Figure 103: Conceptual site plan (Author 2015).
Chapter 6
Masking and unmasking

‘Subject’, from the Latin *subjectum*, is that which is subordinate or subjected. In the 16th Century its reference was to that which was submitted to thought or the work of the spirit. In modern parlance, it implies the question, theme or idea. It is used to refer to an individual while in grammar, it is used to indicate the subject of a sentence (Le Petit Robert 1977).

‘Object’ from the Latin *objectum* refers to that which is placed in front. The word is a composite of *objicere*, to throw, and *jacere* meaning in front. In the concrete they are objects of perception, in the abstract they can be anything that presents itself to our thoughts and occupies our mental activity. Objects are those things, which exist independently of us, as opposed to our subjectivity (Le Petit Robert 1977).

‘Matter’, from the Latin *materies*, meaning ‘wood used in construction’, occurs in states of solid, liquid and gas. When matter has a determined form it can be perceived by the senses while matter, in the abstract sense, refers to that which constitutes the point of departure of thought (Le Petit Robert 1977). ‘Matters of concern’ are those of particular importance, equally there is a tension between the point of contact between matter and the exit from matter; the morphing of the actual object into the perceived and later remembered one.
Figure 104: Location plan (Author 2015).
Figure 105: Site plan (Author 2015).
Foucault insists on the fact that there is no liberating design since "liberty is a practice" and therefore cannot be planned or guaranteed by architecture. We can notice that architecture invented a series of apparatuses – doors and windows in order for the human body to be able to act upon the spatial configuration with a minimal amount of energy. The locking device was then another invention that would allow a door or a window to re-become a wall at the discretion of the owner (Lambert 2012).

Democracy needs to provide for a space of ‘agonism’; the landscape itself is the ultimate platform for conflict as it is reflective of the implementation of power. In the history of many countries worldwide, it is the land itself, which is under contestation, the land and nature, which must be colonised. This proposal suggests that the space of contestation be repositioned at the interface between the city and the structures of power. The architectural intervention aims to explore the inversion, complication and exaggeration of power relations, not through the removal of power but through exposing a new kind of relation between architecture and landscape. A cut into this stilled and silenced landscape of confrontation, allows the removal of land to open up a space of public discourse. As the structure, which is set into the hill, makes its transition from object to void, so the monument and anti-monument are reconciled. Likewise on plan, division is made explicit through the symmetrical relationship of form, which incises all programmes for ultimate re-unification within the spaces of engagement. The interface between opposites, absence and presence, earth and built form, the few and the many, inside and outside, above and below, is reshaped through structure and exposed for all to see and where, through manipulation of programme, a new hierarchical order asserts itself in the landscape.

At the ‘base’ and lowest point of the site, a public park is proposed. This is envisaged as a neighbourhood and community park, with safe play-spaces for children. The second aspect of the programme is an outdoor theatre, which acts as a point of political debate, holding possibilities for public political engagement as well as theatrical performance. Thirdly, there is a political school where practising politicians are ‘schooled’ in tactics of representation and image management. This includes spaces such as a ‘mock’ pressroom where practice ‘performances’ are scheduled. These activities, which aid a form of masking, are penetrated by viewpoints from the public walkway at the side so that all may be revealed. The School of Representation presents a number of lecture courses in a year and caters for a group of twelve politicians at a time. The fourth aspect of the programme is a Political Think Tank where intellectuals, politicians, philosophers and academics are invited for a period of one month to conduct research and have discussions on matters of great concern. These could include thinkers such as Mogobe Ramose, Paulin Hountondji, Chantal Mouffe, Slavov Zizek, and Noam Chomsky.

Threading through and exposing points of interface between all of these, the route between building typologies connects the monumental office towers, in which visiting experts and tribal elders offer advice on issues of land-claims, urban policy and mediation in local disputes, with the Village of Forms, inhabited by the thinkers of the Think Tank. Programme and form are determined in promotion of an agonistic environment which could provide an alternative perspective on normative practice in government. If History is always from the perspective of the victor, here it is the untold stories, which feed off the programmes and form the spine of the collective.

As an anti-programme or inversion of the functional space, the so-called ‘Masking Chamber’, provides a series of ‘thought spaces’, through which one journeys before emerging into the place of presentation and of delivery; where the rest of the architecture is an investigation into autonomous form, the Masking Chamber is an exercise in bare structure.
Figure 106 (previous page): A view into the foyer from the theatre - early in the design development (Author 2015).

Figure 107 (right): Site models and conceptual planning (Author 2015).

Figure 108 (below): Approaching the building (Author 2015).
Analogy and Tactic

A number of strategies were employed in the investigation of an architectural response to political precedent, which were further influenced by an attitude to landscape. The idea of inserting a form into the landscape was not only an act of contestation but a recognition of the schism that humankind has placed between the natural and cultural spheres. Architecture, in this relationship, becomes a force of technology which serves to mediate irreconcilable perspectives so that their interaction can be managed; the land is managed by government and this form of management takes place within built structure and is brought into operation across virtual networks. A building thus becomes a house for the space of instruction, the seat of authority is occupied by an individual and the traditional messenger is replaced by worldwide communication networks. The reading of power in a structure is perhaps less important as there are systems and powerful networks which operate regardless of representation; reference to archetypes of power is more a means of situating form within a greater memory. The autonomous form or typology, resists singular interpretation while the transparent façade, as it is expressed in modern architecture, is presented as a truth and modernity as a unifying force. The façade becomes a mask, behind which there is perhaps a glimpse of the hidden face. In view of this interpretation, the treatment of the façades in this project had to be managed with a specific aim in mind. The building consists externally of two anti-facades, which disappear into the earth, and two visible façades. The main entrance is intentionally obscured in order to challenge predominant perceptions of hierarchy of entrance. The blank wall at the top of the theatre steps is merely a screen, onto which can be projected the flimsy and changeable meanings of identity construction. Into this screen, a narrow glass slit provides an incision which continues throughout the structure, in form or by implication of the central axis. The interior is never revealed as a total experience unless one is actually within and wandering through. The roof plane, a façade, clearly visible from the route on the hill, is a transitional element. Covered by a sheet of water, literally a place of reflection, the roof links with the sky and makes apparent the passage from solid material to liquid to air.

The portrayal of identity was avoided in this project. When the strangler fig is successful at squeezing the life out of its host, the inner tree rots away leaving only a void. The shape of this void space is determined by the existence of the host; the victor is shaped by the conquered. The striving for representation of identity is just as closely related to that which has been overthrown. In this way, what is expressly contested is actually perpetuated. Infiltration was also considered as a means of disrupting authority. The Trojan horse is an image and a memory of the process of insinuation into the confines of power; power operating from within. It refers to danger that is disguised as a gift and also invisibility.

The question of what could occupy the series of interior forms, programmatically, was important if the hierarchy were to be reinterpreted.

Within the temple, the sacred space of political debate where decisions are made that govern the lives of so many, these Trojans could be envisaged as oppositions, filled with unimportant people doing unimportant things (glorification of the ordinary, the profane and secular activity). These rituals or objects should be diametrically opposed, the profanity of commerce within the temple space, what uproar! Furthermore, they should not be objects in isolation, for power lies within a system of connections, and may emerge as a process of infiltration in abstracted form; order dissolving into the virtual in order to be energised by it. Order is weakened when it is too effective at controlling, the chaos which
Readings of the site to govern response

We are formed always by what we contest, in responding to colonialism it is perpetuated just as the strangling ficus climbs up the host tree and takes on its shape, until eventually the host dies leaving a void within the victorious fig’s structure. The sketch shows the possibility of the ficus becoming a panopticon, pods attach to the periphery allowing a visual intrusion into the meeting space below.

So what to do with the monument? Eating monuments is heavy work and causes indigestion....

The site can act as a watershed collector of the Union Building’s spill-off, ‘amassing’ theatrical and political energy for itself and thereby undermining the current role...

The design can become an anti-monument presenting a complementary inversion to the existing, this may involve recreating the monument in order to disrupt it...

The design can disaggregate, presenting the kind of dualism which exists between the two halves of the brain. In this way it becomes a route, connecting the city to the monument.

A grand meeting space can arise, for a Think Tank... but this can be infiltrated... by trojan horses, threats disguised as gifts...

But power is in the connections, elements of infiltration need to be linked into a network - entities cannot operate in isolation

These entities could embed themselves into programmes, forms, structures... they could become pervasive, viral, form a web...
it is trying to organise, essentially then order only has a limited lifetime. Endurance lies within chaos! This does not necessarily imply a series of haphazard relationships, rather strategic connections between the purity of form and its subtle disruption, all in aid of an architecture which can frame new questions.

This is an exploration in priming repetition, this is not to place authority in history but to recognise difference that could never be expressed in a singular solution, that of a surface value ‘Africanised’ identity. The further development of the Rossian and Scolarian typology brings with it a tension, between autonomy and the interruption of autonomy.

**Philosophical Underpinnings**

About post-94 buildings, many claims have been made of transparency, inclusiveness and freedom. In searching for a notion of authenticity, reference is made to origins in an attempt to draw power from history or the landscape, this in combination with a kind of corporatised modernism and facadism. For this investigation, I have been looking at autonomy in architecture, autonomous, anterior forms that are true in their representation of their aims; architecture always divides, forms barriers and separates. The invention of the facade is only as old as the Middle Ages, before this, walls formed spaces rather than the edges which are now manipulated to ‘claim’ interaction. Ancient cities had city walls, now there is an internalised hostility - everything is penetrable and is also not.

There is no blank slate, the land, space, the site - all are politicised. In the wake of a South African diaspora, standing looking at a Renaissance landscape in the heart of Pretoria, trees line the hillside marking the gap in which the old tram once made its way - who can say about this that sites are neutral and who will tell this to the dispossessed? It is the land itself, here, that is under contestation. A single incision will right this relationship, just as ‘a little water clears us of this deed’, so shall the cut become generative. Political relationships will change as demonstrated in agonistic programmes and equally within a formal agonism, which will serve to shift power relations as they are presented in our existing precedent, the Union Buildings.

The void in this work implies the opening up of possibility, it suggests the space beyond representation, it presents a question: how can architecture influence the form of society, the relationships between human beings? As if pushed into the land like a battering ram, the form becomes a negation of the landscape; as one disappears deeper into the ground the building makes no reference internally to its context but rather, forms are carved into and carve out space. Through the manipulation of form, the holding back and cutting into of the earth is expressed in the internal compositions - all contained within the neutralising factor, the container, the box.

The question of authenticity, originality and representation calls for a reconceptualisation of the formal and intangible environment. The archipelago, a series of islands, becomes a powerful metaphor for understanding knowledge structures and the city, with its collection of islanded buildings. If the sea is the ‘common’, a shared unconscious expanse, then the conscious is but a raft floating on it. From the point of this raft (or island), we have our only symptomatic experience of what underlies; this is the terrain of assumed facts, accepted norms and standards. Channelled through this, becoming a series of ‘offshoots’, we have the realm of representation - the statements we make about our objects. In this territory, buildings can be monuments, the city can be a panopticon and objects have unstable ‘meanings’. Through this three-tiered knowledge construction, each form, building or island is given the authenticity of representing the common. Archetypes of form and architecture, swirling around in memory, below recollection and indifferently existing, are pulled out and inserted into the ‘known’ - from here our representations are erected. From this reading, this design becomes a microcosm, of not only the city, but of our means of extracting, understanding and interpreting information and interactions between objects and their subjects.

The process of design presents an opportunity to make knowledge-constructions explicit. In the work of Lucio Fontana (1899 - 1968), a sense of depth is created which extends beyond the ‘jurisdiction’ of the canvas. In this way Fontana gouges through pure representation, working back towards an indication of the shared depths referred to earlier. Francis Bacon (1909 - 1992) illustrates the dissolving of the ‘known’. If architectural interiors protect from the dangers of the exterior, here the casing that is the body, the armour we bear, is breaking up and
making its return to a state of ‘outsideness’ or ‘beneath-ness’, its subjects screaming their way into dissolution.

An analogy could be drawn between the questions posed by these two artists and the work of Italian architects Aldo Rossi (1931 - 1997) and Massimo Scolari (born in 1943), who both explored the autonomy of architecture. Rossi tests the strength of typology, using a similar plan for a cemetery and a school - the space of death can equally be a place for the living. Using a palate of Rossian forms, Scolari pushes these to the brink of tension and ambiguity. The suggestion of space beyond can be immediately brought to the present, into our experience, the rawness of the common expressed. The exposure of tensions brings forms closer to their unfamiliar origins.

By cutting into the contested landscape, one defamiliarises it. The exposure of the void reveals monument and its opposite. Eyes into the spaces of agonism suggest an internalised panopticon within the object. The dominant question, was the resolution of the object and anti-object, the container as common or enveloping surface which houses the autonomous objects. In this I seem to be adopting both strategies but to what effect? This is the mediation of the panopticon in bringing together cell and monument into one formation, tomb and cell – both places to be passive, to wait; the monument is the antithesis, it exerts a force. In this sense I am resolving functionality, with architecture as an intervention of power, where it is not the force of the individual, who is merely waiting, but the strength of history, of withdrawal from the fabric of urban life. By pushing into the hill the design presents a critique of the constitution and make-up of the city. It is its disappearance that gives the form its validity and it is also not ‘growing out’ as this would be to suggest the return to a ‘better time’, seeking authenticity in history. By pushing in, the object confronts history, the land as a site of conflict, while withdrawing slightly from the urban as a managerial condition. Internally, the finite objects contain space and event but also have possibilities between them. They are not static as they intersect at times, they are not merely containers, as they represent the external conditions by mirroring and embodying contradiction in society through their form.

It is important also to understand the project’s ‘withdrawal’ as a decisive action on the environment, the points of contact which emerge between the anti-object and the ground, relate to a theoretical underpinning of the relations of objects as is expounded on in the theory of an object-oriented ontology, which dissolves hierarchies by stating that all objects are equal, power-relations exist in the interplay and gathering of forces between objects in interaction. Just as one can only access the ‘common’ by moving through the islands, so an all-encompassing understanding of forces is never possible; understanding arises through the limited connections
made by direct points of contact, as they occur in the motion of forms, as they collide and reflect one another.

One reading of the progression through the form would be to understand it as the movement from the city window to the earth window, but as this project is a critique of so-called transparency, the architecture serves to mask this transition. The excavation of earth reveals the generative cut, a form of unmasking which is then re-masked by the intervention; earth as a mask of authority is replaced by architecture as a mask to the earth. There is then this tension between the idea of detachment and active intervention; the building is a battering ram, punching through to open up experience, to defamiliarise and to establish new points of interaction below the ‘surface’. The forms start to embody the process of punching through, of intersection, crossing and opposing relationships; while there is a violence contained in this approach, the architecture could equally be seen as exerting a protection over the earth. The container is an equalizer that removes hierarchy, as the monuments are singularities within a shared common ground; they are effectively neutralized as entities, their power is internalized in the composition of the interior. The interior becomes a microcosm of the city and the strata of knowledge and power constructions.

**Evolution of the Section and Plan**

The investigation of the section becomes a means of introducing the poetic aspect of the design. The form, in incising itself into the landscape, creates the void or ‘generative cut’ from which to explore the concept of inversion: monument and anti-monument. From starting off as a simple block, which, in the diagram, reveals the slope of the land as a diagonal running through the shape, spaces were then carved out or forms inserted. The initial exploration was of a Lalibela-like series of facades which would be experienced on the inside of the void, as a means to bring light down into the spaces and behind which to organise the various programmes. The lines of trees, on either side of the slit, tower above the structure in all iterations, their regularity creating a powerful axis and marking the ascension of the slope. As the design was envisaged as a contestation of the land, it was not seen as important to emphasize or clarify the experience of the rising earth line, rather the structure provides a new defamiliarised landscape, an interior which does not reveal all but acts as a mask to the earth.

Figure 113: Making ‘place’ within passage (Van Eyck).  
Figure 114 (right): Iterations of the section (Author 2015).

The plan is a narrative and political device, the slit implied by the ordered row of trees, an absent memory of the tramline, was early on envisaged as a route which could connect the city and the Union Buildings, via the landscape. The earlier versions of the plan consisted of this path, with programmes on either side of a central passage. With the plan, the intention was to bring to it an aspect of Italian Rationalist design, with reference to typology and archetype, a clear progression of forms and a symmetry in the layout. A conceptual collage which combined the floor patterns of Norman Eaton, as a façade, with a collection of Russian forms, ordered alongside the passage, began to suggest the resolution of the plan as a series of objects along a route. The breakdown of the programme into its accommodating typologies began to form a plan, where housed activities occur in smaller spaces and conversation and debate occur within the surrounding void space. Here the Union Buildings can really be taken as a precedent, the open court contained by the arms of the plan casts a non-place into, essentially, the most important one. The two options outlined in the analysis of the possibilities of the plan, reference the city plan with destination and street at either end versus a scenario where the open spaces become important and monuments are not read in isolation but in their relationships; they do not exert power in themselves but in the arguments that they set up in their relations.

The positioning of the open-air theatre was derived originally from exploratory diagrams which illustrated ‘energy’, flowing down the contours, and pooling lower down the hill. Conceptually the theatre is envisaged as a catchment for political activity, facing onto a neighbouring residential street, it acts as a public square which anyone can use. Formally, the application of typology shapes internalised monuments for secular activity, a series of smaller defamiliarised and oblique buildings (a village of forms) and a panopticon of angled glances into the main void, from the passages at the sides. The central stair and symmetrical monuments provided the starting point for the design of the interior. From their position, a main gathering space was an obvious tribute to monumentality and provided a foyer in which to arrive.
Sequence

A path extends from the building, continuing the axial relationship between incision and site, and meets the sidewalk. The route from the street leads to the theatre, at either side of the façade a passage leads into the form, one an obscured entrance, the other a pedestrian route which climbs the height of the slope and reconnects to the land at its completion. Both ways provide access into an entrance cave, which is carved out underneath the stairs. In the cave, a linear pool of water is lit from slits in the theatre seating; the directionality of the space, perpendicular to the length of the plan, must be mediated by the intention of entry. Within the foyer, the place of reception is unveiled; monumentality is used in order to give precedence to temporary inhabitation, offices for visiting tribal elders as well as lecturers are housed in the towers, their forms incised by the central stair. The Political School is accessed from the foyer, its seminar rooms, held between stair and wall, are on the first and second floors. The supporting programmes and ablutions are contained within the passages on either side of the building, under the public walkway and additional staircases provided for each programme. The research output, which results from the organisation of the Think Tank, is stored in its own library underneath the monumental staircase, these documents can be requested by researchers. In the foyer, a pair of symmetrical typological forms, contain political journals and newspapers, which can be read in the incised and adjacent waiting spaces, or taken to the coffee bar.

The enclosed space of the School opens out into an open air court, the height of the structure, in which the Village of Forms is situated. These typological forms are occupied on a temporary basis by visiting members of the Think Tank, while the Chamber of the Master which is a larger form, is the permanent abode from which the Think Tank is arranged and managed. The building closes up again after the village, the general meeting room, with auditorium above, is there for the use of all the programmes. The Masking Chamber presents the last point before the earth and signifies the end of the journey and the moment at which one must take a position in the endless tug of identity, repetition and representation. A mask is donned; the agonistic programme gives way to an expression of agonism in form with a private and internalised programme. As the weight of the earth presses against the outer wall, so the weighty decision must be made. The final space, the ‘masking chamber’ becomes a place to investigate agonism in form, where architecture becomes a mask to the landscape. The politician, who has completed the course on representation, enters this place alone. Here one must dress, prepare one’s notes and reflect on the entire process of political and individual representation. Ascending the stair, one arrives at a small tunnel from which one must emerge, at the end, in the auditorium where a resident audience is addressed from a pulpit. This is the final test for the politician, if one can bear the scrutiny of those that watch, some from behind the portholes which peer into the auditorium, then the aspect of political performance can be overcome.

The final façade is above one; the roof is envisaged as a water garden, which mediates the experience of the gardens and the built incision. It is equally, a plane of light relief for the occupants of the interior realm; steps lead down from the path, which connects the central stair to the landscape, and into the water. From here, one has a view of the city, framed on both edges by the symmetrical line of pine trees; these are the same pines which emphasised a prior journey through the site, the tramline which connected the city to the monument.

Figure 115: Entering the cave (Author 2015).
Figure 116: Conceptual section indicating closed (purple) and open (orange) zones and buildings in open zones (yellow) (Author 2015).

Figure 117: Two-hour fire-rated passage, detailing the retaining wall (Author 2015).

Figure 118: Two-hour fire-rated passage, service spaces and ablutions under the stairs (Author 2015).

Figure 119: Pedestrian walkway linking theatre and landscape (Author 2015).

Figure 120: Longitudinal section (Author 2015).
Site, Drop-off Zone and Parking

The northern-most section of the site is partially pine forest and partially botanical garden. Within the garden, an old stone rondavel is linked via the original serpentine paths to the water garden. The existing vehicular access is from the top of Carriage Drive, adjacent to the rondavel and proposed restaurant in the gardens. Parking is provided on the northern edge of the site, underneath the pines and near to the heritage Engelenburg House, which would be accessible as a museum.

From this area of the site, the grand stair, which protrudes out from the roof, is really the staff entrance but is also available to the curious explorer. The main entrance, to the south, is accessible from the street and would be used by people taking public transport, as well as dignitaries who would arrive at the drop-off zone on Carriage Drive, just above the intersection with Zeederburg Road.

Technical Approach

The building as an incision into the landscape, counters the monumentality of the Union Buildings by becoming an anti-monument. Within the ‘common’ space of the concrete box, which in its relation to the ground has only anti-facades on three of its elevations, autonomous forms are contained. The forms on the interior continue the typological investigations of the Neo-Rationalists, Aldo Rossi and Massimo Scolari, and they exist as defamiliarised Laconic objects. The challenge in this design, is the resolution, on a functional level, of the occupation of these forms and of insertions, openings and points of entry as are required in terms of lighting, thermal comfort and ventilation while maintaining a sensitivity of detail which respects the conceptual intention.

Encasement:

Concrete is used to enclose and contain forms, spaces and water. This provides ‘wrapped’ space for the anti-monument, where form is not legible. The planes formed by the vertical and horizontal concrete work are deepened with inlays of doors and floors.

Figure 121: *Technical concept* (Author 2015).
Autonomy:

Facebrick is used for the interior typological forms; these are oblique, defamiliarised and Laconic. The texture of the brickwork emphasizes the directionality of form and binds the different formal investigations into one overall language. Here, experiential and monumental form provides an analogy to the city of parts. Internally, a different tectonic is explored, the brick skins are paired with wooden suspended flooring, which brings a different aspect to the detailing of the particular, that is not present within the ‘common’.

Incision:

The idea of incising, into the landscape, is communicated at all scales of detail. Surfaces, both of encasement and autonomy, are cut into to shape the entry of light and allow specific relationships to nearby objects. Material and form is cut back to allow for the passage of people, water and light; the carving out of space and object, alternately suggests absence and presence.

Lighting:

Light is closely linked to the expression of the incision and of autonomy. The majority of the light enters through the roof plane, into which light wells are incised, illuminating the forms and open spaces below. The use of light is strategic, the mystery of form is specifically highlighted; light is never ubiquitous but is rather controlled in order to shape the spatial experience. Glass inlays in the roof let in filtered light which is dappled by the sheet of water.

Figure 122 (above): Investigations of the balustrade in terms of the technical concept of incision (Author 2015).
Figure 123 (below): Analysing light in the section - noon on the summer equinox (Author 2015).
Services and Climate Control:

The building maintains a regular temperature throughout most of the year, as it is predominantly in the ground. Issues of ventilation and thermal performance are addressed in order to minimise the use of mechanical systems. All the soil excavated for the project can be used in the rammed earth construction determined by the greater Union Building’s framework.

Cool air is brought into the building from the southern slope, channelled through earth pipes in the slope, it is then fed into the various spaces, at floor level. The closed sections of the structure are provided with roof vents which can open and close while the two central towers draw hot air out at the top by means of a solar-assisted stack. The auditorium and general meeting or conference area, is heated and cooled with an HVAC system, contained in the passage at the northern end of the building. Extractor fans are linked to the light switches in all ablation areas so that cooler air can be pulled into the spaces.

Service spaces such as storage, ablations and a staff kitchen are positioned under the stairs in the side passages. The bathroom layouts are structured in such a way so as to allow for ducts and cleaner stores. These ducts are accessible so that rodding eyes and inspection eyes are accessible, the ablations vent via pipes, which pop up at the sides of the building, in the forest.

As building has no ‘back door’ a dumbwaiter is installed in the side passage under the pedestrian walkway, proximity to the coffee bar; deliveries and waste removal can be managed from this point.
Figure 127 & 128 (above & right): Forms to bring in light and ventilation, no longer part of the scheme (Author 2015).

Figures 128 & 129 (right): Ventilation systems, solar stack and mechanical (Author 2015).

Figure 130: Rendering of the foyer (Author 2015).
Fire:

The right hand passage, in which the three staircases linked to the interior programmes are located, is a two-hour fire-rated passage. All doors are self-closing and the glass inlays, which allow light from the passage into the interior, are all fire-rated. As the doors open into the passage, the balustrade is constructed on a frame and thickened to 750mm so that the doors do not open into the flow of movement. An additional 1.5m space is allocated for each stair in line with the minimum requirement for a fire route.

Disabled access:

A lift is located in the foyer so that all levels of the interior are accessible to wheelchair users. A smaller wheelchair lift is provided next to the auditorium so that the length of the building is easily navigable without the need to use the stairs. Disabled ablution facilities are provided at ground and first floor levels.

Water and Waterproofing:

The passages on either side of the central void are viewed as external. To express a sense of being in the ground, gabion infill strips suggest a diagonal trajectory which echoes the slope of the land. The external retaining walls, 450mm of concrete, hold the gabion insertion between capping plates. Copper pipes, of 100mm diameter, protrude into the passage; during a storm water will pour through these, from the soil, and drain into a concrete channel which is carved into the side of the concrete stair. The amount of water flowing out of these copper spouts, is evenly distributed as the external wall is divided into collector regions, formed with K-tech drainage collectors. Geotextile membrane lines the space between backfill and wall, agricultural drains at the sides and under the foundation reduce the soil pressure and channel a great deal of the water down the slope. A bidum layer on the inside and outside of these collector regions, prevents fines from entering the building; the water can then be channelled into a sub-surface rainwater collection tank. The ablutions and other service areas below the stairs are sealed off and protected with a layer of torched-on bitumen. The wall is cut back slightly so that a 12mm softboard layer can lie flush with the edge of the concrete, while protecting the bitumen layer. The water collected on the roof, is stored underneath the

![Figure 131-132: View towards city from the water garden on the roof (Author 2015).](image1)

![Figure 133: Precedent - design for a funeral parlour (BAAS).](image2)
Figure 134: Impression of the roof garden (Author 2015).

Figure 135: Water System - tank under the foyer, filtration and purification tower, linear pool under theatre and water on the roof (Author 2015).

foyer; all water is directed to this tank from where it can be circulated in the filtration and purification tower, which maintains the quality of the water on the roof and in the pond.

Structure:

The concrete structure acts like a box, or raft, which distributes the weight of the interior forms and the pressure from the soil, along its surfaces. Once the earth has been excavated and sub-surface drainage installed, the foundation is cast over a 150mm casting pad. The retaining walls in the passages are supported by a system of blade walls, the concrete stair and 500mm deep beams which resist the pressure of the soil and prevent the structure from caving in. The internal walls are then thinner.
Figure 136: *Answer to the sky.* (Author 2015).

Figure 137: *A journey into the earth - retaining experience.* (Author 2015).
Figure 138: *An interior monument of anterior forms.* (Author 2015).

Figure 139: *To the chamber of the Master - Think Tank.* (Author 2015).
Figure 140: *An anti-monument - view into the foyer.* (Author 2015).

Figure 141: *The Village of Forms - to the chamber of the Master.* (Author 2015).
Figure 142: Ground Floor Plan - nts. (Author 2015).
Figure 143: First Floor Plan - nts. (Author 2015).
Figure 146: Roofscapes - when thinking tanks. (Author 2015).

Figure 148: Longitudinal section - nts. (Author 2015).
Figure 147: *Panopticon - a glimpse of the pulpit.* (Author 2015).
Figure 149: Cross section - nts. (Author 2015).
Figure 150: View of the theatre steps. (Author 2015).

Figure 151: The Village of Forms - to the Town Hall. (Author 2015).
Figure 152: Plan view of reflection pond under stair - nts. (Author 2015).

Figure 153: Detail section through reflection pond under stair - nts. (Author 2015).
Figure 154: *Detail connection - exposed channel* - nts. (Author 2015).

Figure 155: *Detail connection - scenario at threshold* - nts. (Author 2015).
Figure 156: Plan detail of the balustrade - nts. (Author 2015).

Figure 157: Elevation detail of the balustrade - nts. (Author 2015).

Figure 158: Section detail of the balustrade - nts. (Author 2015).

Figure 159: Detail of the balustrade - nts. (Author 2015).
Figure 160: *Plan detail of the Pulpit - nts.* (Author 2015).

Figure 161: *Elevation detail of the Pulpit - nts.* (Author 2015).

Figure 162: *Section detail of the Pulpit - nts.* (Author 2015).

Figure 163: *Plan, section and elevation of the pedestrian stair - nts.* (Author 2015).
Figure 164 & 165: Final model (photographed by Arthur Barker, 2015)
Figure 166: Final model (Author 2015).
Addendum

Jean Pierre de la Porte & Patricia Theron in Conversation

(published in the Bou-kin journal November 2015)
We are in the year 2015, in the now, in South Africa, and we have recently recognised the mark in time that, for us, has represented the passage of twenty years of democracy. As citizens we may have some conception of our present time in relation to our history. As architects and students of architecture we may question our roles within a new society, we may equally experience an enormous pressure to act, but we are in the dark yet in terms of our understanding of the complexity of our specific situation. To think of our cities, with their largely fictional public realm, is to touch on the unreal in South African architecture. Working in this environment, we are subjected to the interface of issues of identity and the fragmentation of landscape. We need to assimilate or ‘unpack’ a new cultural identity for ourselves.

Let us imagine a closed box containing a number of bouncing balls, one could read their relationships in terms of their containment in space; their own experience of one another and their environment would be limited to the specific positions of their interactions, arising from the point of contact made with a surface or another ball. This point of contact produces an experience and it is from the accumulation of these ‘moments’ that a limited sense of all surrounding interactions, is formed. This limited access to the larger picture virtualises experience, in accepting this situation there is a recognition of possibilities contained within that which is beyond immediate understanding. The invention of the fact, like the invention of the façade, is a recent filter of experience, in order to go beneath this layer we need to learn how to reconfigure our perceptions of the relationship between what we understand as elusive and what is immediately obvious. To understand the city is to understand the workings of power through form, in an on-going negotiation various archetypes of form communicate the city as a political entity, these representations of form occur endlessly in art and in architecture.

In the following interview, Jean-Pierre de la Porte tries to respond to my questions about different ways of conceptualising the political, natural and cultural environment and the interactions which take place within it. Within the many different models we construct of our urban experience, we come to see the city as an expression of identities, we are face to face with exercises in identity-formation, as they are expressed throughout the city, and we see the energies of power relations as they operate at a larger or smaller scale. From this dynamic, our vision is reformulated continuously as part of a design process. In questioning before we act, we end up with fragments to reassemble, our jigsaw stares back, its disarray frightening and apparent. To disrupt and rearrange forms, to alter the existing with new insertions into context, gives a strange power to an external condition of which we have limited understanding. It begins to stare back at you so that you become the receiver of strange insights occurring below the language radar. This same process can be traced in the art of Francis Bacon and Lucio Fontana, in the work of the neo-rationalists Aldo Rossi and Massimo Scolari, where the questions surrounding the design process are opened up through an operation - a careful incision, a slash, a distortion perhaps – shifting around the known, re-using and repeating in such a way as to refine subtly, these expressions of an eternal search. The void in our work is exposed, as the unreal and the unpainted become ways to reach beyond. Slavoj Zizek describes the total embedding of fiction within reality, so that any attempts at the creation of authenticity within design must reconcile the mask or persona of the façade and the nature of spaces which are formed from the inside, by those that must inhabit them.
PT: I’m trying to understand the city as a political landscape, where you have various ways of establishing power. This can take the form of increasing privatisation (the modern city is not bounded by city walls but internally freedom of movement is increasingly restricted in the sense that the capitalist exercise has resulted in hostile environments that exclude the many while incubating the few), the monument (these have unstable meanings as they always used in support of the power of their current inhabitants, so that a structure like the Union Buildings has changed in meaning over time) and the city as a panopticon (increasing surveillance from CCTV cameras as well as the ubiquitous digital environment and the internet, offering instant connection at all times). The production of space for the present and future begins with a raw material that is already not a neutral territory. You referred in the afterword of 10+years 100+ buildings - South African architecture since 94, to the absence of a public realm, saying that “post 94 architects have each acquired the ability to work like dramatists inventing characters - client, user, public and nation personae - that nobody has seen before but which everybody will soon come to see themselves in.” In addition to the invention of a public, much post-94 public architecture has presented a themed return to an Africa of the past, referencing what are seen as original themes contained in structures such as the Ruins of Great Zimbabwe, which are utilised to donate authenticity to new projects. In the search for an architectural language, in the absence of a public, we revert to representation where meanings find it difficult to inhabit purely fictional devices, so that public architecture becomes more and more private – buildings recede from their audience in order to preserve their purity. These ‘architectural virgins’, hiding behind their own shy skirts (facades), actually cast the public as a kind of perversion – inhabitations, access, use – these are threats to the image of a pristine and overly sanitised environment which favours exclusion behind the pretence of hygiene and control.

The city will have authority regardless of what is put into it, in Guattari’s description of the archipelago, the sea is the ‘common’ and the islands arising from it imbue that common even though they are individual expressions. So the search for appropriate representations will always unveil genuine matters regardless of the claims for architecture and whether or not it is ‘free’. Architecture invariably sets up boundary conditions, whether through the use of walls or facades, spaces have an edge, which usually separates people and activities as well as reinforcing hierarchies; transparency is an illusion which presents a lie of inclusion. To continue with the archipelago metaphor, the sea, as containing content, belongs to the realm of origins while the island, which could be something as fragile as a raft, is what we might regard as a pure discipline and the habitat of lived experience and assumed facts – I imagine that representation, the power to produce image, could be visualised as a balloon which is tied to this raft, it is clearly the offshoot of the lived experience and any reference made to origins will have been mediated by the experience on-board the raft.

Architecture and urbanism try to address these political issues without talking about it in political terms, the result can become quite muddled. The City of Joburg’s project, the Corridors of Freedom, presents an interesting dichotomy – a barrier seen as creating freedom. Furthermore, the corridor, a very important exercise in the Baroque period, has its own connotations of control, domination of landscape etc. that seem to confuse this statement even more. It reminds of the Situationist overlay for Paris, where a world of possibility is envisioned but in the end the transformative devices follow the existing Parisian routes so closely that the result seems quite conservative.

JP: Well the question is how one works with that situation: as a rising architect, almost all of your access to these issues is mediated by other people – established architects, city planners, fund managers – a thousand and one different go-betweens. It is not enough to call to action because the minute you act, you find yourself within a huge negotiation around stakes. In a classroom a corridor is inert like everything else in architecture, in a boardroom it stands in for actions and gives them permanence - it fails or succeeds to make profits for an investor, to lower transport costs or to vindicate a policymaker. In this way every part of the built environment becomes a reason for putting expertise into play, the city assumes the role of coupling human and non-human agents, of helping such agents to act more easily upon each other. This design of action through action, upon action, gives life in that city the sense of being a strategy that requires strategic reactions of its own. Every city, acquires in this way, an overdesigned future whose reality seems to wax and wane as its technocrats either step past the unforeseen or collide with it.

PT: Fanon makes reference to African philosophy as a contestation of Western philosophy; this thought is continued and modified in Paulin Hountondji’s writing, where he describes the danger of African philosophy not existing in itself but being too much of a reaction. In the case of Fanon, African philosophy is given a great power in that it takes hold of Western philosophy and provides it with a critique of itself from an outside avenue, a retrospection which is lacking in the Western version. Hountondji’s warning, however, raises an interesting point: that when we expressly contest these issues, we find ourselves reformed by that original line that we are trying to get away from.

JP: The real challenge is to stop believing that you can get away from it, that there is a neutralisation or perspective from which you can apprehend things more purely. Fanon’s books were programmatic; he did not live long enough to write
retrospectively the way his idol Hegel did. I like to imagine a plot in which Fanon comes back, something like Mauricio Kagel’s film where Beethoven arrives unexpectedly in Bonn for his own bicentenary. He would not be recognized by his Ivy League followers, who expect him to be Judith Butler, and he would be fascinated by the way Afrikaners managed their version of the postcolonial condition which at some times, apart from the selfish intent, could almost have been stolen off his pages. By the end of the movie his only friend is Zizek who shares his faith in the political force of ideas from the psychology clinic and his sincere love of Hegel. In the final scene they hitchhike to an African film festival in Dubai.

PT: Foucault says that as things become less and less explicit, they become more dangerous and cruel.

JP: But explicit things are dangerous and cruel. Few things explicated themselves better than British or Belgian colonialism or the steps of the Afrikaner secession. The 1961 republic was the fully unpacked western civilisation in Africa -something fit for Eco or Hofrat Schreber - even down to state budgets for music, architecture and literary avant gardes concocted from up to the minute study tours and suggestions from the best consultants. Homelands were attempts to destroy African Nationalism through the force of explicitness by implementing it as caricature. The pioneer technocracies, the social engineers who displaced Britain and ruled South Africa until 1994 are geniuses at putting everything under a concept where management and money can unfold it with clarity. Our implicit is produced by an explicit that has since gone on to produce such crazy adventures as ‘blanconormic’ liberalism: the implicit in South Africa is too sophisticated to be reached by its colonial eradicators.

PT: It is in a sense an overlay of new meaning onto a situation, which is what the Situationists tried to do and what policy-makers and urban planners intend with their ‘Corridors of Freedom’. But it is not just to stamp something onto an existing condition, but also to understand that the stamping will have impure reactions, which are unpredictable. It is easy to map a new way, to hold onto so-called guiding threads in the labyrinth but to understand the effect on the complexity of the existing fabric is much more difficult. We have new perspectives and a historical understanding of old ones, but there is no clear path between the way things exist physically and the way that we understand them. So there is already a disjunction in our understanding and then we come back with new forms, which are introduced into the old fabric, and it’s the interactions between those that create the possibility.

JP: I wouldn’t wait for new forms because they are at the end of their life by the time they get built. Here the Situationists were right, also de Certeau who died too soon to be vindicated: it is more subversive to repurpose than to replace.

Cities and their technocracies seem so philosophical because like philosophy, they work with ‘reality as such’. A technocrat induces you to build your most radical notion just to prove it gathers less reality than her alternative: Koolhaas is now experiencing this in China, and Johannesburg and Pretoria were locked in such a rivalry throughout the nineteen-sixties. Besides you can only jump ahead of your adversary in the direction of their motion, hopefully putting their momentum behind yours. This demands less innovation than a type of imitation, assimilation and refinement. The design and redesign of strategies has no left or right because both prefer redesigning their way inside of what exists. There is no new queen to place in the beehive to order the confused bees: critics, NGOs and sadly even academics still dream of the ultimate exposé, leveling unanswerable accusations, new facts or knockdown arguments at technocracy - but a strategy cannot be touched in these ways. It takes better skills than these to see where managers have overtaken and ‘deskilled’ politicians. Despite Fukuyama proclaiming this secret decades ago, nobody quite accepts it at face value: a committed enough managerialism will wither extant politics and cause history to vanish as a style of justifying and explaining, so it’s hard to imagine where young architects can acquire the discernment they need now, except by working in and around technocracies. The older generation, politicised through hard knocks, was cynical and took the path of punk aesthetics and ironic consumerism to reconcile with the market. They still have no hint that technocracies have razed politics on its home ground despite knowing the EU or post Codesa South Africa. The redesign, that people like Sloterdijk and Latour identify as a front of repolitisation, occurs at the heart of bureaucracies and this of course raises horrified scorn in ageing punks who think that big helpings of hermeneutics or dialectics will bring back a critical opposition. Whoever can push the idiom of social engineering furthest in this situation has the advantage, almost every element of social engineering and alongside it, almost every utopia grew first within architecture sometime in the last three millennia and was first perfected in a colony, yet despite this architects are still waiting on special politics all of their own to arrive rather than recognise that their own tools of thinking and planning, thinking where what universally dissolved politics and heralded the managerialism that succeeds it: the original technocrats are tired of themselves now that architecture and urban planning are no longer the biggest managerial force in town.

PT: But wouldn’t you say that secrecy plays a part in the retaining of power – there is always separation between the many and the few in a hierarchy, and this is maintained by exactly the degree of removal and of mystery that preserves it.

JP: Remember a strategy today arises to correct previous strategies, constant redesign and institutional memory provide it with the most sophisticated present, the flexibility to play
in a growing game with emphasis rapidly shifting across parts. Strategies are hard to see only on account of their sheer size and minute detail. Paper tigers, like ideology, discourse or power are not what they use to keep you out of them - you can critique all the concepts, values and the apparent politics in a strategy and still be overwhelmed by its reach, institutional depth and inertia. Apartheid is like this, incoherent as an idea but endlessly fertile as a management principle, communism in contemporary China is like this and so is the apparently accephalic Post Reagan tradition of Republican America. These are strategies too subtle in practice, and in tactics, to be penetrable by ideas (which they would simply absorb and deploy from their own stronger vantage point anyway, leaving their critics dumbfounded or tainted). Technocracies do not operate inside history, where they would have to wait for impetus from something outside themselves, they don't wait for favourable 'conjunctures' to absorb, analyze and act upon. They are the exact opposite of the critical historicist graduate school that only sees a mounting Benjaminian chaos at its fashionably clad feet. Technocracies bring about events by design, then amplify and carefully couple their consequences: hence they thrived in close proximity to social engineering in the 20c, where of course they produced the sense of drowning history in its own ingredients. The USSR, Fukuyamas USA, Verwoerd's 1961 'overcoming' of colonial white history in Africa by its carefully constructed double are laboratories at the end of time. Even their bitterest opponents accede to their forms in order to reach into their mode of existence and perhaps reprogramme them.

Codesa refined and redefined both sides by liquidating politics to emancipate technocracy. Despite its bizarre portrayal as cathartic dialogue by the TRC, it was the clash of two highly evolved hierarchies, one to manage mobilisation for war the other to manage capital in a state-designed vacuum. Each used the other as a fully wired crash dummy. Neither aimed at anything beyond its own persistence and neither knows the other except as enemy. The one left with private ownership of the economy, the other with the task of turning mobilisation into management: this seemed to produce our novel ultra-managed society out of nothing, out of freedom or the future but in reality, directly out of each other.

PT: In her book, on the political, Chantal Mouffe criticizes left wing democracy as not really being an open discussion. Democracy, according to Chantal Mouffe, is under threat from complacency and a lack of interrogation of accepted norms. Democracy, which is held together by agreement, in the absence of conflict, becomes a farce and is not reflective of the jarring and warring of real concerns. According to Mouffe, antagonism creates enemies whereas 'agonism', a term she has coined, creates adversaries. Agonism implies a healthy level of disagreement which is not limited to the obvious rhetoric - so how can the environment be more agonistic, does that lie with political power, is that something that lies with public space or in the relationship between the public and the government?

JP: It's been a European dream that democracy, or the devolution of power to the majority, and unrestricted discussion aimed at consensus somehow go together. Jürgen Habermas is the greatest modern exponent of this view of civil society as inherently a conversation, therefore being able to reach some mutually satisfactory compromise or some kind of binding consensus through communicating. It's this pacification of public space, which is the striking political theme in Habermas, and perhaps the utopian aspect of his thought. Whereas for somebody like Chantal Mouffe, the very problem is the pacification of these processes which she equates with depoliticization. And then she and others will go on to say that depoliticization doesn't just happen because of the change in attitude or the change in civic form, it happens because the work done previously by politics has been taken over by something else, it's been taken over by management and by technocracy, of which the EU is a striking example. You have this situation where management by expertise displaces politics and conversely when you restart a political process from whatever means, from antagonism, agonism, scooping together populisms into a hegemonic frame, whatever the mechanism, you will first and foremost be displacing a technocracy. That is an interesting way into the South African situation, because despite each of Foucault's books having mapped the huge - hopeful or horrifying-terrain of normative rationality that makes the replacement of politics with technocracy possible, many architects, or more accurately teachers of architecture, have consistently uttered the most confused and unusable things in his name, despite architects being the first technocrats and the celebrated power - knowledge or biopower – which is the hallmark of managerialism. Foucault's works could be rewritten and brought out of the 19c in terms of purely architectural phenomena, just as we have seen Kittler overwrite them in media epochs or seen Sloterdijk write Heidegger out of time and historicism and into design and space.

PT: That is what the city is said to have become, Pier Vittorio Aureli says that urbanisation was the end of architecture forming the city and the beginning of management determining the built environment. The city is now managed which is why the experimentation of the Italian rationalists interests him, how to reinsert forms, the archetypes of architecture, back into the fabric, which ones will survive and how will they interact with one another because it's never clear. Architecture is autonomous but it is equally about the intersections, between these autonomous forms, that create new interactions.

JP: When we said just now that we should not wish to throw new forms into the mix, I really had people like Scolari and Rossi in mind. There's an old saying, never argue with a fool
because he will lure you onto his territory where he is much more at ease than you and beat you. It is a lesson for architects to stand by their seemingly limited repertory, which is at least theirs and not get drawn into spatial geography, financing, engineering, ergonomic issues, green environmental drives, historicist cultural conservationist policies, which are all completely extrinsic to architecture. If you simply reimagine these kinds of issues arising around mathematics departments or the composers of music, you would see just how extrinsic they are. But somehow the blur around the institutionalisation of architecture in the university allows people to believe there are all these proximities and common boundaries with human sciences or other self-adjudicating things that seem successful only because they are too inconsequential to fail.

**PT:** Do you think that the proliferation of connections to other fields could be linked to the scarcity of work at the moment?

**JP:** Work is scarce but it is a managed scarcity, it’s like the scarcity of diamonds. Diamonds are not really scarce but their availability is rendered scarce by certain groupings, alignments, cartels and so on. Italy has had a gigantic over-supply of architects – it has had about one architect to every 400 or so people. Work should really be very scarce but the cumulative effect is that architecture as a discipline (and in Italy architecture is taught in a very pure sense, doesn’t derive its prestige or posterity from surrounding disciplines as happens here) has simply permeated the society and the economy to the point where Italy is the world’s leading exporter of a certain kind of intellectual property. It is a design capital of the world, it is a design leader of the world, and it’s just created a greater and greater design capacity, which has seeped right throughout everything in that society. And this is design in the ability to completely reconceptualise materials, manufacture, social role, polemical role, aesthetic, stylistic role and political role but purely in architectural terms, in terms indigenous to architecture. So I would interrogate the scarcity, I think the scarcity is caused by architects themselves because they have been seduced away from the very powerful means at their disposal, the traditional means at their disposal, into believing that they can augment their power by becoming involved in different practices. Where of course they are lured by fools onto the fools territory, where of course an architect is not going to match the moves of a financier.

**PT:** Isn’t this something that has spread into the way that architecture is taught, it is always something that appealed to me about studying architecture, that it seemed so well-rounded, providing access into history, the natural environment, design across the range – a myriad of other interests. My vague interest in geology was also catered for – It makes you a very good person to have at a cocktail party because you have a smattering of knowledge about very many things but little in depth. I remember you once saying that the power that architecture has lies in its ability to synthesise information and to create connections between the various bubbles, operating between cultural, natural and political spheres. Has this power of synthesis become diffuse in the interpretation of the architect’s role, in its interpretation by academia and in practice? Latching onto other disciplines without maintaining that speculative distance, that removal which allows you to play with all of this cards while still keeping the essential card the priority. Because what you are actually working with is on a very formal level.

**JP:** I would add that in focusing on what is unique to itself, architecture does not have to eliminate all these other concerns, it simply has to realise that it focuses on all of them most powerfully from within its particular domain. One might say how can one focus on the nature crisis, on cultural heritage, on poverty interventions or the future of the city without becoming extraordinarily eclectic, without becoming someone who tries to master all these particular domains, but I think that view arises from seeing all of those things from within the university perspective as though they are disciplines. One very soon forgets that outside the university environment, in the market place, all of those very specific disciplines are applied to each other, to a problem or to a process at a particular point. And that point is only as good as the adhesion – you’ve got all of these disparate things being applied to produce a solution. Now architecture, design in a comprehensive sense, is that point of mutual application. And we find that even if the architects abandon it because they want to be amateur politicians, social geographers or social historians, it doesn’t become dysfunctional, it becomes very carefully inhabited by engineers who are the next step in the ladder of a design competence, and then by social engineers, technocrats and politicians, who are another tier in design. You’ve got a general demand for the design of a solution between all these different disciplines, factors, and this huge range that is always the milieu of architecture. The way they come together is in this much-maligned notion of design. If the architects leave that seat, someone else will sit on it, but all those someone-else’s are coming in with a design competence. The architects should simply dig deeper and mobilise and become far more in possession of the massive case histories that they’re standing on, all the way back to Vitruvius’ advocacy of intended projects. Architects need to take possession of that in such a way that no one can disintermediate them from it. It’s very hard for you and I to take hold of an economic argument in a way that will allow us to argue convincingly with Thomas Piketty or Joseph Stiglitz but it is impossible for even their economic policy to find traction in a city without a design solution. Our real colleagues, people who have been carrying the flame for architects, have been the very technocrats, managers of cities and the engineers.
PT: I would like to ask more about Scolari and Rossi, what was their project and what is the value in investigating them today?

JP: I've been in and out of Italy often in the last twelve months and fortunate enough to get to know and engage with colleagues and pupils of Rossi as well as many pupils and friends of Scolari. The Italians are always fascinated that someone in Africa should be so curious about Rossi and Scolari, who they see as a very important but quite Italian phenomenon. I think one should first honour the individuals, Rossi and Scolari, and their projects, that were undertaken in very difficult circumstances and not in any way obvious career or promotion gatherers. One can hardly name any other person who brought architecture back from death by banality in the nineteen-seventies like Rossi did. If you want a perspective on Rossi and Scolari today, you could parallel them with somebody like Jacques Lacan, who re-established the foundations of Freudian psychoanalysis. With Lacan there is the Russian sense that everything is given but not in any workable order—that all you can think and be is already cast and you arrive upon this as a latecomer needing huge inventiveness and courage to organise it and acquire yourself.

PT: Are you referring to the fact that we assume ownership of our own consciousness but that we act after the neurological event has occurred leaving us to interpret what we have done and in a sense moralise it?

JP: Yes we do that but its not neurological as much as an effect of the media through which we encounter ourselves and also of course architecture: speech, writing, diagrams and the exactitude that print gives to all this. Rossi navigates here by writing about recollection, putting him in a situation comparable to Raymond Roussel, where what can be said, thought and named somehow escapes what can be seen and recognised. In Rossi's day, when architects still had some concern with the general climate of ideas, it would have been possible to evoke Saussure or Riffaterte and say that Rossi sees every architecture formulation turning around its hypogram. Scolari takes this aspect of Rossi's thought so far that it becomes his own instrument. Scolari's writings address modernism very precisely and run oblique to his image making, splitting apart what book culture has taught us should be somehow reinforcing. Architecture does not have its Roussel or Duchamp moment through individuals except spread in those aspects of Loos or Corbusier or Benjamin's dusky incidental city that leave their housekeepers in the academy so puzzled: architecture as a practice, and its output, has always been on the level of the machines described by Foucault, inseparable from the manageability and regularisation of places and actions but its reflection on itself has often been borrowed or primitive until Rossi and Scolari reunited the way architecture thinks with the way it acts and exists. The last third of the twentieth century saw few unambiguously great works: les Mots et les Choses is the massive exception, we are all in debt to its pages: Rossi and Scolari's works are in every sense - quite literally - comparable to it.

PT: That is also the thing about Rossi, about inserting forms, things that are already there in the world, that when we interpret we introduce meanings that aren't there. Susan Sontag describes the reading of texts as the addition of meaning in order to make the raw works more acceptable to our time. If these works are already representations, in the end we have representations of representations, we loose all clasp of reality and power, spinning off in other directions into a world, which is increasingly full of noise, everything speaking to everything else to infinity.

JP: I understand why you would see that as sterile. That is not the notion of interpretation in psychoanalysis, when Freud talks about the interpretation of dreams – traumdeutung – deutung is a polemical term, almost closer to palm readers or gypsy crystal balls. It has little to do with hermeneutics or the true meaning of a text or action. It's more like the experience of finding something where is doesn't belong or where you'd never expect it. When such experiences go on occurring you realize that surprise and repetition are closely linked. This has little to do with digging out hidden meanings but more like burying all too well known things that keep tunneling up out of their grave.

PT: Would you say that aligns with the idea of the archipelago, that somehow the repetition is contained in the ocean and the fragments that appear from it, the forms that arise, while each unique, are all products of the same endless process of regeneration?

JP: It is more like the eternal return of the same, that heaven or hell dreamed up by Nietzsche in which architecture finally gives up the trade in novelty and diversion and develops the strength to carry the unvarying upon its shoulders.

PT: You mean that you never know what is surface? In Tarkovsky's Solaris, the sea gives rise to the images of your desires but those desires are in a way fickle and uncontrollable. That spectral image could be something that rips your life apart or could be the McDonalds around the corner...

JP: Well they're in play before you arrive on the scene. Your job is to keep arriving on the scene by no longer imagining it as deep or hidden but rather perfectly on the surface, superficial. How do you get with it? It's not a question of being more aware, politically correct, honest, engaged, or in with the in-crowd because as Deleuze and Guattari noted: if you are trying to get with a capitalist process, the only way you can experientially approach it is to be schizophrenic. So it is
no easy matter to decide - I’m going to incorporate this into my awareness then do something about it: where would you get to grips with what never stops and is never quite contemporaneous with you, der Andere Schauplatz, as the mystic psychophysicist Fechner put it.

PT: If these forms are endlessly repeating and if they are drawing from the same sea, they may look different but they are drawing from a collective. In painting, artists like Lucio Fontana and Francis Bacon must be dealing with the same thing – simplification or dissolving as a means to get behind representation, cutting through to expose something beyond. The cut and the dissolving are linked; they are two ways of perceiving inside and outside.

JP: How does one connect Fontana to Bacon? They are both irritable users of American abstraction with its insistence on media specificity, pure opticality that always hangs on the edge of collapsing into form and all the other great things that Greenberg correctly saw in it. In Fontana’s case he brings the medium to foreground by slashing the canvas, ingeniously, defining the point where the colour and the cloth can do no more together and, so to speak expire before our eyes. A key to Fontana is his lifelong love of somewhat sentimental ornament: that is the second way he intersects with architecture apart from his framing the void. With Bacon it’s different, almost from the opposite direction he pushes abstract expressionism to yield up a tale of actions and events - it is not very useful to describe this as figurative, any more than in de Kooning. Those who, in the eighties, latched onto the example of Beuys students emulating Bacon and mistakenly thought it was a postmodern franchise in Kollwitz and Koko-shka can now only hide their naiveté as eclecticism.

PT: Is architecture involved or only peripherally? How does collecting water on my roof help?

JP: I would like now, to consider the world’s preoccupation with sustainability in architecture. As architecture is a means of excluding nature and the elements, the view seems to be shifting from an idea of a hostile exterior to be shut out, towards something needing control, or perhaps that hostile exterior is at last taking revenge on us? In the South African situation this may raise the question of how Nature has been perceived in the past and how we view it now. On the one hand there is a movement towards preservation of the landscape but on the other there is the overly sanitised environment of the city, how are these opposing views brought into a single understanding of the Nature-Culture relationship?

JP: How do we see nature in South Africa? At the recent Pierneef exhibition we saw a nature that was depopulated, at the time Pierneef operated, everyone had been thrown off the land, South Africa was a diaspora. Therefore there was a motif among the colonials, that they were now indigenised into this blank canvas as though destined to inhabit it. Suddenly you would get Moerdijk churches popping up almost like surveyor’s beacons of this void, on the assumption that completely white urbanisation would follow in the wake of these structures. All these stylistically uniform, ingenious churches cropping up everywhere, almost like a Kafka fable. And of course today ‘Nature’ means riding a very expensive bicycle with your friends in some holiday resort and avoiding the informal settlement. It’s about feeling good, paying extra money for your coffee for a two rand carbon credit for children in Ethiopia, which is the way that capitalism has reformulated greenness; these are ingenious fantasies of marketing, like buying immortality by eating organic trout. On the other hand nature needs to be managed and in order for it to be managed, it needs to be brought out of a political process. The resource crisis will have to be managed carefully by civic management, and not by the private sector or soon Bill Gates will be renting us oxygen. It will mean the public sector getting involved in the management of nature, hand-in-hand with various scientists, hence a form of technocracy. Technocracies might become highly refined, no longer around the social engineering motif of managing people but around the management of nature, around the common conditions. One would hope that gets taken care of outside the orbit of commercial interests. Look at what happened with potential for common good like bandwidth, which is completely befuddled by the number of private interests running through it, government should nationalise the ITC industries because the right to communicate, transact and have information should be a citizen’s basic right, how does that sit with the fact that we have to rent space in a communicational sphere and the software to occupy it?

PT: If one is already so busy with disease, how does one get to grips with what never stops and is never quite contemporaously involved in those matters the way in which priests are involved in disease. I think it’s relatively simple to sit down, maybe with architects and with policy makers, and approach the current consensus on how to do this. It would be a very simple matter to work out all the ways in which a building or a structure, a designed artefact, can be useful and then just legislate that. It’s no different to the setbacks regarding light: Scolari said that the ordinances will be through ordinances which are perfectly clear, easily revisable and perfectly imposed —therefore they will cease to be a resource for architects to play funky variations on. And architects are poorly advised to reinvent themselves through those kinds of concerns because they are as out of their depths there as a meteorologist would be in designing a façade.
that the fundamental and underlying cause can’t be treated – so we tend to see the symptomatic as being unimportant, uncomfortable but having a lower status than the underlying causes. But in the case of our discussion, the symptom is extremely important, it is actually more important than the underlying.

**JP:** The kinds of things we deal with almost never have deep and meaningful strata underlying them but seem puzzling only because we regard their superficiality as banal. In an attractive and almost toy-like way, Wolfram showed that genuine complexity is reached after very few iterations of a simple rule on a two dimensional surface. You can infer from such experimental mathematics that the symptomatic is always underlain by something vastly plainer than itself and not by exciting depths. This complex surface is of course also the state in which we encounter most things and processes in our lives and the level on which we first begin understanding their consequences, properties and managing them.

There is a famous essay by Carlo Ginzburg, a contemporary and compatriot of Rossi and Scolari and in many ways their exponent albeit without ever mentioning them. Ginzburg, a famous historian, perhaps by way of reflecting on the nature of his craft after the collapse of historicism, writes about finding one’s way in the incidental, the banal, the obvious and overlooked, by using clues and traces, the forensic disorder on the borders of thought and the senses. He creates a triptych of Giovanni Morelli, Sherlock Holmes and Sigmund Freud as three thinkers who recreate the identity of an agent from next to nothing, from the despisedly incidental. In Morelli’s case, the true author of a painting, in Holmes, the author of a crime and in Freud, the unconscious insofar as it authors our daily blunders, vain sufferings and all our dreams. Ginzburg is almost perfectly devised to appeal to hypochondriacs those among us who set greatest store by symptoms (Holmes was almost certainly hypochondriacal, accompanied at every turn by his best friend, the doctor and always needing cocaine and retreats from polite company, Freud was quite similar)- yet the thrust of Ginzburg’s work is to show how capricious it is to be concerned with profundity when you could become more engaged with detail instead, and this is of course the lesson of his famous subjects as well.

**PT:** What about the transformation of the industry, it is happening slowly but the architectural degree and the professional environment are very exclusive, it’s expensive to study and seems to be restricted to the elite ‘family’. It is difficult to penetrate but it may be shifting... We already touched on the ‘africanisation’ of architecture in this country and the farcical aspect and limited precedent this usually involves.

**JP:** If you look at the equity index developed in Professor Keshlan Govender’s report, we are looking at the university demographic having parity with the national demographic in 40 years time. So the Govender report should be one’s baseline for evaluating transformation; it’s an interesting competent, very technical and un-emotive document. The issue of africanisation seems to me really a completely pointless decay because the major africanisation that one associates with liberation, national liberation movements and the achievement of a postcolonial status, all occurred in this country from 1910 onwards and effectively ended in 1994. It occurred in the hands of the first postcolonial society, which consisted of the Afrikaner. So when people read Ivy league treatises on the post-colony and they see all these traits of postcolonial societies, it’s easy to imagine that this is what is happening now, somehow expressed in the whole debate about the Rhodes statue, being unable to slap a white, Cecil the lion and so on but nothing could be more mistaken. What happened in South Africa is that all of the steps of postcolonial process, colonial devolution from British sovereignty to a Republic, happened in the hands of a particular small group as if they were miming this process while they initiated a total break from a colonial power in 1910, before almost any other independence movements. All of the characteristic processes of postcolonial societies were precipitated, undergone and tightly managed by the Afrikaners; the indigenisation of styles, institutions, a certain kind of 20c nationalism, in fact every postcolonial processes was applied and very successfully developed against the British. The Afrikaners really were like placeholders in a pure postcolonial space. So by the time the ANC liberates the majority from this experiment, everything that one could mention in terms of a postcolonial theme had already been explored and played out once. And interestingly played out in the same way most independence scenarios would play out, think of India and Brazil, in modernizing terms. So we are endowed with a modernistic infrastructure and an ultra modernistic society, the question of coming to terms with the oppressive South African past is really a question of coming to terms with Modernism because that past achieved oppression and unrestricted capitalist growth, by separating it from rights, and engulfed the merely colonial politics of the British, and other arrivals, in utopias of managerialism.

Countries like China, India, Singapore and increasingly America, don’t see democracy as a condition for free markets any longer but rather as an option or even a threat to future capitalist flexibility. The Afrikaners pioneered and perfected this style of value management long before the 21st century in which China globalized it. So we have a very rich history if you like social engineering. To say that one is going to offset this futuristic frictionless plane, for free markets minus democracy, with a decorative return to the Zimbabwe ruins is cynical. Simply from the way the early public buildings, post-94, rolled out, the present retreat of architecture, and the built environment professions, from transformation is predictable. The inappropriateness of that whole phase, the immense disregard for public engagement of any sort – that's
why I wrote that piece many years ago to say that the architects gave themselves a good conscience by creating a fantasy public, culled together from various academic motifs, social histories, spatial geography, art history and identities, whatever the theoretical fever of the day was, in order to say, well I’ve taken you into account. It rather reminds me of Lacan’s definition of love: love is when you give someone who doesn’t exist something you don’t have. And I think that sums up that phase of public buildings.

A properly transformed profession will come about, less from the efforts of its vaguely mandated representatives, than from understanding and allying with the public sector that manages all cities and infrastructure. Some futuristic colonial minorities understood this rapport very well in the 20th century, when such public administrations were in fact, cadres of Afrikaner expert managers and brought about some fascinating and autonomous experiments, particularly in Johannesburg, which became a kind of white oppositional utopia or a miniature America. Of course with the introduction of rights, it was naïvely assumed that architects and architectures, from and of the vast South African majority, would emerge to fill, the now vacant opportunities left by the retreat of all pirate regimes. Naturally the opposite happened, as ex-colonials reinvented themselves into developmental facilitators, NGOs, professional intermediaries, outreachers and proselytizers - in short enviving the sly colonial role of missionaries but this time moving much faster, without God. Transformation will come about from outside this deadlock, by increasingly counterpointing the norms developed by 300 million people in SADC with the endlessly over-explicated colonial standards, that somehow enjoy such a vigorous afterlife in South Africa, the self appointed exception.

The academy might help, rather than hinder this, by shedding its 19th century self-accrediting skin and finally breaking through to genuine polytechnic models, which could provide architecture with an incubational capacity and the ability to manage needs and resources internally, and with research programmes, worthy of that name. People of my generation can still remember how astonishingly fast the Soviet Union crumbled: in the same way the inflated overrepresentation of whiteness will crumble as soon as it is noticed that whiteness (in the sense of some Malcolm Bradbury inter-discipline called White Studies) is all too easily severed from its only supports - Westernness and Modernity, which now, of course, are experiments belonging to the majority and its transformed technocracies.
A Modern Myth

Mapping and Urban Framework

Patricia Theron & Arthur Lehloenyana
Pertinent Parks (Union Building's Framework 2015)
Racial Territories
Suburban Demarcation - Public Park

Adoption of public parks as racial formation of suburbs in the post-apartheid period in post-apartheid South Africa. The inner city and inner suburban park-usage is predominantly white and high-income groups. The outer city and western suburbs predominantly have lower-income groups occupying the same parks, but they are residential areas. Meanwhile, the peri-urban and rural areas have high-income groups occupying the same public parks. This implies that public open space availability is higher in the central and eastern parts of the city.
Interpreting the hill architecture of Pretoria & mythical readings of site (Union Building’s Framework 2015)
Mapping elements (Union Building's Framework 2015)
Areas of intervention (Union Building’s Framework 2015) (to the left) Herbert Baker’s original plan for the Union Buildings showing the proposed parliament buildings and ‘temple of peace’.
Proposed projects (Union Building's Framework 2015)
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