspects of modernity. It was not only the pedestrian who was emblematic of modernity, however, but also the train passenger, car driver, and jet-plane passenger (URRY 1995: 141). The shifting ways of viewing the world, from the vantage point of the railway, the ocean liner, or the airplane, as well as the new gadgets associated with traveling, provided architects, urbanists, and designers with novel image-making and viewing tools (such as cameras and binoculars) but also with new ways of conceiving architecture and urban space. Convergences between architects and thinkers of the new era of speed were in effect in the work of the Italian futurists in the 1910s, who imagined an architecture dynamic, ephemeral and kinetic, in an era of 'ubiquity and omnipresent speed', as expressed by Marinetti (1909, CITED IN KERN 2003: 119). Just as experiments by visual artists during the early industrial era were influenced directly by optical effects produced by the rotation of the wheel and the speed of the railway travel (CRARY 1990), in the age of aviation the work of architects reflected the new mode of territorial observation from above. The horizons opened by aviation in the early twentieth century led to a new way of reading the terrain as a two-dimensional map, and brought architecture, urbanism, and landscape into unifying visual patterns.

Mobility in the Post-World War II Era

The remaking of borders and, as a consequence, of identities that was still at work in the first part of the twentieth century subsided in the post-World War II period, which emphasized national architecture and overall design production within the enclosed borders of each sovereign nation-state, many of which needed reconstruction and renewal after the war. This was paralleled by exchanges between nations with linguistic, regional, or political

affiliations (such as for instance German-speaking countries, Nordic countries, countries of the Commonwealth, or countries of the Non-Aligned Movement) that were often organized or endorsed by the respective states. During this period, the Bauhaus as a leading institution was subsumed by new educational establishments or those reinvigorated by a new director, such as the Graduate School of Design (GSD) at Harvard University or Cranbrook Academy in the United States, and the Architectural Association (AA) in the United Kingdom.[18] Architects and designers from around the world attended these schools,[19] obtaining membership in reputable international circles that provided them with support and visibility in their professional careers. Yet, despite these travels, most architects of the postwar period aspired to return to their home bases rather than work internationally. As part of their education or individual goals, architects were also eager to travel to remote regions of 'otherness', often motivated by spatio-anthropological quests and continuing a legacy established as a counter-discourse to Modernism in the 1930s by Bernard Rudofsky.[20] The increase in the number of multinational construction firms that emerged to facilitate the 'development' and decolonization of various regions in the world, often under the auspices of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, also contributed to an increase in architects' and engineers' international commissions. Numerous professionals in the construction industry expatriated to foreign countries for the construction of large-scale engineering, tourist, or housing projects.[21]

Mobility and Globalization

Our contemporary era, still under the premises of the unfinished project of modernity, has witnessed revolutionary growth in the modes and degree of mobility that have become a daily reality for a large percentage of the workforce in the developed world. Architecture, as well as other design professions, has been ready to respond to contemporary globalizing requirements.[22] In part, it has been assisted by the international scope of architectural and design education, which emphasizes a range of decontextualized 'transferable skills' (a notion developed by Robert Merton in 1957) beyond those generated for specific conditions, such as local construction or manufacturing methods or building codes. Most importantly, architects, as other designers, carry a sense of belonging to a clearly demarcated occupational group whose members have acquired the same ethos – one that can readily overcome national cultural differences and can transfer their 'collective structures of meaning' as they move in global space (KENNEDY 2004: 163). For most designers today, working within a broader regime that often views being local as 'a sign of social deprivation and degradation' (BAUMAN 1998: 2), ambition is intertwined with the career possibilities created by globalization. Traveling for education or work is often associated with a feeling of freedom, as is

19 ⋯⋯⋯⋯⋯⋯⋯⋯⋯⋯⋯⋯⋯⋯⋯⋯⋯⋯⋯⋯⋯⋯

Among numerous others, Bulgaria-born, ethnic Greek Constantinos Doxiadis (1913–75), Japan-born Fumihiko Maki, China-born I.M. Pei and Japan-born Yoshio Taniguchi studied at GSD, while Sri Lankan-born Geoffrey Bawa (1919–2003) and Iraq-born Zaha Hadid studied at the AA.

20 ⋯⋯⋯⋯⋯⋯⋯⋯⋯⋯⋯⋯⋯⋯⋯⋯⋯⋯⋯⋯⋯⋯

Such were for instance Aldo Van Eyck's (1918–99) travels to study the Dogon settlements in Africa in the 1960s, to be emulated later on by Hiroshi Hara's travels to North Africa with his students at Tokyo University in the 1980s.

21 ⋯⋯⋯⋯⋯⋯⋯⋯⋯⋯⋯⋯⋯⋯⋯⋯⋯⋯⋯⋯⋯⋯

In 1951 Shadrach Woods (1923–73), George Candilis (1913–55), and Henri Piot joined the office of ATBAT-Afrique (*Atelier des Bâtisseurs*) a multidisciplinary organization founded in 1947 by Le Corbusier, Vladimir Bodiansky, André Wogenscky and Marcel Py. Works of the subsequent firm Candilis-Josic-Woods, as well as by Constantinos Doxiadis in the Middle East and North Africa, among numerous others during the period from the 1950s to the 1970s, are interconnected with such major developmental enterprises.

22 ⋯⋯⋯⋯⋯⋯⋯⋯⋯⋯⋯⋯⋯⋯⋯⋯⋯⋯⋯⋯⋯⋯

It is important to note that the character of 'stabilitas' and the scale of architecture seemingly differentiate it from other design practices (such as graphic or product design, for instance) whose products are by nature more portable. In the contemporary world, however, mobility affects all design disciplines beyond scale. Not only small-scale products are promoted to wider audiences that expand beyond the closures of sovereign nation-states, but also the users and makers of architecture are in constant move due to major immigration trends and new work conditions.

23 ....
For a discussion about offshoring by US architecture offices, see Solomon and Linn (2005).

24 ....
For the Centre Culturel Tjibaou (Cultural Center of Tjibaou) in the French territory of New Caledonia by Renzo Piano, for instance, a building that was built as a means of reflecting and preserving the indigenous culture of the Kanak people, mahogany was harvested from forests in Africa to be shipped to France for intensive shaping, gluing and forming and finally to New Caledonia for its assemblage at the final location (FINDLEY 2005: 44).

25 ....
Enzio Manzini is one of the first proponents of the Slow Design movement that advocates the use of local resources, transparency in production systems and de-intermediation, sustainability and sensoriality in design (MANZINI AND VEZZOLI 2008).

obvious in the third of the quotes that open this chapter. Today building construction and architecture firms are key participants in the global economy, increasingly seeking overseas contracts and establishing subsidiaries abroad. Among other types of global companies, they benefit from the revolution in electronic communications, the rise of global cities (as strategic sites for global capital that generate business opportunities and attract numerous migrants), and postnational single-market regulations, such as those within the European Union that permit all businesses and citizens within the region to bid on equal terms for contracts and jobs (KENNEDY 2004: 159).

Even though the degree to which an architect travels was seen until recently as an indicator of their status, usually accompanied by widespread publicity in the international media, this is no longer necessarily the case. Celebrity architects – Norman Foster, Renzo Piano, Santiago Calatrava, to mention but a few – do gain prestige as they travel for commissions throughout the world, but numerous architectural offices today constantly restructure their protocols, office organization, and communication in order to accommodate the ever increasing degree of mobility of their principals and staff. Well-known firms with multiple offices around the world (Ove Arup or Richard Rogers Partnership), as well as medium- and small-scale architectural practices, obtain commissions or win architectural competitions at distant locations that often result in transnational collaborations. To accomplish this effectively, practices increasingly resort to the solution of 'offshoring', moving large portions of their design process to regions with highly skilled and low-paid technicians, thus contributing to the increased flow of information and capital throughout the globe.[23] The physical materials that constitute contemporary buildings are often produced off site and transported to their actual location; importing materials from different parts of the globe is an established practice that ties architecture with transnational market networks.[24] Amid this delirium of mobility, current design thinkers and practitioners have become increasingly weary of the negative consequences of travel, not least for its significant ecological footprint. Many designers are working today for mobility substitution, finding it imperative to 'design away the need to move, and foster new time–space relations: from distance to duration, from faster to closer' (THACKARA 2005: 51). These approaches are paralleled by a recent interest in 'slowness' rather than speed,[25] as well as by efforts to reduce the inordinate movement of material that is involved in the contemporary building industry.

Immobility and Imagination
A view of travel must also take into account those who, due to various restrictions, remain relatively immobile, and it must expand the definition of travel to include the imaginative capacity that is engendered during non-physical types of border-crossing. Indeed, according to political scientist Roxanne Euben, journeys

may not even require physical movement … imaginative travel across history, for example, may well involve exposure to what is strange and estranging, a dislocation that can initiate awareness of and reflection on modes of life other than one's own.

(EUBEN 2006: 12)

These journeys start and end before physical dislocation, and involve the imaginary construction of the 'other' in opposition to the notions of 'home' and 'self'. Bruno Taut, long before his exile from Germany and his trips to Japan and Turkey, indulged in his imaginary East as the 'savior of Europe', as is obvious in his work *Ex Oriente Lux* (*The Sun Rises from the East*, 1919) 'treating the Orient as a region where one could search for an alternative to and ultimately redeem what he perceived as the Western crisis that culminated in World War I' (AKCAN 2006: 12). Greek architect Dimitris Pikionis exhaustively studied the architecture of Japan without ever setting his foot in the country. Seeds of the Japan he constructed through his imaginative pursuit found their way to sites in Athens, in his Loumbardiaris pavilion (1957) and his playground in Filothei (1961–65), expressed in an architectural language that aspired to be not strictly regional or national, but rather universal, 'through the admixture of sympathetic alien cultures, just as Greek archaic sculpture had once been fertilized by Egypt' (FRAMPTON 1989: 9). For Marc Wigley, the pursuit of the foreign is inherent in any act of architecture; architects are essentially foreigners, and architecture is precisely the act of turning the world into a foreign place that makes the local strange (WIGLEY 2003: 108). The fact that architects are fond of geographical fantasies – often much more than of geocultural realities – is obvious in the immense popularity of Italo Calvino's *Invisible Cities* (1972), narratives of the imaginary places Marco Polo mentally constructed during his travels around the Middle Kingdom (China).

TRAVEL IN CONTEMPORARY ARCHITECTURE SCHOLARSHIP

Even though it has been tangential to architectural scholarship, architecture's relation to processes of mobility and displacement in the modern world has been, in a direct or indirect manner, the subject of scrutiny by numerous scholars of architecture through a variety of theoretical frameworks, methodologies and intellectual affiliations.

Pure exploratory traveling, outside of professional obligations, has often been described as the highlight of an architect's career, a means of acquiring deep and critical knowledge by obtaining 'authentic', first-hand experience of the beaten and unbeaten tracks throughout the globe. Two obvious cases are Le Corbusier's journey to the East and Louis

26 ··

 For a compendium of seventy three travel sketches by Le Corbusier between 1914 and 1964 see Le Corbusier (1981–82). For a complete list of Le Corbusier's travels and related publications from his carnets and his sketchbooks to works by various scholars see Bacon (2003: xiv, 320. For Louis Kahn's sketches during his three visits to the Mediterranean (1928–29, 1950–51 and 1959) see Johnson and Lewis (1996), and for his broader travels see Scully (1991). For publications and studies of travel sketches in the Mediterranean by Alvar Aalto, see Schildt (1991). For a broader discussion on architects' travel drawings and their relation with 'travel pedagogy' see Jones (2001).

27 ··

Said (1978) characterized as 'orientalist' the traveling views of Western intellectuals, politicians or artists that longed for and exoticized the Asian or Middle Eastern 'other', replicating mythologies that saw them as static, inferior and unable of progress or change. Pratt cautions against the 'anti-conquest narratives', the self-claimed innocence of a type of Western traveler who hesitated to partake in the grand process of colonization claiming their distance, while their very presence in the foreign land was only possibly due to their membership in the regime they appeared to criticize, without challenging 'older imperial rhetorics of conquest' (PRATT 1992: 7). Renato Rosaldo names 'imperialist nostalgia' the paradoxical phenomenon of 'people mourn[ing] the passing of what they themselves have transformed' (ROSALDO 1989: 107).

Kahn's travel to Rome and other Mediterranean areas,[26] both recorded in notebooks and considered milestones in the history of modern architecture. The celebratory tone of these publications often led to the neglect of the broader regimes that surrounded architects' journeys. Since the late 1980s, however, studies of architecture and urbanism have shown an increased interest in addressing architecture in light of broader geopolitical contexts and hierarchies, and by questioning the premises of architects' travels. Several contemporary scholars of architecture have been inspired by the works of postcolonial critics who scrutinized dominant subjects' travels to the 'other'. Prominent examples include Edward Said's discussion of 'orientalism', Mary Louise Pratt's observation of 'anti-conquest narratives', and Renato Rosaldo views of 'imperialist nostalgia'.[27] Along the lines of thinkers such as Henri Lefebvre, David Harvey, Michel De Certeau and Paul Rabinow who view spatial organization as fundamental to the disciplinary nature of modernity, contemporary scholars of architecture have also focused attention on the ways in which architects, planners, and other spatial constituents comply with political establishments, illuminating how their travels were reciprocally supportive of various regimes.

The Postcolonial Shift

Focusing more specifically on contexts of colonialism or postcolonialism, authors such as Thomas Metcalf (1989), Anthony King (1990, 2004), Gwendolyn Wright (1991), Mark Crinson (1996), Mary McLeod (1980), Zeynep Çelik (1992a, 1992b, 1997), Gülsüm Baydar-Nalbantoğlu (1997, 1998), Wong Chong Thai (1988), Abidin Kusno (2000), Annabel Wharton (2001), Vikramaditya Prakash (2002), Samer Akkach, Peter Scriver and Gülsüm Baydar-Nalbantoğlu (2002), Lisa Findley (2005) and Reinhold Martin and Kadambari Baxi (2007), have pioneered notable critical scholarly work on architecture's participation in such contexts. Their work examines the processes of production, interpretation, and inhabitation of architecture and urban space within broader international or transnational political relations and regimes in which the travel of both people and spatial paradigms is involved.

The works of these writers focus on several specific themes: the sociopolitical role of architectural production in contexts of contacts between the West and the 'rest'; relations between the US, Europe, and newly decolonized states during the Cold War; the impact of colonization, imported modernization, 'invented tradition', and postcolonial patronizing in architectural culture; conditions of alternative modernities beyond dominant Western paradigms, and consequences of the geocultural framing of architectural thinking in global culture. These writers see architectural and urban design, 'ranging from ornamental design to municipal regulations' (WRIGHT 1991: 7), as only one part 'of the much larger entanglement between power and the control space' (FINDLEY 2005: 4), and thus perceive sites as be-

longing to 'political' rather than simply 'urban' landscapes (WHARTON 2001: 3). Such notions make clear that architects' travels are not immune to broader imperialist frameworks: the wish to dominate is often implicit in the will to travel as well as to build. Both intentions, however, are part of a much broader operation that includes multiple agents, from politicians to health specialists. Most of these works on transnational relations also reveal that national (or, often, imperial or colonial) identities are shaped precisely based upon a view of the 'other', a process that is often constituted through the physical and conceptual frameworks of displacement.

Premodern Travel and Area Studies

Relations between travel, spatial representation, narratives and practice in conditions of premodernity have been addressed by scholars in area studies, as well as by scholars of architecture who have worked in intersections with domains of area studies. Examples are the works of Samer Akkach (2002a), Jilly Traganou (2004) and Laura Nenzi (2008), among numerous others. Such works scrutinize the influence of travel and geographical imagination in domains of culture that involve spatial thinking (but do not always have direct effects on architectural production), as expressed, for instance, in the literary – and at times pictorial – notions of the *meisho* ('famous places') in Japan, or the *fada'il* ('virtues' or 'excellences') in Islam.[28] Such works examine the effect of real or imaginary travels on travelers and their communities, by paying attention to their cultural, social and gender identities, and/or to modes of seeing, mapping and narrating the places they visited, as well as the broader world. Also, these works emphasize the relations between travel and broader religious and sociocultural domains, and approach travel as a multisided process that affects knowledge production and acquisition, identity formation, and sociopoetic imagination and becoming. These works look at a wider array of cultural forms that relate with or emerge through travel, from maps and guidebooks to diaries and poems.

Scrutinizing Authenticity

Notions of 'authenticity' or 'originality' in architects' traveling experiences have become the subject of interrogation by contemporary architecture historians whose works reveal how mediation and preconceived ideas, nurtured within wider cultural environments, have guided architects' appreciation of otherness. Research by Beatrice Colomina (1994: 83–90) and Zeynep Çelik (1992a) on the drawings made by Le Corbusier during his travel in Algiers and Istanbul, for instance, have revealed that they were actually produced upon the architect's return to his studio by tracing over postcards brought as souvenirs from his journeys[29] – an approach not unlike that of Louis Kahn's 'selective interpretation' of buildings he chose to

28 ⋯⋯⋯⋯⋯⋯⋯⋯⋯⋯⋯⋯⋯⋯⋯⋯⋯⋯⋯⋯⋯
The meisho were poetically attested locales that were scattered within the territory of Japan (TRAGANOU 2004: 1). They were celebrated primarily in poetry, but also in visual representations of premodern Japan. The fada'il is a premodern Islamic concept represented by a unique genre of literature. It denotes the distinctive virtues of texts, individuals, places or times. A large portion of these texts is devoted to the distinctive virtues of provinces, cities, places and monuments (AKKACH 2002A: 12). Both meisho and fada'il were often written by authors who had never visited the lands which their texts described.

29 ⋯⋯⋯⋯⋯⋯⋯⋯⋯⋯⋯⋯⋯⋯⋯⋯⋯⋯⋯⋯⋯
These revelations however do not diminish the role of these sketches' in the architect's reinterpretation of what he absorbed during his travels, and their role in internalizing these interpretations into a new formal language that united his studies of places with his architectural and artistic work.

30 ···

Nute traces several such assessments by histo-
rians and architects, including Charles Ashbee
(1863–1942), Hendrik Berlage (1856–1934),
Walter Behrendt (1884–1945) and Henry Russell
Hitchcock (1903–87) (NUTE 1994: 3–4).

31 ···

Major examples are Le Corbusier's Rio de Janeiro
(1929) and Algiers (1931–42) projects which are
strongly related with his fascination with the 'epic
of the air', described in his book *Aircraft* of 1935.

32 ···

See Boyer (2003), and Morshed (2002).

33 ···

For recent scholarship on Jaqueline Tyrwhitt refer
to Society of Architectural Historians session at the
Vancouver Annual Meeting in 2005 organized by
Volker Welter 'In the Shadow of CIAM and Marshall
McLuhan: Jaqueline Tyrwhitt and the course of
Twentieth-Century Urban Design and Architecture',
with Pierre Chabard, Rhodri Windsor-Liscombe,
Tanis Hinchcliffe, Deborah Lewittes, Ines Zaduendo,
and Ellen Shoshkes as participants.

34 ···

Such approaches are characterized either by the
inclusion of spatial elements that involve both
physical and tele-presence (such as in the work of
Diller and Scoffidio), or by formal considerations
that take into account vectorial properties of force
and motion (such as in Greg Lynn's or Markus
Novak's work).

sketch, as suggested by Johnson and Lewis (1996). Mardges Bacon discusses Le Corbusier's preconceptions of the US prior to his first trip to America in 1935, influenced by travel nar-ratives and other accounts of America, and nurtured in the environment of French *améri-canisme* of the 1930s that mythologized American industrialized democracy as a model for modern society. However, as Bacon observes, much of Le Corbusier's understanding and criticism of America was flawed by 'cultural stereotyping' associated with the most conser-vative elements of *américanisme* (BACON 2003: XIV–XVI). Similarly, Kevin Nute has argued that the nineteenth-century concept of *Japonisme* promoted by Japanese art historians as well as art collectors shaped Frank Lloyd Wright's interpretation of Japanese architecture and influenced his architectural language much more so than the Japan he saw upon his arrival in 1905. Most importantly, several historians and architects point to Wright's ex-posure to Japanese woodblock prints and his visit to the World's Columbian Exposition in Chicago in 1893 as particularly influential to the development of several characteristics of his work (such as the relation of buildings to landscape, visual composition, horizontal-ity, deep eaves, or the exposed timber studs),[30] despite Wright's own denial of architectural influences from Japan (NUTE 1994: 4).

Travel as Visual Apparatus

Another branch of architectural scholarship, continuing the investigative line of Walter Benjamin, examines the influence of the 'modern vision' in the conception of the nine-teenth-century modern city, focusing on the intersections of modern ideas of travel and pleasure. Among other theorists, Christine Boyer has studied metaphors and representa-tions of travel that were inherent in the 'city of collective memory'. Boyer turned new attention to topographical views collected through travel that found their way to stereo-scopic, binocular, and panoramic visions of the modern city, combining spectacular with documentary modes of representation (BOYER 1994: 203–91). Twentieth-century archi-tects' fascination with aerial views[31] has also been the subject of architectural scholarship focusing on studies of visuality and modernity. Such studies have revealed a genealogy of visual apparatuses that inspired new architectural concepts, starting with the invention of perspective and continuing to the camera obscura, photography, film, and digital space.[32] This interest in the visual has recently expanded to include the thinking of late modernist planners such as Jaqueline Tyrwhitt and the pedagogical role she attributed to aerial pho-tography as a means of town-planning in the post-World War II era.[33] Contemporary modes of digital mobility and animation have inspired not only new approaches to architecture[34] but also a recent genealogy of writing by authors who either focus specifically on cyberspace as a new 'architectural promenade', 'shaped by connectivity and bandwidth constraints'

(MITCHELL 1995: 24), or depict digital space as a realm of physical and informational networks within which people, products, capital, and information are in constant motion and exchange (THACKARA 2005).

Consumption and Tourism

Architects and architecture scholars have an ambivalent relationship with the subject of consumption and tourism. Following the Pevsnerian tradition of prioritizing paradigmatic architecture, architectural scholarship has been slow to absorb how national, global, and corporate interests interplay with architecture for the tourist industry. Like sociologists of tourism, who in the 1990s began to acknowledge the importance of 'paintings, guide books, literary texts, films, postcards, advertisements, music, travel patterns, photographs' (Urry 1995: 30), architecture scholars during the same period also expanded their material of inquiry beyond buildings. Most importantly, they also expanded their inquiry to include built works that had no particular normative value but were conducive to an understanding of architecture's participation in broader sociocultural contexts. The parallel interest in consumption as an exchange of meaning and an act of identity expression, which architecture scholars endorsed following Jean Baudrillard's description of consumer society (1968), paved the way for this new attention to tourism. Gradually, tourist-related architectural questions became legitimized as a subject of study, and the stigma that tourism carried as a mass culture practice subservient to capitalism – and thus, for some, not worthy of scholarly attention – was slowly removed.

Elizabeth Diller and Ricardo Scofidio set the tone in the early 1990s with their book *Tourism of War*, which expressed a view of tourism that was unconventional at the time and suggested that

> Tourism, a tacit pact of semi-fiction between sightseers and sightmakers ... results in a highly structured yet delirious free play of space-time which thwarts simple, binary distinctions between the real and the counterfeit, ultimately exposing history as a shifting construct.
> (DILLER AND SCOFIDIO 1994: 53)

Since then, several notable works – by D. Medina Lasansky and Brian McLaren (2004), Keller Easterling (2005), Joan Ockman and Salomon Frausto (2005), Brian McLaren (2006), and Miodrag Mitrašinović (2006) – have addressed the relation of tourism, spatial production, and architecture, taking into account the global flow of information, investment, consumers, and consumer goods as well as broader geopolitical currencies. Importantly, these scholars, like the postcolonial scholars discussed above, situate the produc-

tion and consumption of tourist-related enterprises within larger scholarly discourses and geopolitical relations.

Lasansky and McLaren's volume *Architecture and Tourism: Perception, Performance and Place*, examines the reciprocal relationship between the modern practice of tourism and the built environment, understanding tourism as 'both a process through which sites are experienced and as a cultural force that has shaped and interpreted them' (LASANSKY AND MCLAREN 2004: 1). Lasansky and McLaren recognize the multiple forces that shape the culture of tourism: in addition to architects, there are planners, politicians, preservationists, artists, entrepreneurs and tourists; and in addition to buildings, there is a wide variety of materials, including propaganda, policy, photography, souvenirs, film, and print (2004: 2–3). In *Architourism* (2005), editor Joan Ockman coined the homonymous term as an analogy to ecotourism, addressing the dual phenomena of architectural sightseeing (which culminated in the notable 'Bilbao effect') and travel by contemporary architects to distant territories as tourist-theorists of architecture. *Architourism* expands on the views of Dean MacCannel (1976) as described in his book *The Tourist*, rejecting the derogatory perception of tourism as inferior to other forms of traveling and seeing tourism rather as an expression of modern man's 'quest for authenticity'.

Travel Pedagogy

Inquiry into architecture, space, and travel has become particularly important among the proliferating architecture study abroad programs worldwide. These programs, sponsored by architecture schools, participate in a tradition that traces its lineage to the grand tour and the American Academy in Rome, founded in 1913. In 2001, in her essay 'Unpacking the Suitcase: Travel as Process and Paradigm in Constructing Architectural Knowledge', Kay Bea Jones claimed the need to articulate a 'travel pedagogy' in order to 'resituate travel as critical to cultural constructions of architectural knowledge' (JONES 2001: 128). By the term travel pedagogy Jones means 'experientially centered studies dependent on some cultural, geographic, and paradigmatic shift that radically alters sense perception and challenges visual and spatial cognition' (JONES 2001: 127). Jones points to the loose relation between travel programs and architectural curricula, the weak engagement of foreign resources, and a notable hesitation to establish experimental methods of inquiry as well as to accept and rethink the unavoidable architectural and cultural changes that affect 'great places'. A reconsideration of travel as architectural pedagogy, beyond its potential to enrich the scholarly approach to travel, would also contribute to more reflective modes of travel for architecture students and professionals.

QUESTIONING MOBILITY'S INFLUENCE ON ARCHITECTURE
IN THE GLOBAL ERA: AN AGENDA FOR FUTURE SCHOLARSHIP

> I recognize the place, I feel at home here, but I don't belong. I am of, and not of, this place.
>
> –CARYL PHILLIPS, INTRODUCTION: *A NEW WORLD ORDER*, 2001

Ironically, beyond monitoring the travels and works of world-renowned architects, archi-
tecture scholars have produced little research that deals in a comprehensive, intellectually
engaging manner with the effects of mobility on the cultural politics of architecture and
place in the contemporary era of globalization. The following paragraphs briefly outline
two of the many areas of research that are essential to obtaining a critical stance toward
the politics of mobility in a global world, with respect to the role of architecture within
the framework of globalization. These areas have been approached thus far primarily by
scholars of other disciplines, particularly social studies, anthropology, and political science.
Despite the indisputable contribution of such studies in pinpointing the subject and exam-
ining architecture travels in conjunction with other areas of study, these authors sometimes
perpetuate rather commonplace criteria in their evaluation of architecture or are hampered
by outdated perceptions of architecture and design as primarily formalist enterprises. Thus
a more appropriate manner for conducting such studies is by forming interdisciplinary
teams in which like-minded scholars, representatives of various disciplines, participate and
work in collaboration.

For an Ethnography of Mobility and Networks of Architecture and Beyond

Our contemporary era is characterized by a system of interdependent types of mobility
that distribute people, activities, and objects throughout the globe, disconnecting and sub-
sequently reconnecting social groups through different modes of communication.
These mobilities operate via various entangled and coevolving professional and social
networks. From a sociological point of view, the formation of networks is a part and parcel
of globalization and is a departure from community-based societies.[35] As sociologists have
shown, an architect's professional development is strongly related to his or her 'networking'
operations, which are conducted through combined physical, virtual, and communicative
travels.[36] In today's transnational world the architecture profession is not only 'highly mo-
bile', as architects move to study and work, but also 'rich in networking capital', as architects
will often 'undertake long journeys for social networking' (LARSEN, URRY, AXHAUSEN 2006: 64,
74). Yet networking is crucial not only for contemporary architecture; it has characterized
the development of the profession for decades, as Marc Wigley (2001) reveals in his study of

[35] A network is different from a community, 'a unit of belonging with clear boundaries providing a source of common identity' (KENNEDY 2004: 161), and func-tions beyond spatial restrictions.

[36] According to Larsen, Urry and Axhausen, 'virtual travel' happens on the internet, while 'communica-tive travel' is realized 'through person-to-person messages via letters, postcards, … telephones, faxes, emails, instant messages, videoconferences and "skyping"' (2006: 4).

37 ···

According to Larsen et al., while many architects
have been highly mobile as students they are not
as highly mobile when they start their career. Many
of their interviewees 'rather than moving to new
cosmopolitan places, talk about settling down
and going back to their partner's roots' or their
own parents' location or place of origin, because of
'physical support' (LARSEN ET AL. 2006: 75–76).

38 ···

If we take the paradigm of Bombay, each of these
people 'is simultaneously living a little bit in
the United States and also living substantially
in Bombay. But Bombay itself, because of films
and so on, is not merely empirical Bombay' (AP-
PADURAI 2002: 43).

the circle surrounding the Greek architect, planner and politician Constantinos Doxiadis in the 1960s.

According to Manuel Castells (1996), postindustrial networks differentiate between 'spaces of flows' – nodes and hubs for the elites – and ordinary 'spaces of places'. In the case of architecture, the space of flows circulates among prestigious schools of architecture, locations designated as major construction sites for the global building industry (Berlin after the reunification of Germany, or Dubai and China today), cities mythologized as emblematic of the zeitgeist or even of the future (Tokyo in the 1980s and 1990s),[37] or more recently, areas of the developing world where transnational, non-governmental organizations seek architects' and designers' collaboration in improving impoverished environments and envisioning new temporary habitats for emergency shelter. Beyond the polarities observed by Castells, in the architecture profession today networks expand far beyond the well known 'epicenters' of architectural education and publicity, and it would be an exaggeration to claim that they are confined to elites. Even though one must be cautious of the asymmetries and hierarchies maintained by these networks, the architecture of the global era is characterized by multiplicity and pluralism and is being experienced and produced through various translocal networks.

An ethnography of the practices of mobile architects and other space constituents, both in terms of their professional and human parameters, would illuminate how conditions of translocality and transnationalism (in non-places, nodal-spaces, and hubs, but also in everyday localities) are experienced and reflected upon by these mobile subjects. The notion of locality is dramatically redefined today, and this cannot but have an effect on spatial practices in both their production and consumption modes. According to Appadurai, today it is not only culture that is 'delinked' from place: People also live in 'layered places which in themselves have a variety of levels of attachment, engagement and … reality' (AP-PADURAI 2002: 43, 46) because they are affected by flows and linkages in an interconnected world. Spending more time away from one's home base alters one's connection with what conventionally constitutes 'home' and 'community' (family ties, collegiality, sense of citizenship), while the limited time spent at other destinations is often hardly enough to produce similarly immersive relations. In the words of Caryl Phillips, quoted above, more and more people today 'feel of, and not of' the places where they spend their lives (PHILLIPS 2001: 1). At the same time, increasing numbers of people live in more than one location at the same time, whether these people are call-center employees of US companies physically residing in Bombay, or architects/draftsmen in Belgrade or Beijing working for US architectural offices that 'offshore' part of their digital design production overseas.[38]

In their large percentage, architects as travelers are not immune from the typical business traveler's experience, dominated as it is by the bland infrastructural environments where traveling unfolds (from the airport to the hotel to the food court). At the same time,

the geographically scattered sites where architecture is conceptualized, manufactured, and developed give rise to new modes of architectural thinking and communication protocols that synthesize these dispersed processes, systematically or ad hoc. What is the influence of these conditions on the way space and place are being experienced and practiced from a combined phenomenological and pragmatic perspective? Investigating such relationships would require paying close attention to several interconnected activities that are part of architects' and other mobile subjects' daily routines of survival in a transnational world: from the inventive use of electronic communication gadgets and the circulation of architectural drawings between offices and hotel rooms to cultural exchanges and misunderstandings in transnational educational or professional environments. Most importantly, studying the face-to-face or mediated relations between mobile architects, their professional collaborators, and the groups with whom they interact and join in various destinations would reveal ways globalization is being localized, interpreted, and internalized beyond architects' intentions. Such investigations, performed so far primarily by sociologists but lacking focus on the consequences for architectural thinking, would illuminate crucial aspects of how practices of production, representation and consumption of space operate in the global world. At the same time, they would reveal relations between an ever-expanding network that includes architects and their clients, but also end-users, broader communities of interests, politicians, financers, engineers, construction workers, advertisers, cultural intermediaries and so on.

Travel and Identity Formation: Between National and Global Citizenship

It could be safely claimed that most architects in the developed world today would view (or would wish to view) their identity as defined more by their profession than by other constituents of identity, such as nationality or ethnicity. As Paul Kennedy has remarked, global architectural networks have a distinctly 'postnational' character, being almost irrespective of the nationality of their participants (KENNEDY 2004: 176). This does not mean, however, that architects' national or regional identities do not cease to surface at critical moments, compromising the fluidity of their networks and limiting the architect's realm of operation to 'community'-related confinements that may seem repressive or even absurd to architects themselves. Such critical moments occur, for example, when visa restrictions inhibit an individual's mobility, or when ethnic prejudices are encountered in work or educational environments – the most obvious case in recent times being that of Muslim architects in the US or Europe in the post-9/11 era.

It is a challenge for a researcher today not to be blinded by the fluidity and glamour of such networks as celebrated in the contemporary architectural press. Scholars must also, therefore, heed Appadurai's call and pay attention to blockages that inhibit the systems of flows or push them in certain biased directions.[39] It is no coincidence that today, when, even

41 ···

See Delanty and Jones (2002); Delanty (2000); Jones (2003); Jürgen Neyer's lecture on 'Images of Power: The European Union and Its Architecture;' Max Weber Lecture Series on 'Power and Architecture: The Construction of Capitals' in NYU's Deutsches Haus, March 2008.

42 ···

As noted by Zeynep Çelik, at the time of independence after colonial rule, newly built nations heavily relied on foreign architects, due to the lack of their own. For instance, after independence, Algeria 'had only one Algerian architect and the government had to commission foreign architects and planners to develop and execute new projects' (ÇELIK 1997: 183).

43 ···

For a comprehensive study of the portable building see Kronenburg (2002). Please also note that the commercial applications of the portable building have also proliferated recently. See for instance mobile homes designed and sold by IKEA or Muji. This indicates that the portable building operates today between two poles: on one hand, covering emergency needs for refugee-seeking or evacuated populations, and on the other, as a luxury item to facilitate middle-class, leisure-related lifestyles.

44 ···

For a comprehensive history of humanitarian design and emergency housing that touches upon the subject of portable structures, see Stohr (2006).

45 ···

Habib Chaudhury and Atiya Mahmood (2008) guest-edited a special issue of the *Journal of Architectural and Planning* on immigrants' residential experience.

though as James Clifford has stated, there seems to be 'no return for anyone to a native land' (CLIFFORD 1988: 173), architecture is increasingly produced or rationalized in the name of nations. Examples include architecture in newly established nation-states, such as those of the 'New Europe,'[40] or architecture produced within particularly nationalist frameworks, such as the Olympics or other international athletic competitions. The fluctuations in rhetoric from a universalist/internationalist focus to one deeply ingrained in the notion of nation or ethnicity (which is often symptomatic of unities that feel threatened by mobile 'others') is an important area of interdisciplinary study that has been primarily undertaken by social and political scientists rather than by architecture theorists.[41] Similarly, the contributions of foreign architects to the physical and mental construction of newly independent[42] or newly established nation-states (or regions that claim their nationhood) have not been examined in a comprehensive manner. From Louis Kahn's Bangladesh National Assembly Building in Dhaka (1962–83) to the late Enric Miralles and Benedetta Tagliabue's (EMBT) Scottish Parliament in Edinburgh (2004) and Renzo Piano's Cultural Center of Tjibaou in New Caledonia (1998), the presence of the foreign 'other' seems to be a catalyst in the definition or even recognition of national or ethnic selfhood. Analogies between such cases, in a manner that would bridge political and architectural thinking, remain to be drawn.

In recent years, architects and designers have shown a refreshing interest in seeing their profession through the prism of citizenship. This includes searching for allegiances conceived globally rather than in service of the corporate world or narrowly defined national interests. Architects and designers today are increasingly participating in the design of refugee camps, emergency shelters, subsidized housing, and other sociocultural facilities for immigrant or refugee-seeking communities, and they are often members of these communities. The works of the Japanese architect Shigeru Ban, California-based Teddy Cruz, and interdisciplinary teams such as California-based Architecture for Humanity or Italy-based Stalker are characteristic of such positions. Moreover, in these contexts, architects often become conscious that their practice is only one segment of a multifaceted design and policy operation comprising industrial design, packaging, and the planning of the distribution process, in which the portable building[43] is often (but some times mistakenly) seen as an optimal solution within a great number of constraints. Systematic approaches to the ways in which contemporary architecture responds to these conditions, in collaboration with national or transnational civil institutions and other design and cultural practices, or comparisons to responses in emergency cases of the past, are scarce.[44] Similarly, comprehensive studies of diasporic spaces in the context of their relation to group identity and material culture (currently being produced mainly by environmental psychologists or anthropologists) are rare from scholars of architecture.[45] This is a missed opportunity, as architects often overlook the end-users' emotional or symbolic attachments to their material environ-

ments in favor of newly conceived designs that are often devoid of such important links. A combined view of such architectural, anthropological, and sociopolitical approaches would forge new interdisciplinary paths in architectural practice, education, and scholarship.

INTELLECTUAL AFFINITIES AND DEPARTURES: QUESTIONING ROOTED IDENTITIES, DISPUTING CELEBRITY TRAVEL

Travel, Space, Architecture operates between two prevailing intellectual domains that both influence contemporary architectural thinking, standing in opposition to each other. The first domain involves the continually debated relationship between architecture, place, and culture that has preoccupied architectural thinking ever since the development of modern architecture. This approach culminated in the 1980s in the theory of critical regionalism, which describes and advocates the need for a type of architecture that resists the homogenization of universal culture by looking for selective such examples in various localities around the globe. The second domain relates to the recurring valorization of travel to the 'other' as a means of theorizing and renewing architecture. If the first approach values architects as 'insiders' and members of 'local communities', the second prioritizes architects' positions as 'strangers' or 'nomads' who are nevertheless always firmly connected within networks from which they obtain their legitimacy and status.

From a theoretical standpoint, one of the largest challenges to addressing travel as a central subject within architectural scholarship is the fact that several respected theories of architectural thinking and pedagogy, varying though they might be, have primarily adhered to the notions of locality and placeness. Such established theories range from Patrick Geddes' civic surveys in the early twentieth century to Vittorio Gregotti's anthropo-geographical considerations of the territory in the 1960s, to Yi-fu Tuan's *topophilia* and Christian Norberg-Schulz's theory of *genius loci* in the late 1970s, the latter based on Martin Heidegger's ideas of rootedness as the only secure foundation of sociopolitical action. The conjunctions of 'culture' and 'place' are traceable in contemporary architectural theories such as 'vernacularism, contextualism, regionalism, critical regionalism and heritage conservation', while 'even architectural history has tended to re-emphasize its geo-cultural foundations' (AKKACH ET AL. 2002: VI). As Marc Wigley has stated:

> even the most dedicated international secretly cling to a rhetoric of the local. ... Almost never will an architect declare an active disinterest in the local, even if such a disinterest is not only evident in their work but is its most striking characteristic.
> (WIGLEY 2001: 104)

It has been recently claimed by Tzonis and Lefaivre
that critical regionalism proposes a new idea of
place that 'goes beyond ethnicity against the grain
of national insularity', thus not simply against the
homogenization of universal culture (TZONIS AND
LEFAIVRE 1996: 486).

Indeed, for most theoreticians and practising architects 'roots always precede routes' (CLIFFORD 1997: 3), and places hold largely fixed meanings, essences that architects should endeavor to unearth critically through intellectual inquiry and, subsequently, to reenact through their building.

Important theorists of critical regionalism in the 1980s, such as Alexander Tzonis and Liane Lefaivre (1981) and Kenneth Frampton (1985), influenced by the Frankfurt School, valued precisely the kind of architecture that emerges as an authentic critical practice anchored in the specificity of a place. Such theorists view architecture as a means of resistance against forces of homogenization.[46] These approaches, at times polemical, at times poetically argued, linked architecture with a commitment to 'place', establishing a scholarly discursive space within which architecture was framed as an antidote to the dangers of 'mediocre civilization', in the words of Paul Ricoeur – the dull, homogeneous landscape of commodification and corporate sponsorship that characterizes modern culture. As Ricouer put it in his 1965 essay 'Universal Civilization and National Cultures', we face the paradox of 'how to become modern and to return to the sources; how to revive an old, dormant civilization and take part in the universal civilization' (FRAMPTON 1985: 313; RICEOUR 1965). This phrase, quoted by Kenneth Frampton in 1985, became the justification for a type of architecture that is both local and modern and confronts the homogenization of contemporary culture while at the same time, as emphasized by Tzonis and Lefaibvre, maintains its antinomy to sterile and stereotypical attitudes of 'romantic regionalism' that construct scenic, overfamiliar settings 'for arousing affinity and sympathy in the viewer' (TZONIS AND LEFAIBVRE 1996: 489).

Ironically, the opposite approach, namely the valorization of distance, has also characterized contemporary architectural discourse. Since the early twentieth century, much of the architecture theory promoted by renowned practising architects has emerged as a result of their access to remote locations that were largely inaccessible in the past. At first glance, there is nothing new in contemporary architects traveling to distant locations to discover 'unconscious' local but innovative practices that act as points of departure for exploring new architectural ideas. Indeed, the genre has a long genealogy, from Le Corbusier's *Journey to the East* (a revision of the itinerary and tradition of the grand tour) to Venturi and Scott-Brown's *Learning from Las Vegas* to the recent travelogues of Rem Koolhaas, Stefano Boeri, and David Adjaye, which focus on Asian and African countries. In most cases, architects traveled temporarily to various types of otherness, and had no particular contribution to the places where they performed their travels, except from placing them on the 'global architectural map'. What has changed since the early twentieth century is the environment within which traveling takes place, and the proliferation of travels by professional architects in an almost routine basis. At the same time, 'others' are now not merely visited by centrally

located subjects, but do travel themselves, feeding the global architectural imagination with insiders' knowledges. The most dramatic of all the changes has been the emergence of a broader geopolitical condition whose focus has shifted from the bounded localities of nation-states (conceived in the aftermath of the French Revolution to grant political legitimacy to 'a people') to the fluidity of identities, cultures, and borders that characterizes transnationalism. If within the world order of the sovereign nation-state, most architects traveled to bring back 'home' ideas from distant lands, under the contemporary conditions of transnationalism, the locations or even the existence of architects' 'homes' can no longer be taken for granted. Most architects operate within a network of differentiated places: on the one hand, their office base; on the other, the locations where education, public relations activity, and commissions take place.

In recent time, the perception of place has changed profoundly from that of an autonomous, introverted, and transcendental notion that integrates elements of nature, culture, and man's individual beliefs into a unique ensemble, to one that privileges connectivity with other locations (MITRAŠINOVIĆ 2006: 53). At the same time, as Samer Akkach states, the persistence in the understanding of culture 'as a logical, coherent, bounded system that is rooted in a specific geography' is often used as a means to 'keep people *culturally in place*'. Nevertheless, the resulting 'conventional racial, religious, geographic or cultural references (such as Arab, Islamic, Middle Eastern, Asian, European, Australian and so on) … are becoming increasingly difficult to maintain as their defining references are rapidly loosing their currency in the current global context' (AKKACH 2002B: 184), despite or in contrast to attempts of various ethno-nationalist or religious fundamentalists to do the opposite.

Most contemporary travel and the subsequent theorizing of architecture, however, continue to consider place within pre-established power relations between centers and peripheries. As such, they reaffirm rather than question pre-existing orders. Indeed, neither travels within the international nor within the global world order have been immune from hegemonic attitudes toward the 'other'. It is no surprise that most of the internationally prominent travelogues continue to be directed to destinations beyond Europe and America, which are the places of origin or office base of most established mobile architects today. If the journeys of these architects no longer search for realms of primitiveness or 'authenticity', the new preferred destinations are areas of delayed or alternative modernization, such as the various megacities of Africa, Asia, and South America, or cities in communist regimes such as North Korea and Cuba. Many of these places are often characterized by uncontrolled processes of urban development, slum conditions, and environmental degradation. These 'rural, industrial and non-photogenic' environments encountered off the beaten track, which Kay Bea Jones wished to see altering the grand tour's canon (JONES 2001: 155), do not, however, escape post-aesthetization by architects. Critics not seduced by architects'

grand ambitions have reacted sternly. On recent GSD students' trips to Lagos guided by Rem Koolhaas, journalist George Packer noted:

> As a picture of the urban future, Lagos is fascinating only if you're able to leave it. After just a few days in the city's slums, it is hard to maintain Koolhaas's intellectual excitement. What he calls 'self-organization' is simply collective adaptation to extreme hardship. Traffic pileups lead to 'improvised conditions' because there is no other way for most people in Lagos to scratch out a living than to sell on the street ... The impulse to look at an 'apparently burning garbage heap' and see an 'urban phenomenon', and then make it the raw material of an elaborate aesthetic construct, is not so different from the more common impulse not to look at all.
> (PACKER 2006: 66)

The publications that follow such journeys in the contemporary architectural press present in a rather sensational – even neo-Orientalist – manner the hybrid urban conditions that centrally located subjects encounter in these travels, despite their will to demystify established hierarchies of intellectual or political domination. Paradoxically, as Roxanne Euben has suggested in her review of contemporary travel writing by intellectuals of various disciplinary affiliations, 'attempts to deconstruct these mechanisms of domination have tended to reproduce this structure and organization' (EUBEN 2006: 2).

Travel, Space, Architecture interrogates both of the above domains: one that favors rootedness and community, and another that favors distance and networking for those privileged subjects who are entitled to draw the mental map of eminent architectural trends worldwide. By emphasizing routes rather than origins or points of departure, *Travel, Space, Architecture* aspires to an unbiased overview of the cross-pollinations that result from mobility, as well as to shed light on the oppression effected by privileging 'rooted' conditions as more 'authentic' than others. Singular views of identity that place-bound theories often seemed to assume are now impossible to sustain or defend. The privileging of singularities and the subsequent dichotomies between eastern and western, or northern and southern worlds, cannot but reify singular notions of place and identity, thereby marginalizing processes and outcomes of heterogeneity, multiplicity, pluralism and hybridism that are induced by cultural encounters and mobility. Today, as multiple identities proliferate and a variety of pervasive types of displacement are becoming commonplace, the emphasis on routes begins to frame a political but also an ethical position. This position supports the dissolution of established orders that derive both from overarching narratives of the nation-state (which often repress minorities and internal difference), and from existing international, geopolitical hierarchies. It also claims the rights of those non-privileged identities (immigrants or ethnically impure subjects), advocating their participation in the production of architecture and urban space and the politics of representation.

But on the other hand, the travel perspective interrogates the geopolitical and other hierarchies upon which processes of nomadism and architects' networking are being established. Viewed in a new way, travel does not necessarily require physical mobility as a means of searching for difference but rather relates foremost to the establishment of a 'routed' perspective that can be applied both in conditions of physical stasis and boundary crossing. This view necessitates rethinking the condition of the stranger, and thus revising the certainties that constitute the identities of individuals, groups and places. This engagement with the condition of strangeness that is proliferating in the world today is necessary for architects, as well as for intellectuals and citizens, and most importantly for those who want to see these roles in combination.

In order to establish this routed perspective, advocated in this book, it is necessary to broaden our lens, and look for connections far beyond the specificity of a given site, building or architect.

··

TRAVELING AND THE EXPANDED MILIEU

Within the different contexts of modernity, architects have conducted their work from a variety of subject positions: as physical or imaginary travelers, as tourists, or as immigrants, conforming to the requirements of a regime or the stance of the critical thinker. However, looking at the reflections of architects themselves is not the only means by which a travel perspective in architectural thinking may be established. Rather, this book aspires foremost to expand the scale and mode through which we conventionally view space and locality from seeing it as a static entity to one of translocality, which is affected by a broader network of relationships – a way of thinking that has been pertinent in urban design discourses but less so in architecture.[47] Two related areas here demand recognition and assessment: the first has to do with the wider epistemological and political contexts that relate architecture to other domains of knowledge; the second deals with an expansive geographical framework that surpasses the narrow view of the architectural site, perceiving it rather as a point within a broader milieu of spaces where architecture is being conceived, produced, reproduced, consumed and imagined.

It is hard to negate that traveling is a productive spatial practice, a site of cultural exchange with what is encountered during the course of such travel, and which may have unpredictable effects of renewal for an architect's career or for a group establishing its identity at a foreign locality (e.g. foreign immigrants in places of displacement). Traveling, however, not only produces new ideas that were not previously thought or explored but also often reproduces preconfigured ones. Thus the architectural and urban productions that result from traveling cannot easily avoid (and often do not wish to do so) the ideologies and

47 ··
According to urban theorists Brian McGrath and David Grahame Shane, thinking of cities as networks of relationships began with Ferdinand Braudel's studies of Mediterranean trade in the 1960s and 1970s. This approach was developed further in Emmanuel Wallerstein's world-system analysis, extended in John Friedmann's world city hierarchy diagram, documented in detail by Peter Taylor, and transformed in Saskia Sassen's global city model of superimposed rich and poor components (BRIAN MCGRATH AND DAVID GRAHAME SHANE 2005: 5).

hierarchies that, deliberately or not, their producers carry as they travel in the form of their own social subjectivities. An important premise of this book is that the potential of traveling emerges from its ability to operate in a dynamic space that unfolds between the perceptual and the cognitive: the physicality of presence on the one hand, and the conceptualization of what is anticipated or imagined, often prior to traveling, on the other. Traveling, as well as representation, are often 'conditioned more upon conceptual and imaginary notions, than on the realm of corporeality and direct experience'. These 'conceptual or imaginary repositories' from which traveling and representation derive their resources are broader than the direct physical contexts that surround travelers and affect their subjectivities in multifaceted ways (TRAGANOU 2004: 2). Thus, traveling often functions as a

> framework of representation, upon which various sets of conceptual, literal or visual images are being projected. However, most of these images are not direct products of a gaze and might have little to do with the actual field of perception, vision or physical reality. Rather, they are related to major epistemological and geopolitical transformations that shape geographical desires and imaginations (TRAGANOU 2004: 3)

and which may be subsequently internalized or resisted by individual travelers or collective perceptions of travel.

One has to be attentive to the contrasts but also to the convergences between the 'geographical desires and imaginations' of a given historical and cultural context, on the one hand, and the 'epistemological and sociopolitical' conditions that constitute the framework within which travel takes place, on the other. Traveling in the service of a regime, as in the case of a war or colonization, may be substantially different as an experience from travel motivated by intellectual curiosity. By paying attention to their epistemological and sociopolitical contexts, however, we may discover that different though as they may seem, such diametrically opposed positions may be surrounded by the same broader 'regimes of truth', to use Foucault's term (FOUCAULT 1980: 133); in fact, they may often be two sides of the same coin. The mythology of the lone traveler (one who deliberately flirts with that of the dropout) lies at the heart of the modern man; similarly, the figure of the colonizer is inseparable from the project of modernity, and in many cases its precursor. Despite their superficial contrasts, one subject-position does not negate but rather supports the other. Can a traveler be immune from such broader contexts? Can a site remain unaffected by what happens elsewhere, at other sites? What concerns us as scholars interested in architecture as an intellectual and social enterprise is not merely the particular (the case of a traveler-architect or project seen in its specific location or environment), but rather a broader entangled matrix of sites of translocality – places, institutions, materials, people, and ideas from from afar or from within– that are involved in the complex process of space making.

26

III. INTRODUCTION TO *TRAVEL, SPACE, ARCHITECTURE*

Jilly Traganou

Travel, Space, Architecture aims to position architecture within a field of inquiry that explores the effects of mobility on human experience and practice. In doing so, we as authors and editors wish to participate 'in the broader acknowledgement of the material-ity of ideology' that has been overshadowed by the predominance of language and literary studies in the humanities and postcolonial studies (WHARTON 2001: 11).[1] This book builds on notions examined in our earlier works (TRAGANOU 2004 AND MITRAŠINOVIĆ 2006), which addressed the relationships between travel and spatial representation and design. These ideas were informed by broader theories of travel, tourism, space, visuality, and design, produced by scholars in the disciplines of anthropology, geography, sociology, and the fields of design and cultural studies. In these earlier works, we argued that traveling cannot be discussed solely in terms of an isolated act framed as a means of achieving individual freedom or escape, or as a pursuit of popular entertainment. Rather, traveling operates 'as a manifold project negotiated by a complex set of conflicted or synergetic agents – nations, governments, commercial enterprise, artists and ideologues, popular and mass cultures – each of which associates space and traveling with selected meanings, anticipating specific practices' (TRAGANOU 2004: 222). The processes that surround the practices and industries of travel soften the boundaries between the fictive world of the media, the works of social imagination, and the physical world, as material human experiences merge with imaginary configurations. Thus these domains of human experience – conventionally seen as sepa-rated from one another – come together into novel configurations (MITRAŠINOVIĆ 2006: 21). These intermingling domains also explicate Henri Lefebvre's understanding of space as a perceived, conceived, and lived entity (LEFEBVRE 1984: 33; 38–40).

      Travel, Space, Architecture investigates architecture's position not simply in global or universal cultures but rather in conditions of 'trans-locality' (CLIFFORD 1997: 7).

1

Annabel Wharton has rightly argued that because literary criticism dominates the postcolonial field, materiality and, accordingly, spatiality are sometimes reduced to an abstraction of language (WHARTON 2001: 206).

It also looks at 'contact zones', social spaces where disparate cultures grapple with one another, often in highly asymmetrical relations of domination and subordination (PRATT 1992: 7). With this investigation, we also recognize that 'natives, people confined to and by places to which they belong, unsullied by contact with a larger world, have probably never existed' (APPADURAI 1988: 39). This book describes traveling as fluctuating between two cardinal points: on the one hand, it is a normative act, a process through which subjectivity and culture obtain a spatial definition, often conforming to prescribed orders and hierarchies. On the other hand, it is a possibility that fuels the 'work of imagination', capable of effecting emancipation from such prescribed orders and hierarchies, towards the exploration of new socio-architectural visions.

....

THEMES AND STRUCTURE

The following chapters explore the influence of travel on architectural thinking and spatial imagination in various historico-geographical contexts. The texts focus on travelers' experiences prior to, during, or after the completion of their journeys. Three main themes emerge:

> **1.** Issues of identity. Several authors address traveling as a process that forces the identities of architects and other spatial constituents to oscillate between two determining factors: from notions of origins, which are related to architects' national or regional backgrounds; to processes of alterity, which result from encounters with various 'others'. Though seemingly opposed, both concepts are folded under the same rubric, functioning almost as antidotes to each other.

> **2.** The visuality of traveling. The second theme relates to spatial representation and visuality as these are configured both physically and mentally during but also beyond the spatiotemporal realm of traveling. On the one hand, this realm denotes the views of space that emerge through the various apparatuses of traveling, and the redefined concepts of architectural space that these views produce. On the other, it denotes the conceptual visuality of place-as-culture, the anticipated notions and sets of knowledge that are configured beyond traveling by various discursive frameworks.

> **3.** Travel and the design process. The third theme concerns the experience of traveling and its subsequent (re-)working during the design process by the traveler-architect or other traveling populations as mediated by memory, mental mapping, or bodily processes. This process may function in multifaceted ways, from the integration of selective visual references into subsequent projects, to the extraction of 'genotypes' that endeavor to link existing patterns or processes observed during travel with new architectural configurations, to impromptu improvization and appropriations that take place during the condition of displacement.

The book is organized roughly chronologically into three sections that advance from the period of early modernity and architectural modernism to our contemporary times characterized by globalization. A summary of the chapters within each section follows.

....

SECTION 1: NEW VISION AND A NEW WORLD ORDER

Chapters by Andreas Luescher, Dianne Brand, Sarah Teasley, Esra Akcan, and Smilja Milovanovi-Bertram address architecture and urbanism from the eighteenth century to the twentieth century, a period marked by expanded possibilities of travel and of the various types of exchanges and realizations that this travel introduced.

Andreas Luescher's chapter, 'Great Travel Machines of Sight', offers an intriguing examination of the relationship between travel, space, and architecture using the specific example of the panorama, a late-eighteenth-century visual apparatus that featured gigantic 360-degree paintings installed in purpose-built rotundas with central viewing platforms. Luescher argues that the panorama, and the broader techno-epistemological ideas that it embodied, played a significant role in reproducing particular perceptions of traveled space; these perceptions were also instrumental in their concurrent conceptualizations of architectural space. According to Luescher, the panoramic idea of space is evident in the work and writings of architects Étienne-Louis Boullée (1728–99), Claude-Nicolas Ledoux (1736–1806), and Karl Friedrich Schinkel (1781–1841). Moreover, Luescher perceives genealogical traces of the panorama in Le Corbusier's concept of the *fenêtre en longeur* (elongated horizontal window), which the architect first expressed clearly in his Five Points manifesto of 1926 as well as in his Parisian apartment for Charles de Beistegui (*c.* 1929–31). As the author claims, the above apparatuses induced transitional experiences in spectators, not only through different techniques of environmental representation but also through a common investment in cinematic immersion, mobility, and experiential novelty. In Luescher's view, Le Corbusier's architecture, which was oriented toward the exterior just as the original panorama was intended to be, reconfigured the imagination and experience of the new spectator, mobilizing the ambiguity that exists between a real object and its mental or material representation – a complex discourse that united the physical and the metaphysical aspects of travel and architectural space.

The expansive realm opened up by eighteenth- and nineteenth-century advances in navigation, which both propelled and was exploited by colonization, also critically affected the establishment of urban settlements in the New World. The extended lengths of most sea journeys, and the necessary stopovers in various places along the routes, provoked unexpected cultural exchanges that influenced the inhabitation of the new lands. As Diane