

CONCLUSION

Bibliography
List of figures
Declaration

What constitutes a man? Whose ideology should be followed?

Of course there are lots of factors that contribute to the constitution of a man. A man carries with him certain ideologies carried down from his cultural background and other influences he carries with on his way. Perhaps the answer to the question lies not in the constitution of man but the constitution of men; the coexistence of different ideologies to bask in a singular space where such ideologies are either dismissed or discussed, to create a post democratic space where there is transparency over secrecy.

The project was thus an attempt to exploit the very idea of what secrecy should be. The exploration and theoretical backing was a politically driven motive to understand the political transition from fortifications to what could possibly be transparency of such a fortification. The project also made a statement on the meaning of the Union Buildings with the current socio-political climate, to be able to insert a new programme which allows for a more integrated approach in the idea of collective memory.

The Union Buildings remains, and will remain as a pivotal building in the history of South Africa. The proposed intervention was not meant as a wilful

display of architecture but was an interrogative process in the meaning of history and its notions of static monuments. A counter monument was thus employed, physically and theoretically to submerge the space, to fill the void that was left between the two wings of the buildings.

What constitutes a man? Who's heritage is it anyways? Mine or yours.

Ours

As the initiates walked in their righteous path, the modern man traversed their path, conflict arose, a dialogue was initiated.

In a fragmented culture of strangers, wanderers and political heads, who has authority over who, who has the power, and who's heritage is it anyway? Mine or yours.

Dialogue and power



Bibliography

References

Abiye, T., Mengistu, H. and Demlie, M. (2011). Groundwater Resource in the Crystalline Rocks of the Johannesburg Area, South Africa. *JWARP*, 03(04), pp.199-212.

Artefacts.co.za, (2015). Union Buildings, Pretoria. [online] Available at: <http://www.artefacts.co.za/main/Buildings/bldgframes.php?bldgid=312> [Accessed 13 Oct. 2015].

Badges of the Brave traditional blanket. (2010). [image] Available at: <http://maliba-lodge.com/blanketwrap/2010/lesotho-stories/the-history-of-the-basotho-traditional-blanket/> [Accessed 8 Sep. 2015].

Bakker, Karel A. (2003) Preserving intangible heritage resources: Examples from South Africa. In: 14th ICOMOS General Assembly and International Symposium: 'Place, memory, meaning: preserving intangible values in monuments and sites', 27 – 31 oct 2003, Victoria Falls, Zimbabwe. [Conference or Workshop Item]

Bhabha, H. (1990). *Nation and narration*. London: Routledge.

Benton, T. (2010). *Understanding heritage and memory*. Manchester, UK: Manchester University Press.

Caravaggio, M. (1600). Narcissus. [image] Available at: http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Narcissus_%28Caravaggio%29 [Accessed 18 May 2015].

Corten, J., Geurts, E., Meurs, P., Vermeulen, R., Corten, J., Geurts, E., Meurs, P., Vermeulen, R. and Os-Thompson, W. (n.d.). *Heritage as an asset for inner-city development*.

Department of Public Works, (2007). *Towards a conservation management plan: Union Buildings*. Pretoria, pp.1-37.

- Dovey, K. (1999) *Mediating power in built form*. London: Taylor and Francis
- DSpace. (2011). *Union Buildings sketch perspective from Church street on axial line of building*. [image] Available at: <http://wiredspace.wits.ac.za/jspui/handle/10539/10881> [Accessed 16 Mar. 2015].
- Eliade, M. and Trask, W. (1959). *The sacred and the profane*. New York: Harcourt, Brace & World.
- Falkvinge, R. (2014). *Without Anonymity, Free Speech Does Not Exist*. [online] Privateinternetaccess.com. Available at: <https://www.privateinternetaccess.com/blog/2014/02/without-anonymity-free-speech-does-not-exist/> [Accessed 20 Oct. 2015].
- Fisher, R. (2004). *The Union Buildings: reflection on Herbert Baker's design intentions and unrealised designs*. *South African journal of Art History*, (19), pp.38-47.
- Freschi, E. (2006). *The Politics of Ornament: Modernity, Identity, and Nationalism in the Decorative Programmes of Selected South African Public and Commercial Buildings 1930 – 1940*. Ph.D. University of the Witwatersrand.
- Graafland, A., Mynott, A. and Hauptmann, D. (2000). *The socius of architecture*. Rotterdam: 010 Publishers.
- Goffman, E. (1959). *The presentation of self in everyday life*. Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday.
- King, H. (2015). *Slate: Metamorphic Rock - Pictures, Definition & More*. [online] Geology.com. Available at: <http://geology.com/rocks/slate.shtml> [Accessed 13 Oct. 2015].
- Logan, W. and Reeves, K. (2009). *Places of pain and shame*. London: Routledge.
- MacLeod, G. and Ward, K. (2002). *Spaces of Utopia and Dystopia: Landscaping the Contemporary City*. *Geografiska Ann B*, 84(3&4), pp.153-170.

Markus, T. and Cameron, D. (2002). *The words between the spaces*. London: Routledge.

Masikela, H. (1974). *Stimela (Coaltrain)*. [CD] Connoisseur Collection.

Mbembe, A. (2001). *On the postcolony*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

McGregor, T. (2010). *Plan of Fort Schanskop (SANDF Museum Services)*. The three German-designed forts all have basically the same shape. Fort Daspoortrand is quite different. Image from “The Military Fortifications of Pretoria 1880 - 1902” by Anton C. Van Vollenhoven. [image] Available at: <http://tony-mac04.hubpages.com/hub/Pretorias-Four-Forts#> [Accessed 8 Sep. 2015].

Mkhize, M. (2015). *Union Buildings: Dissertation 2015*.

Msimango, Z. (2013). Full version of Sunday Times interview with former President Thabo Mbeki | South African History Online. [online] [sahistory.org.za](http://www.sahistory.org.za). Available at: <http://www.sahistory.org.za/archive/full-version-sunday-times-interview-former-president-thabo-mbeki> [Accessed 19 May 2015].

Nel, K. (2015). Fort plans. [image] Available at: http://able.wiki.up.ac.za/index.php/Fort_Klapperkop_and_the_Pretoria_Forts [Accessed 8 Sep. 2015].

Noero, J. (2012). St. Cyprian’s Girls’ School. *Journal of the South African Institute of Architects*, [online] (55), pp.24-28. Available at: <http://saia.org.za/wp-content/uploads/2013/11/ASA-55.pdf> [Accessed 12 Aug. 2015].

Sahistory.org.za, (2015). Fort Schanskop | South African History Online. [online] Available at: <http://www.sahistory.org.za/places/fort-schanskop> [Accessed 29 Nov. 2015].

Sahistory.org.za, (n.d.). Second South African War 1899-1902 | Second Anglo-Boer War | South African History Online. [online] Available at: <http://www.sahistory.org.za/article/second-south-african-war-1899-1902-second-anglo-boer-war> [Accessed 19 May 2015].

Smith, K. (2012). *Introducing architectural theory: Debating a discipline*. New

York: Routledge, p.324.

Soja, E. (1996). *Thirdspace*. Cambridge, Mass.: Blackwell.

Solomon, J. (1910). *The Union Buildings and their architect*. The State of South Africa, [online] 4(1). Available at: <http://repository.up.ac.za/handle/2263/542> [Accessed 20 May 2015].

Solomon, J. (2010). *Perspective view of main facade*. [image] Available at: <http://repository.up.ac.za/handle/2263/542> [Accessed 16 May 2015].

StudyBlue, (2015). *Forbidden City: Imperial Palace*. [image] Available at: <https://www.studyblue.com/notes/note/n/arc-313-study-guide-2012-13-soo-deck/9710859> [Accessed 12 Oct. 2015].

The Burra Charter. (1999). Sydney, N.S.W.: Australia/ICOMOS.

The Venice Charter. (1964). Sydney, N.S.W.: Australia/ICOMOS.

Todes, A., Wentzel, M., van Zyl, J. and Cross, C. (2008). *Contemporary South African Urbanisation Dynamics*. In: *UNU-WIDER Conference: Beyond tipping point*. Cape Town

Van der Klashorst, E. (2013). *A reinterpretation of urban space in Pretoria*. Masters. University of South Africa.

Waade, A. et al. (2010). *Re - investing authenticity*. Bristol [UK]: Channel View Publications

Wikipedia, (2015). *Plan of the main floor of the Palace of Versailles*. [image] Available at: https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Palace_of_Versailles [Accessed 12 Oct. 2015].

Wikipedia, (2015). *Pretoria Forts*. [online] Available at: https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Pretoria_Forts [Accessed 29 Nov. 2015].

YOUNG, G. 2001. *Union Buildings – Affected areas vegetation survey*. Report by Newtown Landscape Architects. In BAKKER, K.A. & DE JONG R.C.

2001. New headquarters for the Dept Foreign Affairs at the Union Buildings:
 Heritage Impact Assessment, ADDENDUM C. Pretoria: Cultmatrix CC.

List of Figures

00

Collage showing initiate and modern man crossing paths (Author, 2015)
Image of Union Buildings (Sahistory.org.za, 2015)

01

Figure 1.1: Site plan of the Union Buildings (Author, 2015)
Figure 1.2: Diagram showing relationship between programme and user (Author, 2015)
Figure 1.3: Sketch of the city drawn from the Union Buildings (Author, 2015)
Figure 1.4: Sketch of the city represented in a gridded city versus the landscape of the Union Buildings (Author, 2015)

02

Figure 2.1: Macro, meso and micro framework structure (Author, 2015)
Figure 2.2: Fort plans (Nel, 2015)
Figure 2.3: Plan of the city in conjunction with the hills that surround (McGregor, 2015)
Figure 2.4: Aerial view of Pretoria with connections between the forts and the Union Buildings. This study explores the relationship between the grand narratives and the small narratives [the military forts, political fort and the city in between (Author, 2015)
Figure 2.5: The image highlights the city, seen as a sink that is encapsulated and fortified the forts that lie around it. There is a constant shift of power from the forts to Church Square to Union Buildings. History is constantly shifted
Figure 2.6: The axis points of the Union Buildings and Church square axis in relation to the hills and forts. Highlights the change in power relations in the growth of the city from its inception 1856 to the forts in 1896 (Author, 2015)
Figure 2.7: The blanket (Badges of the Brave traditional blanket, 2010)
Figure 2.8: Urban Framework structure (Author, 2015)
Figure 2.9: Suburban enclaves (Author, 2015)
Figure 2.10: Occupancy on the Union Buildings precinct recorded over 24hrs (Author, 2015)
Figure 2.11: Aerial view Union Buildings with immediate context (Lehloeny and Theron, 2015)
Figure 2.12: Energy points/movement points/ pause points (Lehloeny and Theron, 2015)
Figure 2.13: Axial line (Lehloeny and Theron, 2015)
Figure 2.14: Pedestrian movement patterns (Lehloeny and Theron, 2015)
Figure 2.15: Sacred vs profane (Lehloeny and Theron, 2015)
Figure 2.16: Masculine vs feminine spaces (Lehloeny and Theron, 2015)
Figure 2.17: Transitional space/ spaces of difference (Lehloeny and Theron, 2015)
Figure 2.18: Historical layering according to governance (Author, 2015)
Figure 2.19: Historical timeline of statues and the comparison of height of statues over time (Lehloeny and Theron, 2015)
Figure 2.20: Connecting the city to the Union Buildings (Author, 2015)
Figure 2.21: Historical timeline of Union Building plans (Author, 2015)
Figure 2.22: 1909 Union Buildings plan (Cultmatrix, 2001)
Figure 2.23: In 1911, as illustrated above, the triangular area at the bottom was divided from the rest of the precinct. Today the area remains derelict with a palisade fenced monument situated at one of the corners. An attempt was made to extend the trees into the triangular area, but an informal path (desire line) emanated that separated the spaces (Young, 2005) (Cultmatrix, 2001)

- Figure 2.24: Union Buildings sketch perspective from Church street on axial line of building. Behind the Union Buildings lies the Parliament building and on the left is the Temple of Peace (DSpace, 2011)
- Figure 2.25: Site plan showing the path of the hero (Author, 2015)
- Figure 2.26: Habitat, corner of Leyds and Church street (Stanza Bopape (Author, 2015)
- Figure 2.27: Habitat, view of corner of Leyds and Church street (Stanza Bopape street (Author, 2015)
- Figure 2.28: Sketch of the city from the Union Buildings (Author, 2015)
- Figure 2.29: View of the Union Buildings (Author, 2015)
- Figure 2.30, 2.31, 2.32: Garden of guides (Author, 2015)
- Figure 2.33: Perspective view of the south façade (Solomon, 2010)
- Figure 2.34: Temple of Peace and the parliament behind Union Buildings (Cultmatrix, 2001)
- Figure 2.35: Reinterpretation of Parliament (People's tower) (Author, 2015)
- Figure 2.36: Formalisation of routes with access to the back of the Union Buildings (Author, 2015)
- Figure 2.37: Reconnection of the city to Union Buildings (Author, 2015)
- Figure 2.38: Reactivation of Church street into market stalls and study booths (Author, 2015)
- Figure 2.39: Softened thresholds to activate street edge (Author, 2015)
- Figure 2.40: View of market stalls to increase local economies (Author, 2015)
- Figure 2.41: Study booths (Author, 2015)
- Figure 2.42: Tramline running in front of the Union Buildings (National Archives)

03

- Figure 3.1: Figure 3.1: Narcissus (Caravaggio, 1600)
- Figure 3.2: Western side view of Union Buildings. The fortified wall further strengthened by a much later addition of the steel fences prohibiting people from entering the second tier road (Author, 2015)
- Figure 3.3: Acropolis Athens (UNESCO, 2015)
- Figure 3.4: The cultural bandit. Explanation of relationship between Self and Other (Author, 2015)
- Figure 3.5: Third space (Noero, 2012)
- Figure 3.6: Further explanation of Self and Other highlighting their location in space (Author, 2015)
- Figure 3.7: Original line of axis passing through Union Buildings (Author, 2015)
- Figure 3.8: New line of power by new axial line (Author, 2015)
- Figure 3.9: Political issue with timeline of political ideologies (Author, 2015)
- Figure 3.10: Political issue (Author, 2015)
- Figure 3.11: adopted from TEDx talk with Fred Swaniker (Author, 2015)
- Figure 3.12: Architectural issue (Author, 2015)
- Figure 3.13: Architectural intention (Author, 2015)
- Figure 3.14: Primary syntactic relations based on Hiller and Hanson (Dovey, 1999)
- Figure 3.15: Plan of Palace de Versailles (Wikipedia, 2015)
- Figure 3.16: Forbidden City imperial palace plan in Beijing (StudyBlue, 2015)
- Figure 3.17: Union Buildings plan (Liana and Young, 2005)
- Figure 3.15: Burra Charter Process (Burra Charter, 1999)
- Figure 3.16: Demarcation of the Union Buildings regarding different levels of significance (Muller and Young, 2005)

04

- Figure 4.1 Site plan displaying the user's occupancy on site (Author, 2015)
- Figure 4.2 Location and description of users (Author, 2015)
- Figure 4.3 Relationship of users with the Union Buildings suggesting architectural approach (Author, 2015)
- Figure 4.4 Rapture points. Interactions between proposed building and existing (Author, 2015)
- Figure 4.5 Concept diagram with axial line cutting through centre of amphitheatre (Author, 2015)
- Figure 4.6: Different aspects of programme (visitor's centre, market space, political school) (Author, 2015)
- Figure 4.7: Visitor's centre (Author, 2015)
- Figure 4.8: Market and café restaurant area (Author, 2015)
- Figure 4.9: Political school (Author, 2015)
- Figure 4.10: Rites of passage (Author, 2015)

- Figure 4.11: Types of initiation incorporated into design to form programme (Author, 2015)
- Figure 4.12 Rites of passage in relation to programme (Author, 2015)
- Figure 4.13: Section of the Reichstag (Saha, 2014)
- Figure 4.14: Section 2 of the Reichstag (Saha, 2014)
- Figure 4.15: Ramp design around the Dome (Saha, 2014)
- Figure 4.16: Dome structure (van der Klashorst, 2013)
- Figure 4.17: Interior of Reichstag (van der Klashorst, 2013)
- Figure 4.17: Bird's eye view, Interior perspective, Perspective, Interior ramp access and Site plan of Le grande Louvre (ArchDaily, 2010)
- Figure 4.18: Perspectives of Fire station brigade (ArchDaily, 2012)
- Figure 4.19: Images of Hannah Arendt School (ArchDaily, 2012)
- Figure 4.20: Section (ArchDaily, 2014)
- Figure 4.21: Perspective (Author, 2015)
- Figure 2.22 Construction process (Engineering, 2015)
- Figure 2.23 Structural elements (Author, 2015)
- Figure 2.24 Images, plans and sections (Archdaily, 2012)
- Figure 2.25 Bird eye view and perspectives (Archdaily, 2010)
- Figure 2.26 Perspective of Scottish Parliament Building (Archdaily, 2011)
- Figure 2.27 Roof plan (Pinterest,)
- Figure 2.28 Axonometric view (Pinterest, 2015)

05

- Figure 5.1: Conceptual diagram of architectural intention (Author, 2015)
- Figure 5.2: Conceptual diagram of proposed intervention. The image highlights the point of interaction between public and politicians (Author, 2015)
- Figure 5.3: Othering. An illustration of the third face of power. The plan layout of the Union Buildings showing a thirding process in which the plan is realised as thirds (Author, 2015)
- Figure 5.4: Connecting the tissue. Approach in the design intervention (Author, 2015)
- Figure 5.5 First second and third face of power (Author, 2015)
- Figure 5.6 Identity. Analysis of mutation identity vs reconstruction of identity (Author, 2015)
- Figure 5.7 Ruination to feed the fetish of the tourist, assisting in understanding relationship between old and new structure and allowing for scarring of architecture (Author, 2015)
- Figure 5.8 Counter monument. A move from static monuments to a dynamic interaction with structure (Author, 2015)
- Figure 5.9 Design concept (Author, 2015)
- Figure 5.10 Justification of pathway with connection point to the Temple of Peace (Author, 2015)
- Figure 5.11 Original axial line (Author, 2015)
- Figure 5.11: View of construction process of the tramline in 1910 (National archives)
- Figure 5.12: The angle of deflection explaining the disruption of power with regards to maximum deflection as being horizontal and vertical (Author, 2015)
- Figure 5.13: Aerial view of old tram line that ran on the public road at the Union Buildings (National archives)
- Figure 5.14: Outside condition (Author, 2015)
- Figure 5.15: Three sets of conditions that exist for the proposed programme (Author, 2015)
- Figure 5.16: Inference with the wall to describe the conditions placed for new structure proposed (Author, 2015)
- Figure 5.17: The fragmentation (Author, 2015)
- Figure 5.18: Disruption of the wall (Author, 2015)
- Figure 5.19: Disruption of the sandstone wall. Relationship between the old and new, represented through a harsh threshold between outside and inside (Author, 2015)
- Figure 5.20: Radial, linear and circular movement of spaces (Author, 2015)
- Figure 5.21: Illustration of radial linear and circular employed, as compared to the hierarchical nature of the approach to Union Buildings (Author, 2015)
- Figure 5.22: Sketch of first design. The building cantilevers over the building (Author, 2015)
- Figure 5.23: Initial sketches highlighting the linear design that hovers over the Union Building (June 2015) (Author, 2015)

Figure 5.24: Second iteration (June 2015) (Author, 2015)

Figure 5.25: Exploring masculinity in design with proposed intervention above Union Buildings (Author, 2015)

Figure 5.26: Exploration of masculine structure to create tension between the old and new structure (Author, 2015)

Figure 5.27: Exploration of initial idea (Author, 2015)

Figure 5.28: Exploration of initial idea. Sketch taken from back of Union Buildings (Author, 2015)

Figure 5.29: Conceptual sketch of intervention unlocking possibilities of the public vs private confrontation (Author, 2015)

Figure 5.30: Sketch plan of proposed intervention highlighting the visitors's centre, the politician school and the market space. The red dotted lines indicate the existing walls of the Union Buildings. N.B The drawing is a sketch plan and brought all levels to one drawing to understand the relationship of above ground space and below ground space (Author, 2015)

Figure 5.31: A series of boxes aligned against the wall. The three condition weren't as apparent and the plan of the politician not coinciding with the Union Buildings plan (Author, 2015)

Figure 5.32: The centre of the political school became a focal point, in which the plinth is reinstated and a path crafted in the centre to interrupt the idea of a stage, to make commentary on the centre (Author, 2015)

Figure 5.33: Sketch plans of visitor's centre (Author, 2015)

Figure 5.34: Further exploration of visitors centre. The circle was a threshold before entering into the main structure. This ideas was scrapped (Author, 2015)

Figure 5.35: Exploration of Visitors' centre. The aim was to play with the experience of the user to be able to experience the wall by different levels of interaction (Author, 2015)

Figure 5.36: Section displaying underground structure with the plinth and a walkway placed in the middle (Author, 2015)

Figure 5.37: Further exploration of form, in attempt of holding up structure while still be able to carry its own weight

Figure 5.38: Section with Union Buildings to give context. The site is excavated below the Union Buildings to create a pathway right across the bottom of the building (Author, 2015)

Figure 5.39 : Basement ground floor plan of the political school (Author, 2015)

Figure 5.40: Basement second floor plan of the political school (Author, 2015)

Figure 5.41: Plan vs section (Author, 2015)

Figure 5.42 3D Roof design om context (Author, 2015)

Figure 5.43, 5.44, 5.45 Roof design (Author, 2015)

06

Figure 6.1 Tectonic concept (Author, 2015)

Figure 6.2 Material palette (Author, 2015)

Figure 6.3 Historical images of construction process (National archives)

Figure 6.4 Central amphitheatre (National archives)

Figure 6.5: Soil Rock condition of Johannesburg (Abiye, Mengistu and Demlie, 2011)

Figure 6.6: Sectional perspective (Author, 2015)

Figure 6.7 Initial plan design. The circle remains balanced while creating chaos within the internal boundary of the circle (Author, 2015)

Figure 6.8: Section exploration (September 2015) (Author, 2015)

Figure 6.9: Perspective of meditation spaces (prayer spaces) which are held together by compressive and tension forces, highlighting the balance that exists between a spiritual ethereal initiation stage (Author, 2015)

Figure 6.10: Further exploration of structure through section, highlighting the centre amphitheatre and the public space below it. Different structural problems are realised such as holding up the Union Buildings while excavation and tunnelling happens below it. The degree of tunnelling is also questioned, as the heights to the underside of the amphitheatre are too great (Author, 2015).

Figure 6.11 Section of the political school with connection to the underneath structure (Author, 2015)

Figure 6.12: Sectional perspective showing amphitheatre in relation to the school (Author, 2015)

Figure 6.13: Section of political school. The lower part of the structure has strengthened glass in which people can view the earth, as a process of archiving and creating transparency. The roof structure is designed with reference to the Union Buildings with its hidden ridge (Author, 2015).

Figure 6.14: Detail exploration_01 (Author, 2015)

Figure 6.15: Detail exploration_02 (Author, 2015)

Figure 6.16: Detail exploration_03 (Author, 2015)

Figure 6.17: Extrapolated roof structure of the connection between old and new (Author, 2015)

Figure 6.17.1: Roof structure and structural components (Author, 2015)

Figure 6.17.2: Roof structure and structural components_02 (Author, 2015)

Figure 6.18: Detail: Wall meets ground (Author, 2015)

Figure 6.19: Perspective of wall incision, detail of walkway into the incision (Author, 2015)

*Figure 6.20: Chimney effect. Temperature differentiation causes bouyancy that drives the hot air out(-
Author, 2015)*

Figure 6.21: Hot air from roof, cool air from the bottom (Author, 2015)

Figure 6.22: Perspective of confrontation spaces in interior space (Author, 2015)

Figure 6.23: Perspective of impromptu theatre stage (Author, 2015)

Figure 6.24: Perspective of roof on the existing amphitheatre. Politicians access way (Author, 2015)

Declaration

In accordance with Regulation 4(e) of the General Regulations (G.57) for dissertations and theses, I declare that this thesis, which I hereby submit for the degree Master of Architecture (Professional) at the University of Pretoria, is my own work and has not previously been submitted by me for a degree at this or any other tertiary institution.

I further state that no part of my thesis has already been, or is currently being, submitted for any such degree, diploma or other qualification.

I further declare that this thesis is substantially my own work. Where reference is made to the works of others, the extent to which that work has been used is indicated and fully acknowledged in the text and list of references.

Arthur Lehloenyia

December 2015

-F I N-