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INTRODUCTION

Global economic and social forces are affecting people and places everywhere. Despite its insistence as a mechanism for universal growth, the adoption of a neo-liberal world view has essentially led to a justification in restoring (and creating more) power for the economic elites, thus inviting intense competition among major global cities such as New York, Paris, London, and Hong Kong, as well as other cities throughout Europe, North America, and Asia. This worldwide competition has instilled great pressure upon emerging cities to become more accustomed and responsive to global trends of modernity. Since the late 19th century, the expansion and consolidation of free trade, global monetary systems, and the mass movement of goods, services and people, has gone hand in glove with the need to connect the world through networks (Kaika and Swyngedouw, 2000). Optimizations in technology certainly have led to standardized processes of architectural and urban project delivery. This proliferation of universalized spatial form has rendered a simulacrum effect not only illustrated in the trend-driven iconographic skylines and traditional planning processes (Fainstain, 1999; Sklair, 2006), but also everyday cultural activities within our cities.

However, general discourse on the topic has pointed towards a global occurrence of uneven development due to social, geographical, and financial exclusion or combinations of these factors (Harvey 2006; Smith and Harvey, 2008). Acknowledgement of this claim withstanding, the primary focus of this paper hinders on an examination and critique of the more conventional perception of globalization as branding sameness. Indeed, from these contrasting views, complex questions arise. What exactly is the nature of globalization? Has it yielded marginalization and exclusion? And if be the case, to what scale has homogeneity occurred within and between cities? Grounding itself in the debate surrounding globalization, Part 1 of the paper seeks to address these questions, first through an examination of key theory and rhetoric then followed by a look at the impacts on society, specifically cultural identity and the urban city fabric. What will become clear in this overview are the relational concepts of the global and local, which in turn provide a foundation for the subsequent alternative argument. Highlighted here within the parameters of neo-liberalism are limitations and constraints of universal tendencies. To understand and resist such tendencies, causal instruments must be critically analyzed alongside the existing cultural paradigms allowing them to operate.

As a response to the affects of globalization, the concept of regionalism proves to be such an attempt to thwart a deafening universalism. At its root, regionalism is characterized by main concepts of cultural production and identity and relations of geographical zoning or locality. Chapter 3 will cover the historical development of regional methodology from its ancient beginnings in the Greek and Roman Empires through the Enlightenment and further onto its battle with the International Style of modernism.

More recently, the alternative approach known as Critical Regionalism advocated by Mumford (1947, 2007), Tzonis and Lefavivre (1981, 2003) and Frampton (1998) has strived to mediate a balance between the impacts of universal society and elements derived directly or indirectly from the nature of a particular place. Chapter 4 will expand on this paradigm to understand its significant position alongside modernism within the urbanism debate.

Emanating as a spatial methodology, relevant examples in Part 3 will support the rhetoric, first highlighting works by noted modernist architects Alvar Aalto and Le Corbusier, before shifting scales to the more opportunistic and contested realms of post-colonial Algiers and Delhi, suggesting a framing of political and social governance in development. Lastly, a recent Taiwanese village project reveals the vitality of a critical regionalist approach in citing proposals that reinforce cultural identity as eventual urban transformation takes affect in developing regions.

Part 4 serves as a conclusion, reflecting upon and clarifying prior arguments while looking beyond critical regionalism. Presenting suggestions for future strategic contextual response alongside the evolving debates of urbanism, this paper seeks to address questions regarding the caution of labeling a movement, the limiting concept of intervening scale, and the responsibility and role of the professional. In a changing world, can a newfound sense of practice justly negotiate congested local and global landscape?
PART 1 THE LONG ARM OF GLOBALIZATION: A CONCEPTUAL AND PRACTICAL URBAN THREAT
CHAPTER 1 - THE STATE OF AFFAIRS: THEORIES AND MANIFESTATIONS OF THE GLOBALIZATION DEBATE

Due to the differing of perspectives and the difficulty in analyzing the processes involved, the debate surrounding globalization is highly conflictive. In order to address this contested concept and perhaps offer any legitimate alternative, it would be sensible to begin by examining basic theoretical characterizations of globalization through current interpretations and historical reference. This as a result of what Stuart Hall (1991) refers to as suffering from a process of ‘historical amnesia’- we believe that because we are only now thinking about something, it has only just begun.

Interpreting Globalization

With the early geographical movement of dominant empires, indeed the global flow of finance and culture has been maturing over the last centuries, amplifying within the last 100 years or so. A system-wide crisis in the 1870s led to the merging and growth of large corporate monopolies, the territorial breaking of the world into colonies, the export of capital, and a worldwide division of labor between the specialization production of goods and the production of raw materials. Not long afterwards, the Industrial Revolution ignited the adoption of a Fordist system of accumulation and regulation, resulting in mass production and technical management of labor (Petras and Veltmeyer, 2001). Arguably the more significant advancement occurred just prior to this in the context of a post-World War II East-West world division, wherein a major decolonization process and a determination, stemming from the global economic hegemony of the United States, to impose a liberal world financial order, created the framework for decades of consistent economic development known as the “Golden Age of Capitalism” (ibid.: 14).

Without diverging too far into capitalist rhetoric, it is important to note here that globalization, in its popular interpretation, is primarily an economic manifestation driven by technological advances, international cooperation, and a structural adjustment to global economic and political order dominated by multinational corporations and large international institutions (Voisey and O’Riordan, 2001). Apart from this popular economic representation, globalization is also very much aligned with social change, hence the argument that a global society is emerging complementary to a world economy. Seeking to account for nearly all of the economic, political, social, cultural and geographical characterizations within the modern world, globalization essentially renders itself a densely conflictive theory and meta-narrative (Clark, 2006).

Along these lines, Giddens (qtd. in Voisey and O’Riordan, 2001: 29) locates social issues at the root of his interpretation stating that “globalization concerns the intersection of presence and absence, the interlacing of social events and social relations ‘at distance’ with local contextualities” expounding that “Globalization can thus be defined as the intensification of world-wide social relations which link distant localities in such a way that local happenings are shaped by events occurring many miles away and vice versa.” Here, Giddens would lead us to understand globalization as a social phenomenon resulting from the capitalism, militarization, and industrialization of the modern project-an idea Habermas (1998), in recalling Weber and the Enlightenment philosophers, says initially consisted of the development of objective science, universal morality and law, and autonomous art forms based on a narrow inner logic. Acknowledging Habermas’ terminology, Harvey (1989: 13) criticizes the concept and excitement of the modern project as doomed to “transform the quest for human emancipation into a system of universal oppression in the name of human liberation.” (See further modernity and Enlightenment comparisons in Part 2.)

Globalization can also be defined from the perspective of a cultural argument. Milton views culture as “consisting of everything we know, think, and feel about the world” (1996: 215), thus citing globalization as the way the world is imagined or perceived versus the events that actually happen throughout the world. This could however, in some regard, be the result of a kind of cultural imperialism- the spreading, imposing, and filtrating of values and habits from a foreign culture to and at the expense of another (Said, 1993; Tomlinson, 1991). On the other hand Robertson sees it as simultaneously inside and outside culture, stating that “globalization as a concept refers both to the compression of the world and the intensification of consciousness of the world as a whole” (qtd. in Voisey and O’Riordan, 2001: 29). Short (2001) also refers to a certain compression caused by the world flows of capital, polity and global culture, or what Castells (1989) refers to as a ‘space of flows’- material and immaterial components of global
information networks through which much of the economy is coordinated, in real time across distances.

These interpretations, all valid and yet contrasting, highlight the many faces of globalization. In a way they also suggest a status quo or current state of affairs. Generally speaking, any existence of a status quo yields a form of opposition. In this case, as globalization occurs, there also exists a culturally concentrated de-globalization that attempts to resist such a world compression. Maintaining suspicion towards globalization, there could be a slight misconception in the totalitarian nature of the concept. For a moment then, let us briefly examine some vulnerability within the argument, if only to remain strategically fair in the filtering of theory.

As noted, economic globalization, if labeled separately, refers to a ‘global market’ where borders are crossed and distance is traveled with relative ease by businesses, currency, and goods. However, Voicey and O’Riordan (2001) declare a more level field than suspected—only a select handful of firms, mostly financial, can claim to operate in multiple arenas while an economically derivative labor force has yet to truly achieve progressive levels of global movement. Linked to urbanization, with economic development, employment is redistributed through sectors, and since different locations become the sites for different sectors of production, so the labor force is territorially redistributed” (Harris, 1991: 23).

Using a specific example, Clark (2006) looks to the proliferation of transnational corporations such as Nike. While often criticized for exploiting poverty and environmental degradation in the developing world, the company yields most of its profits by way of the Western world where consumers, employees, and manufacturers resist exploitation.

An important, but still perhaps weak rebuttal that Voicey and O’Riordan (2001) bring up within the political debate is how, in light of ‘global’ issues such as the environment and the rise of transnational organizations, the powers of nation states are being called to question (see also Short, 2001). In reality though these organizations mobilize around issues usually involving limited states and people. In the case that many states are involved, the organizational manner is often not uniform (some constituencies mobilized here and there, etc.). Therefore to perceive these actors as truly global with consistent impact is slightly erroneous (ibid.).

Likewise flawed is the claim that a ‘world culture’ has come to dominate the globe. Any version of a ‘world culture’ is one indisputably marked by precise organization and in some cases a manipulation of diversity, rather than simulacrum. History itself has in fact demonstrated a promotion of cultural diversity (AlSayyad, 2001).

Despite truth in the argument that global diversity has yet to completely give way to a defining world culture, there are degrees of homogeneous global compression requesting attention and action. The issue therefore lies in understanding the scale and nature of this homogeneity, a subject that being a primary focus of this paper will be covered in detail within the next and following chapters.

Figure 1
The golden arches of McDonald’s rising next to a Chinese pagoda, China 2009

The Neoliberal Relationship
It has been discussed here that the issue of capital is a primary element of globalization discourse. Ever-present where there is talk of capital is the idea of neoliberalism. Like globalization, neoliberal rhetoric has been around for centuries, though it began to materialize as guiding policy in the 1970s and 1980s across Western Europe and North America (Eick, 2009). As highly a polarized debate as globalization, neoliberalism contains main principles that attempt to simplify its role in shaping strategies of social policy. The first principle of individual autonomy rests as the foundation of any liberal society. Second, the market is seen as the most effective way to distribute goods and social wealth. Last, but certainly not least, is the idea that the State is a potential obstacle for both autonomy and an efficient market and therefore needs to be a non-interventionist body (ibid.). However, as Eick (2009) points out, due to the importance of governing scales above and below State ‘level’, neoliberalism actual signals a ‘hollowing out’ of the State
rather than a complete vanishing. While Neoliberalism, like its predecessor Liberalism, is appealing in its premise of openness and promotion of the individual, the course of action that has resulted from its policy implications have garnered equal criticism as praise.

David Harvey takes a highly cynical stance against the issue stating that...

We can examine the history of neoliberalism either as a utopian project providing a theoretical template for the reorganization of international capitalism or as a political project concerned both to re-establish the conditions for capital accumulation and the restoration of class power. I argue that the last of these objectives has dominated. Neoliberalism has not proven good at revitalizing global capital accumulation but it has succeeded remarkably well in restoring class power. As a consequence, theoretical utopianism of the neoliberal argument has worked more as a system of justification and legitimation for whatever had to be done to restore class power- principles of neoliberalism are quickly abandoned when they conflict with the class project. (Harvey, 2006: 149)

It is not my intention here to suggest that neoliberalism and globalization are synonymous world movements. However, it is clear that they share consequential mechanisms that have burdened the working class, the social state, and the domestic manufacturing of capital, hindering sustained social development (Peck and Tickell, 2007), and thus having a parallel effect in the creation and governing of physically diverse urban environments.

Conclusion
In effort to present a rounded overview of the debate, I have entertained contrasting views of globalization, noting its definitive character as “the world-wide distribution and interaction of economic, political, and cultural processes” (Short, 2001: 10). Beyond this “connective” description however, is a threatening infusion within the national and local. If the arms of Globalization indeed span great lengths, exactly what consequences are being transposed at levels of everyday operation in society? How then does the localized event translate back to the global? And is this global threat justified?

Noting questions of scale, Chapter 2 will address urban repercussions linked with governance, culture, and the production of space, anticipating the need for alternative approaches alongside globalization.

CHAPTER 2 - URBAN REPERCUSSION: GOVERNANCE, CULTURE AND SPACE
Introduced in the first chapter, the concept of globalization begs for further clarification as to its scale effect. As Jennifer Robinson (2006) observes, there is a fundamental need to “bring the city itself back into view” by eschewing global enquiries and minute localization separately and thinking of the city as whole- its complexities and diversities. However, she does not discard globalization completely, citing reconfiguration of political processes and expansion of city-level government as well as city regions becoming more central to modern life (ibid.). Directly linked to these changes in organizational scale and the shifting of the spatial realm is the sustaining of collective identities across contested boundaries.

Governance and Organization
The reconfiguration of polity under globalization and its influence within urbanism as mentioned by Robinson (2006: 119) is nothing new, hinting at a long history of “proactive political engagement in ‘making’ city spaces.” Striking a similar chord, Madanipour asserts that Global economic and technological change has caused social and political upheavals at local and national levels, forcing people, organizations and governments to find new responses to these major challenges. As telecommunications and transport technologies enable resources and people to move around the world at ever faster speeds, institutions designed for smaller scales and slower modes of operation find it increasingly hard to cope. (Madanipour, et al, 2001: 1)

With the supposed existence of a ‘world economy’ as mentioned in the first chapter, economic growth and decline result from a dependency on a global investing network, while national and local authorities tend to surrender partial territorial control. Reasoning for this occurrence lies in new challenges due to regional competition in attracting resources within the global marketplace and the general rising of political significance of regions (Madanipour, et al 2001). Furthermore, this regional argument also manifests in terms of
growing environmental concerns as seen in the emerging bioregionalism rhetoric (Dodge, 2007; Coates, 2007) and advocated by knowledgeable citizens whose skepticism of authority has led to expectations of better services and more participation in their own affairs (ibid.). As a side note, despite the fact that we attribute depleting resources and waste accumulation to the very ideal of globalization, developed countries (the G8 and G20 for example) have grown dependent on a ‘globalism’ to forge a collective and comfortable initiative towards environmental sustainability (see Twinn: 5 in Porritt, 2008). Again, this increases competitiveness between countries and a possible disparity in the appropriation for those societies who have not developed enough to garner influence over resource based prosperity. Nevertheless, a positive outcome emerges- as major players engage in competition, city regions and localities, as opposed to nation-states, can possibly develop more aggressively and distinctively (ibid.). In this, a weakening nation-state yields a two way response- “It goes above the nation-state and it goes below it” (Hall, 1991: 27).

According to Porritt (2008: 23), conventional economic growth and the “machinery of global government” is the “unaccountably successful means of enslaving the vast majority of the world’s people in order to enrich already inconceivably rich elite” and pose perhaps the greatest challenge for new urban strategies. Developing countries, in many ways are attempting to step in and curb the disparity of people having a right to resources, though as witnessed, it is often the developing countries contributing to the ever-pressing marginalization. As peripheral regions engage in a transition from an industrial or developing phase they are consistently met with a floundering of living conditions and likewise exclusion from the decision making processes and cultural experiences enjoyed by their fellow world citizens (Madanipour, 2001, Porritt, 2008).

**Global and Local Cultural Implications**

So far presenting much of the globalization debate from an economic and governmental prospective, it would make sense to turn attention to the receiving constituency of culture. The concept of culture and specifically, the localization of culture is a defining component in the way places and resources are used and evolve over time. As the related economic and political climate evolves, so does the need for a reassessment of cultural transitions in the midst of global change. When covering a decline of nation states, Hall (1991) hinted that the response is simultaneous global and local- two faces of the same movement that yielded a new kind of globalization. Definitively linked, a new form of mass culture, in his specific example of British examination, is dominated by a modern cultural production of images and linguistics.

As Allen and Massey contend (qtd. in Voisey and O’Riordan, 2001: 37), “We are part of more than one world. We live local versions of the world and in doing so we have to locate ourselves within the wider global context.” The way we relate to each other socially is very much grounded in our location, but now that location is infused with ideas and events that are not entirely confined to one place. Elements of a particular place evolve over time as in the case of Liverpool where distinctions in gender, ethnicity, religious, housing types and a heterogeneous music scene emit a process of cultural exchange that point to the impossibility of separating the local and global (Meegan, 1995). An issue with this evolution is that in arguably many cases, the influence and intensity of a wider global context is increasing and therefore eroding, at different speeds, the very nature of local. A major rethinking of local particulars must exist, one that Massey argues “allows a sense of place that is extroverted, which includes a consciousness of its links with the wider worlds, which integrates in a positive way the global and the local” (1994: 154-56). Strategic regional negotiation between global and local will be examined further in following chapters.

Within the debate of cultural reformation, Smith (2001) gives much attention to the writing of David Harvey, whose main argument holds that capital is the primary drafier of social change. Harvey’s view suggests an opposing duality where the global is a top-down, anthropomorphized capital restructuring while the local is the site of “place-bound identities and a reactionary politics of aestheticized spatiality” (1989: 305). Despite a strong and detailed critique of Harvey’s oeuvre, Smith agrees that even though the idea of oppositional place-based movements defining a locality has strong merits, they are no doubt up against a relentless foe “whose processes of accumulation thrive on constantly disrupting the spatial and temporal arrangements upon which stable forms of local social organization might be constructed” (Smith, 2001: 103-4).
progressive social movements countering these economic exploitations, cultural dominations, and politically oppressive actions, he argues that, “people have no choice other than to surrender or to react on the basis of the most immediate source of self-recognition and autonomous organization, namely their locality” (qtd. in Voisey and O’Riordan, 2001: 72-73). Believing in a general resistance to the process aims of neoliberalism, Castells reiterates rather that people prefer to ground themselves in community clusters that eventually generate a sense of belonging and cultural identity as witnessed in the still pervasive nature of African American ghettos despite growing racial hostilities (1989, 2006: 60). While Castells reference may be true, it again has repercussions for societies at a larger scale. If we see globalization as a repressive force, one that in such situations, cultures fragment and identities de-construct, then at what scale does pressure to resist and defend identities around local characteristics and strengths exist? Does a narrow sustaining of identity become passively miniature, or worse marginally excluded? Is culture overrun by banal homogeneity?

Spatial Ramifications
Contesting cultural implications has unsurprisingly led us to the significant interaction between the concepts and construction of ‘space’ and ‘place’ within the globalism debate. Foucault has famously argued for the “fundamental importance of space in any form of communal life and any exercise of power” (quoted in Madanipour, et al, 2001: 10). Lefebvre (1991) also contended that because ‘space’ is at the root of the totality of political, economic, and cultural conditions of society, it thus becomes a central concept in the urgency for infusion of spatial thinking within planning discourse and practice. In discussing the semiotics of the city, Barthes (1997) points to growing awareness in functionality of symbols within urban space and the tendency of simulation among planners. If globalization is indeed the culmination of flows and ‘space’ is the fundamental variable across flows, then ‘space’ becomes the primary factor to gauge global impact. Hitting again on Harvey’s argument that capital is the driver of social structure; Castells (1979) details this notion pertaining to the spatial logic of industry where between production and space, the industrial plant represents the determining effect of capital gaining potential on the positioning of organizational management.
Interestingly, Castells follows this with the claim that a freedom of location has increased in relation to geographical constraints and advances in technology. Due to the birth and growth of electricity and distribution networks of energy, a certain homogenization of space through energy has occurred (ibid.). It is not difficult to imagine how, in many cities, industrial zones look strikingly homogenous and are often located in the same relative proximity or distance to other zones.

While Castells’ industrial location meta-narrative example is finite and possibly speculative, it represents the transformative power of influence in globalization to “induce particular spatial dynamics in the evolution and management of urban territories and systems (Pieterse, 2008: 17). Similarly, Short (2001) asserts that the transformation of ‘space’ into ‘place’ through a result of certain exclusions, constraints, and determining factors is exactly the reason power is exercised.

As reverberated so far throughout Part 1, locations are a blended conundrum of different processes at different scales, processes that are ever-evolving. Globalization comes and goes within these processes thus overwhelming the constructed significance of place and, according to Short (2001: 17), creating a “bland space that covers most of the world.” However, as we have seen that localization is not a mere acceptor of globalization, but rather one half ingredients in a cauldron of exchange, then too is the relation between the two concepts not only about the construction of space but rather the emergence of a new form of space-place existence. “Globalization unfolds over space; globalization takes place. Through and in globalization place is transformed into space and space is reworked into place” (ibid: 18). Short’s arguments are informative but perhaps incomplete in the sense that he is basically presenting an “as is” scenario. Although he does admit that while globalization is creating places, it is also undermining their construction through a space-time merging, cultural homogenization, economic re-globalization, and political disintegration. Despite a counter re-creation resulting from these discontents, the question of what type of recreation still needs to be addressed. In this author’s opinion, even along the beliefs that contest naïve homogenization theories, favoring a growing differentiation theory will only lead to a further detailed understanding of the globalization nuance rather than beginning to offer truly significant and timely spatial alternatives to deal with the effects of globalization.

**Conclusion**

As culture has become increasingly placeless, urbanism will continue to be an arena where one can observe the specificity of local cultures and their attempts to mediate global domination (AlSayyad, 2001: 13). Whether in the conflicts of interpretative theory presented in Chapter 1 or in the diversified arguments of scale and repercussion cutting across governmental, cultural, and spatial realms seen in this chapter, the long arm of globalization is indeed intensified and far-reaching than ever in the present day. Without radically discarding the global event entirely, I maintain that changes brought upon society by global flows of capital, politics, and production has rendered global culture “a single homogenized system of meaning” (Tomlinson, 1999: 71). Evident threats stemming from this stronghold seek to establish globalization as an issue still requiring immediate attention.

In Part 2, I will expound on these issues, further examining the idea of a regional argument as a result of global modernity. Within this responsive paradigm, concepts of cultural identity, location-based resources, and strategic spatial planning yield a definitively critical and necessary alternative to an all encompassing and determining view of globalization.

**PART 2. THE REGIONALIST ARGUMENT: AN ALTERNATIVE APPROACH**

CHAPTER 3 - A HISTORICAL POSITIONING OF “REGIONALISM” IN URBAN THEORY AND PRACTICE

The threats and consequences created by an unrelenting global space of flows, as presented in Part 1, have stirred a resistance within architectural urbanism discourse and practice. Significant opposition to certain universal homogeneity has long been reverberating in the form of a ‘Regionalism’ argument that sees resulting development as a derivation of contextual characteristics. In order to properly position the concept of regionalism as an alternative, it makes sense to first look at its place in history. This chapter will introduce the emergence of Regionalist thinking, spanning from the dominance of ancient civilizations to the heated conflict with 20th century modernism and more current reconfigurations.
Ancient Beginnings

Though the idea of regionalism has exploded towards the end of the last century, its origins date back to the empire of ancient Greece. Albeit in a manner of dominant colonial control, the Greeks used architectural and urban elements to enact a representative identity of a group occupying a piece of land. Tzonis (2003) adds that rather than simplistically seeing Doric, Ionic, and Corinthian as mere abstract decorations, these diverse patterns were results of tangible historic contexts of regional fusion, often full of complex political themes, thus molding intra-regional relationships and identities.

These examples illustrate possibly the earliest forms of colonialism, a virtue that generally undermines a ‘bottom-up’ regional perspective. However, for the sake of historic positioning, Tzonis’ example reveals a conscious endeavor in terms of highlighting and promoting cultural identity, despite the fact that it may have been erasing some opportunities for true regional character and fruition.

In terms of textual origin, Tzonis (2003) turns attention to the historic writings of Vitruvius, who held that regional architecture was shaped by particular internal and external physical restrictions. Fundamental to his position was the idea that different Nature(s) was the ordaining force behind the diversified types of structures that appear from one region to another. Vitruvius segue into a political parallel; a move that Tzonis notes is where contradictory in his general rhetoric lies. He believed that as Nature dictated certain building forms it so created a type of people- a ‘temperate’ environment yielded ‘temperate’ architecture and therefore ‘temperate’ society. According to Tzonis (ibid.), because the Romans were themselves a result of this precise ‘temperate’ environment, Vitruvius was implying that it made sense for Roman way to be spread throughout the world and their architectural styling applied universally. Of course this highlights again an attribute of the colonialist reach of the Roman Empire, but Tzonis wishes to acknowledge that Vitruvius’ initial assessment of a regional architecture, sans the political allusion, has seminal merit. After all, it is this work that inspired Leon Battista Alberti centuries later in his own 10 Books on Architecture.

It is generally regarded in architectural history that a fundamental change in expression grew out of Constantine’s decision to relocate the capital from Rome to Constantinople (now Istanbul). The transition is ever clear in the story of St. Sophia whose first version was a timber-roof basilica modeled after old St. Peter’s in Rome, imported as the predominant style of the time and thus not built of its place. By the time the original was destroyed by fire, the Romans had found a respect for the cultural richness of the conquered region (Speck, 2007).
New found regional awareness led Justinian to construct the Hagia Sophia (Figure 6), a landmark of innovation, combining the vastness of Constantine’s Basilica in Rome, the ornamentation characteristic of Asia Minor, and ‘Oriental’ surface patterns. This pioneering fusion alongside the growing influence of modern Roman culture signified new spatial opportunities and technological advances that fueled a spark into architecture (ibid. 74). Eventually spreading throughout the Empire as well as to distant lands and cultures, invoking divergent and sometimes bastardized expressions, Speck’s maintains the notion that the root of these developments was heavily based on regional qualities (ibid.).

Renaissance Revival
Byzantine architecture, as illustrated by the Hagia Sophia example, was sparked by a phenomenal mixture of cultural influence and style. However, in the same essay, Speck (2007) cautions that not every ‘regional impetus’ results from a ‘momentous’ episode, citing that a certain renewal of conscious attention to the evolving character of place can just as well prompt innovative advancement. Keying on the Italian Renaissance as a prime example, he hints on what might be the best example of civilization’s resilience in the face of a societal lull and vulnerability.

By the end of the 15th Century, Gothicism had achieved a universal dominance, an influence certainly ill-suited for the sun soaked climate of Italy. Though Gothic failed to conquer the region, it hindered the production of true Italian form, specifically in those arenas politically dominated by foreign forces such as Florence, where an anti-Gothic resistance emerged, seeking a renewal of classic Roman traditions (ibid.). Brunelleschi, a strong proponent of the Renaissance, traveled often to Rome studying the ancient form and construction methods of important structures, with intentions of reinstating a once dynamic and stable regional architecture. Noting parallel affects in literature, art and civic pride, Speck contends that Italy, more than any other place, seemed the sensible location for such an architectural realigning as it was a regionally inspired movement, (ibid.). However, as we will see later, a narrow resistance welcomes criticism if merely ‘recalling’ traditional forms and construction methods as true alternative regionalism.

From Enlightenment to the Avant Garde
Asserting a linkage between regionalism, historicism, and romanticism, due to their claims that specific, local and inherited practices guide cultural values, including architecture, Alan Colquhoun (2007: 141), quickly applies a critical paradox that the very concept that assumes inter-cultural understanding, re-introduces a certain degree of the universal that it has just shunned. This paradox implies the main drawback of the Enlightenment. As did historicism and romanticism, the Enlightenment challenged the essence of the classicist ideal that dominated Europe since the Renaissance, though it had left various concepts, such as imitation, in place (ibid.).

Following this train of thought, Foucault cites the 19th century as obsessed with history, considering space as “the dead, the fixed, the undialectical, the immobile” (quoted in Madanipour, et al, 2001). Colquhoun reiterates that due to this obsession with the past, the 19th century failed to free itself from the classical trend of imitation, going as far as to say that “the problem of how to recover eternal architectural values without imitating the forms in which they were embodied was apparently insoluble” (Colquhoun, 2007: 141). This idea of resisting imitation proves to be a central variable theme in not only the comparative relations of regionalism to similar paradigms but also in the internal contradictory character of the regionalist argument itself which will be examined in greater detail later.

In Part 1 the dissolving of the nation-state was suggested as a result of economic and political globalization. However, in the 19th century, the power of the nation-state was increasing and so with it the influence of Regionalism. In some cases, groups whose identity had been ignored began declaring independence, while other nation-states came to romanticize their own folk traditions (Colquhoun, 2007). German Romanticism was looking for unified cultural and political identity already enjoyed by France and England. Throughout the 19th century, this Romantic folk idea clashed with idea of material progress and liberal politics. The Art Nouveau movement was both progressive in the sense that it ignited a resistance of classicism and the search for new forms, and regressive as it recalled tradition in the face of industrialism. Likewise in France and Germany, experimentalism strengthened alongside conservatism. A regional architecture movement also emerged in France, similar to the Swiss German Heimatschutz (homeland protection) paradigm (ibid.).

In regards to the Enlightenment, avant-garde architecture has played a significant part in its path forward. A Neoclassicism of the mid 1700s became a mechanism for the spreading of universal civilization. One hundred years
later however, the historic avant-garde took opposition towards neoclassical form and industrial processes (Frampton, 1998).

The coming of the 20th century and WWI brought further change to architectural discourse and practice. The liberating promise of the modern project bloomed as a result of the successes in science, medicine, and industry. Le Corbusier emerged as a major proponent of a universal modernism, his based on abstract painting and the industrialization of the building trades. Claiming to work within the French classical tradition, which was seen as a key element of regionalist architecture, he later stumbled into a dialectic view of classicism and from the 1920s onward, Le Corbusier’s interest in the vernacular and regional grew (Colquhoun, 2007). A belief in reconciling popular regional traditions with modern technology fueled much of his following work:

Architecture is the result of a state of mind of its time. We are facing an event in contemporary thought, an international event. The techniques, the problems raised, like the scientific means to solve them, are universal. Nevertheless, there will be no confusion of regions: climatic, geographic, topographic conditions, currents of race and thousands of things still today unknown, will always guide solutions toward form conditioned by them. (translated/quoted in Colquhoun, 2007: 144)

The inclusion of Le Corbusier’s role within the regionalist chronology is strategically two-fold. His status within the modernist paradigm confirmed, the allusions and interest in the regional interpretations of architecture and his eschewing of what Habermas (1998) claimed as the Enlightenment’s ill-fated emancipation desires validate not only his shift in creative approach, but also reveal further questions linked to the regional and modernist contradictions.

Post WWII and the International Style Conflict
If regionalism has been at the core of development for centuries, gestating as a result of the Enlightenment, the end of WWII marked a significant firestorm of debate. Dating back to the New York Museum of Modern Art’s landmark 1932 exhibition, *The International Style*, by Philip Johnson and Henry-Russell Hitchcock, ‘modern’ architecture was ‘introduced’ to the world. But in 1947, Philip Johnson was absent from his post at MoMA, an opportunity seized by Elizabeth Mock, a fiery young architect, to curate the traveling show *Built in the USA 1932-44* (Lefaivre, 2003). In the accompanying catalogue, Mock disputed the International Style as “badly assimilated European modernism,” and in offering her version of modernity/the modern architect, stated that “architecture deals with mechanical equipment, furniture, textiles, and utensils, the space around buildings and the relationships of one building to another... has a view of the scope and social responsibility of his profession” (ibid: 24).

In the same year, Lewis Mumford (1947) published a controversial article in his New Yorker column ‘Sky Line’ that in defending regionalism, identified a specific group of San Francisco based regionalist architects producing a “native and humane form of modernism” (ibid:25). For the first time ‘bottom-up’ design, claiming superiority was seen as a threat to the so called ‘top-down’ elitism propagated by MoMA. Having returned, Philip Johnson again along with Hitchcock and Alfred Barr, quickly launched a roundtable rebuttal session in 1948 responding to Mumford’s attack (ibid.).

That evening Walter Gropius, founder of the Bauhaus, unsurprisingly defended the idea of functionalism, claiming that “what we have looked for in architecture today is a new approach; not yet a style. A style is a successive repetition of an expression which has become settled, as a common denominator... The real International Style consists of those borrowed Greek buildings, like the museums and banks and ministries throughout the world, from Leningrad to Washington, but the idea of the so-called International Style was regional in character, developing out of surrounding conditions” (MoMA, 2007: 302). In a similar vein of a misconception, Marcel Breuer continued that “If International Style is considered identical with mechanical and impersonal rigorism, down with International Style!” further asserting that “Le Corbusier did not build his machine for living! (ibid: 303-4). Peter Blake, in less defensive mode, branded regionalism as “trying to delay the industrial revolution in building that was finally taking place in America” (Lefaivre, 2003: 26).

Though these and other giants of architecture passionately defended their work, the regionalist claims certainly had affected those in attendance, especially the younger architects. Gerhardt Kallman, architect and teacher at Harvard offered a distinction of post-war regionalism from a mere “folkloristic revivalism”, viewing the shift as trying to surmount the “over schematic and blatant
solutions in earlier phases of modern architecture” (ibid.: 26). Christopher Tunnard, a planning professor at Yale criticized the International Style as “untailored to local conditions,” humorously noting that “functionalism of materials has blazed our thinking around the world because you will find that the building in Rio for the Education Ministry looks exactly like a building that was designed for a giraffe in the London Zoo” (ibid.: 27).

Mumford, in famously closing the session by asking the profession and the world, ‘what is happening in modern architecture?’, he attested to the idea of flexibility in approaching problems from a dialectic human nature- the introvert and the extrovert (MoMA, 2007). This bears parallel to the dialectic alternative mentioned earlier that carries a simultaneous global and local sense. Mumford believed that in searching for a new paradigm; ‘they’ were disposing of the very character that can lead to a true internationalism where people do not ask for a style simply because the local product and method is so sensibly ingrained (ibid.).

As far as architecture and urban fabric is concerned, the explosion of the modernist movement brought as much innovation as it did criticism. Those who resisted such tendencies did not merely wish to suppress advancement, but rather they believed in a necessary critical view towards production. Under the general opinion of those in opposition to a strict and functional modernity, if innovations in industrial technology prompted new desires in architectural expression, then there was a way to ensure a strategic synthesis of this progress alongside an inherent focus on humanity, environment, and locality.

(Note that Kaufman was present at the MoMA debate, defending Modernism alongside Breuer, Blake, Gropius, et al.)

**The Flight of a Critical Rebellion**

For a while it appeared the strength of MoMA and the talented purveyors of modern architecture had lost little ground in their convictions despite critiques from Mumford and negative reception from the younger generation. Johnson and Hitchcock continued to champion the International Style through a series of exhibitions one in the form of revisiting their earlier MoMA production and later in 1952, a sly ‘hijacking’ of Mock’s successful show under the name *Built in the US*, as well as great attention and dependence on the building of the new United Nations headquarters in New York (Lefaivre, 2003).

In reality though only half of the work presented in *Built in the USA* fell under the consideration of International Style. Projects from Frank Lloyd Wright, Eero Saarinen, and Paolo Soleri, among others, certainly expressed regionalist qualities and have all become classics under the regionalism genre (ibid.). Public and professional backlash against elitist modernism had intensified especially with the completion of the United Nations building (Figure 8). Paul Rudolph, architect and leader of the highly regionalist Sarasota School in Florida claimed that it brought the “so-called International Style close to bankruptcy” (ibid: 29).

Towards the end of the 1950s, the tables had turned. Johnson and other of the big heads had swung the other way. Regionalism’s star shone no brighter than in the massive, ironically international building programs- the USA State Department’s Embassy initiative

Figure 7
Frank Lloyd Wright’s hugely contextual Edgar J. Kaufman, Sr. House, better known as “Falling Water” built in 1934 - Mill Run, Pennsylvania, USA

Figure 8
The United Nations Building Complex on the banks of the East River with Manhattan skyline in the background- New York City, NY, USA
and that of Hilton Hotels in the Mediterranean arena. In retrospect, without going into specific detail, the outcomes of these programs were seen as rather meek examples— "surface, themed, or branding kitsch" (ibid: 31).

This kind of shallow 'regionalism' was furthest from what Mumford had dreamed. Granted he never confined his ideas to one concise volume and his departure from various prior styles of regionalist thought (namely the Renaissance and Romanticism) made him hard to pin down. However, Lefaivre (2003) notes, what set Mumford's regionalism apart was that it not only criticized an imposing power such as modernism, but more importantly it was critical of the regionalist idea— a break from the century old tradition of seeing itself as absolutely anti-universal.

The Arrival of a Critical Regionalism
For Mumford, regionalism was a negotiation of forces, a process of integration rather than segregated resistance. And as I have hopefully illustrated in this chapter, he understood that this conflict had occurred throughout history, evolving and manifesting itself in various ways and to varying degrees.

This belief was made clear in the concluding remarks of his famous essay The South in Architecture, where he proclaimed…

These outside influences must usually be modified; they must always be assimilated. Sometimes they are too numerous, as was the case with the various cults that Imperial Rome sought to take to her bosom; sometimes they are too overwhelming, as was the case when highly organized machine industry wiped out the handicraft industries that might often have survived on a basis of local service, but could not compete with the machine in a distant market. But the drama of human development centers in part on this tension between the regional and the universal. As with a human being, every culture must both be itself and transcend itself; it must make the most of its limitations and must pass beyond them; it must be open to fresh experience and yet it must maintain its integrity. In no other art is that process more sharply focused than in architecture. (Mumford, 2007: 101)

To avoid confusion, Mumford was not anti-modern. In fact his first rejection in offering an interpretation of any new kind of architecture was that of absolute historicism. He was at last a purveyor of a highly critical regionalism synonymous with modernism.

Conclusion
In this chapter I have sought to highlight the significant emergence and evolution of the concept of regionalism through an architecturally historic perspective. This overview points to the fact that regional thinking was never far removed from a current debate of city form. Moving in and out of our consciousness, given the scale of globalization today and the consequences it has on culture and the urban built environment, the contestation is as ripe as ever. Strategically positioning ‘critical regionalism’ as a significant current paradigm, pulling largely from the aforementioned discourse of Mumford, Tzonis and Lefairve, and Frampton, I will now examine further the complexities and contradictions of the argument as well as additional critical points within parallel regionalist agendas.

CHAPTER 4 - A CRITIQUE OF “CRITICAL REGIONALISM” AND OTHER REGIONALIST CLAIMS
Though I have purposefully arrived at the architectural scale, I refer to Swyngedouw’s suggestion that “scale, at whatever level is not and can never be the starting point for socio-spatial theory, but that the kernel of the problem is theorizing and understanding the process” (1997: 141). While I disagree with his claim on the level that the question of scale is likely the primary way to engage a true debate between globalization and regionalism, I use his view to briefly revert back to a broader concept of regionalism in relation to the meta-narrative of globalization as discussed in Part 1.

In addressing the event of a declining nation-state, Harrison (2008) cites the mid 1990s shift of ‘region’ to the front of political and economic geography so much that it was suggested we were now in a ‘regional world’ where regions were the basis of a globally connected capitalist state. He further cautioned that a new regionalism had “swung the pendulum too far in emphasizing, almost certainly imposing, the importance of the region as the site and scale for embedding the new institutions of governance and Fordism” (ibid: 925). The role of the nation-state was indeed changing and required new attention and assessment, though the idea of a complete regional takeover may have been presumptuous. Still evident is the regional and local struggle against the global.
Paul Ricoeur also uses the idea of the State in constructing his preeminent 1965 Civilization argument, proclaiming that “the modern State has a recognizable universal structure... not only is there a single political experience of mankind, but all regimes also have a certain path in common... evolving from a dictatorial form to a democratic form... in search of a balance between necessity of concentrating power... (and)... the necessity of organizing discussion...” (Ricoeur, 2007: 44).

However generalized, of course we know all governments are unique and indeed some maintain a more authoritarian influence on their constituents than others. Ricoeur (2007) is simply making a point that this political rationality goes hand in hand with man’s rationality, a phenomenon of common universal rationality that also leads to universal modes of living. He goes further with the claim that though this signifies progress, it damages the “creative nucleus of great civilizations... (and) Thus we come to the crucial problem confronting nations just rising from underdevelopment. In order to get onto the road toward modernization, is it necessary to jettison the old cultural past? There is the paradox: how to become modern and to return to sources: how to revive an old, dormant civilization and take part in universal civilization” (ibid: 47). Reference to the threat of globalization and a resultant contested negotiation was similar to Mumford’s position just years before.

Focused in its claims, yet open to critique, it was revisited in the late 1980s by Kenneth Frampton, who asserted that Ricoeur’s proposition was actually looked over by the “apocalyptic thrust of modernization, while the ground in which the mytho-ethical nucleus of society might take root has become eroded by the rapacity of development” (Frampton, 1998: 19).

Frampton stressed that a practice must remove itself simultaneously from a myth of progress brought by Enlightenment and from an urge to recall a pre-industrial legacy. He referred to this as an ‘arriere-garde’ position, one critically distinguishable from conservative Populism and sentimental Regionalism (ibid: 22). Adopting the term ‘Critical Regionalism’ introduced by Tzonis and Lefaivre in their essay The Grid and the Pathway, he noted caution against the vagueness of an often considered regional reformism. In that seminal text, they acknowledged a dominance of regionalism in architecture:

By way of general definition we can say that it upholds the individual and local architectonic features against more universal and abstract ones. In addition, however, regionalism bears the hallmark of ambiguity. On the one hand, it has been associated with movements of reform and liberation:... on the other, it has proved a powerful tool of repression and chauvinism... No new architecture can emerge without a new kind of relations between designer and user, without new programs... Despite these limitations critical regionalism is a bridge over which any humanistic architecture of the future must pass. (Tzonis and Lefaivre, 1981: 178)

An element of chauvinism was used against Mumford in the 1940s and like Tzonis and Lefaivre, whose positions derive from Mumford himself, Frampton contended, following Ricoeur’s message, that the “fundamental strategy of Critical Regionalism is to mediate the impact of universal civilization with elements derived indirectly from the peculiarities of a particular place” (Frampton, 1998: 23).

Here again, the notion of place arises as a central theme. In response to the wielding of a universal deterioration of place by modern development, Heidegger (ibid: 27) argued that the true nature of a space/place depends on the clarity of its parameters. He says “a boundary is not that at which something stops, but as the Greeks recognized, the boundary is that from which something begins in presencing”. Further linking building to forms of being, cultivating, and dwelling, Heidegger suggested that the conditions of dwelling and being can only exist in a clearly bounded arena. Frampton deduced that only within a defined domain could building occur in resistance to the evolving Megalopolis (ibid.).

Caution to the wind, Frampton’s version exposes and possibly imposes a certain restriction for a critical regionalist claim. He may be neglecting the fact that region as idea can exist in many facets. Acknowledging merit in a view that sees regionalism as “a path between the homogenization of modernist technophilia and the dumb recall of culturally irrelevant fantasies of locality”, Sorkin labels Frampton’s sense of region as “symbolic rather than functional” and the global cause of this resistance as “formal... not the theory of a deep or even shallow ecologist” (Sorkin, 2004: 22). He further questions Frampton’s affinity for the natural, structural, and material
honesty as aesthetic. Noting Frampton’s significant survey in the work of Alvar Aalto and Jorn Utzon, Sorkin cites that while the two masters became more in tune with topography and tactile nature of craft, their work was rather silent on the relative scale of urbanism. If this was the eminent platform for interaction between the social, architectural, and natural, then viewing works sans contextual influence was a risky business (ibid.).

A clearer understanding of context hinders on the relation between space and place and is not entirely physical. Locality encompasses all elements of daily life underneath what Sorkin refers to as a demanding ‘biotope’ (Sorkin, 2004). Climates define cross-regional culture, therefore indicating local opportunities within a global context. We must ‘continue’ the biotope, work within it, to produce architecture that brandishes integrity, agency, and collaboration- embracing local traditions as inspiration for appropriate environmental response, but more importantly signifying an ethical sense of sharing environments (ibid.). In a so-called global climate crisis, one labeled earlier as indicating globalization, this component of a critical regionalism is at the forefront of discourse and practice for good reason. Though it has become apparent that climatic context is but one defining measure of regionalism.

Conclusion
This is the true regionalist debate- what exactly is regionalism? Common understanding sees it as an opposition to a globalized modernism. Indeed we have seen that it positions itself as an ‘other.’ But Mumford had cautioned long ago against label as problem solver. It is for this reason that ‘critical regionalism’ may fall as “fashionable formula, as a catchword to describe a range of difficult and diverse architectures arising from markedly different circumstances” (Eggenger,2007: 406). Also contributing to an undermining is the proposed attention in discourse given to the struggle of resistance or negotiation of top-down forces, rather than product resolution (ibid.). Critical regionalism was attempting to highlight the particular. However, as we have seen, the generalization of the movement was so successful during certain points in history that the idea itself gained universal tendencies (ibid.).

Despite questioning, “critical regionalism” still implies and defends an approach that “recognizes the value of the singular, circumscribes projects within the physical, social, and constraints of the particular, aiming at sustaining diversity while benefiting from universality” (Tzonis, 2003: 20). Using a ‘critical regional’ lens to render the architecture/urbanism debate serves to highlight conflicts from a particular theoretical perspective. Calling to mind underlining anti-modern misconceptions, case examples in the next chapter will be brought forth in order to contextualize the debate across scales and typologies.

PART 3 CONTEXTUALIZING
ARCHITECTURE / URBANISM: CASES, EXAMPLES, AND POSSIBILITIES
CHAPTER 5 - REGIONALISM AND GLOBALIZATION IN CONTEXT

Though the concept of regionalism had been alluded to for centuries, it was industrialization and the subsequent architectural tendencies of the modern project as viewed in the western contexts, that prompted a strict response from critics such as Mumford, and later Frampton whose interpretation of a ‘critical regionalism’ has been plentifully registered and influential in sustaining a vital conversation. Mostly theoretical in character, the previous chapter attempted to highlight strengths and criticisms of a regionalist argument alongside the overarching concept of modernism within the urbanism debate. Here, a notion of acceptance for ‘modern’ elements within the regional radiates. Further implying misconceptions that regionalist work was of a complete modern resistance, I will now turn to relevant examples that illustrate the challenges arising at different scales between external/internal forces of modernization and efforts promoting parallel localized action. These cases reveal the complexities of such a situation where contradictions of modernism are questioned while stressing, as Mumford did, that a concept of regionalism must maintain a level of self-critique in order to avoid trendy labelling.

Frampton’s Paradigmatic Critical Regionalist

While there are contradictions in his many arguments Frampton has indeed gone to great lengths in challenging the discourse of regionalism. In doing so he has consistently reverted to the work of Alvar Aalto as an exemplar of a critical regionalist paradigm. The obvious paradox here is that Aalto was undoubtedly modern in the totality of work produced, but I will use him as Frampton does to illustrate a strong affinity for site phenomenon, materials, and the human condition.
Aalto perhaps more than any other so-called modernist architect, developed his own regional language, eschewing the absolute character of the mainstream movement. In doing so, he was unbounded in using elements of history and the vernacular in combination with the modern, thus creating work that was based on place and time rather than style and place (Pallasma, 2007). Of Aalto’s Villa Mairea (Figure 9), built in 1939, Speck colorfully articulates the design as...

part Nordic sod-roofed hut, part vernacular log cabin with gutters hewn from tree trunks, part reinterpreted board-and-batten-clad volumes. But it is also part Scandinavian Functionalism that had developed quickly in the decade of the 1930s and part new industrial Finland with its emerging ceramics and wood-products manufacturing... The Villa Mairea is rugged and crafty and relaxed like Finland, but it is also clean and orderly and precise like Finland. The regionalism here is not a one-liner. It draws on the shapes of the local topography and the textures of the landscape as well as on building traditions and social customs. (Speck, 2007: 77)

In Speck’s description, one can almost smell and feel the material. This idea of tactile relation to site allows a reading beyond the visual, one that suggests a possibility in resisting commands of universal technology (Frampton, 1998).

Aalto later employed a similar mechanism in his Säynatsalo Town Hall project of 1952 (Figure 10), where the main entrance steps are lined with raked brickwork as well as the treads and risers. Here, as Frampton illustrates...

the kinetic impetus of the body in climbing the stair is thus checked by the friction of the steps, which are ‘read’ soon after in contrast to the timber floor of the council chamber itself. This chamber asserts its honorific status through sound, smell, and texture, not to mention the springy deflection of the floor underfoot (and a noticeable tendency to lose one’s balance on its polished surface. (Frampton, 1998: 31-32)

Made clear by this example is the tactile significance of experiencing something rather than interpreting only through information or worse, a “simulacrum substituting for absent presences” (ibid). The tactile and the tectonic value of material elements work in harmony to create what is certainly a product of the surrounding regional environment, rather than of a universally driven influence.

Material attention, in Aalto’s case, provides a necessary basis for striking a balance with nature, but it is not a means to an end. A year after completing Säynatsalo, he embarked on another project, his own summer house on Muuratsalo Island, Finland (Figure 11).

Figure 9
Aalto’s Villa Mairea - Noormarkku, Finland (photo 2002)

Figure 10
Main entrance steps to Aalto’s Säynatsalo Town Hall
There, Aalto constructed a modest dwelling that was as experimental as it was personally reflective, though entirely responsive to the chosen site. He positioned the house just away from the shore raised on top of granite rock. Using discarded bricks from the Säynatsalo, he designed a simple L-shaped plan for the living spaces that opened out onto an exterior courtyard enveloped, but not completely enclosed by two freestanding wall planes (Menin, 2003).

A non-restrictive enclosure allows this external square to flow outward, through the site and down to the jetty access to the water (Figure 12). Beyond exploring different brick types and alternative pattern configurations, Aalto attempted a foundation system using ancient granite boulders. Acknowledging that “proximity to nature can give fresh inspiration both in terms of form and construction”, he event tried a heating strategy that had a heat pump using solar energy created by the lake (quoted in ibid.: 230).

Aalto’s evolving personality was instrumental in his production, claiming during a 1941 lecture, in reference to a lack of harmony within in modernism

at the root of this disharmony is a break with the individual’s genuine psychological needs… psychological pressure of living in stereotyped, unnatural communities, could be rectified if standardization were inspired by nature’s biological diversity, and if the building took something of its character from the site, thereby becoming an instrument that collects all the positive influences in nature for man’s benefit, while also sheltering him from all the unfavorable influences that appear in nature… (quoted/interpreted in Menin, 2003: 233)

Aalto’s wife Aino had died in 1949. Still coping with the loss, his dependency on nature as a reassuring protector is clear when he was constructing the summer retreat (Figure 13). His submission that architecture should take root in human experience and his resolve to illustrate for modernist forces, a rekindling with “place” (ibid.), reveal the very obligatory essence of a sensitive and dedicated practitioner, seen at scale in his famous Baker House dorms at MIT in Cambridge, Massachusetts. There an unorthodox approach to modernism merges and
The Dialecticism of Le Corbusier

If labels be necessary, then we have shown in Aalto’s case that he defies the simplicity of modernist designation. But, looking at the generalization of architectural history one would still find Aalto’s name alongside Le Corbusier’s in the list of modern giants. As I noted in chapter 3, Le Corbusier was indeed a preeminent advocate of universal industrial advances and purity of form and functionalism. Though like Aalto, he too shifted focus, in this case from his ‘machine living’ to a more responsive hybrid approach to design. No more is this apparent than in his unfortunately uncompleted project at La Sainte Baume in Provence, France, the ‘final resting place’ of Mary Magdalene.

La Sainte Baume is located in Provence’s highest mountain range, full of caves including the grotto of Mary Magdalene, sitting above a densely shrouded forest. Due to this altitude, it is more Scandinavian in character than the climate of the surrounding Provencal areas (Samuel, 2003). It was clear that the architect took great interest in the site and the opportunities it offered.

As an unfinished work, and one whose development evolved over 15 years beginning in 1945, it is difficult to speak of it in finality. However, there is a primary version that provides significant representation. Here, Le Corbusier utilized his favorite ‘24-hour day’ symbol to relate patron circulation to solar movement, and also to evoke the spirit and ‘life’ of the ‘paradoxical prostitut saint’ (ibid.).

A significant site of religious pilgrimage, visitors would ascend the wooded foothills, entering the Basilica through Mary’s grotto, essentially re-enacting her story (Figure 14). From there the patron continued downward into a dark chamber, likely symbolizing her excesses, before ascending upward again, evoking the rising of the sun, or symbolically, the existence of Jesus in her life (ibid.). Believing it imperative that the complex engage with the body in order to attain a certain spiritual enlightenment, he proportioned the design on his Modulor method, which was based on nature’s geometry-

Light, sound, color, rhythm, and space would be used to introduce the body to a sense of geometric harmony resulting in a state of spiritual transformation. At the end of this disorienting trip, likened to an initiation, the neophyte would re-enact her journey to the top of the mountain, emerging on the plateau above where he or she would be greeted by a sparkling view of the Mediterranean and the sun to the south, climax of the spiritual quest. (Samuel, 2003:223)

This allude to geometry also stems from the story of Mary, herself linked to the history of Freemasonry. Via her relationship with master craftsmen, she assumed a protective role in Masonic knowledge of geometries (Samuel, 2003). Le Corbusier used this connective reasoning in the design for a small community to be built on site, serving locals and others who wish to live within the spirit of the saint. Based on a North African casbah layout, the houses were vaulted, rammed earth, cave-like constructions. Materials and detail, Le Corbusier believed, could influence the lives of inhabitants and hopefully simulate the lifestyle of Mary, who like a casbah, was a juxtaposition of orient and occident (ibid.).

Much like his earlier and more famous Villa Savoye, the journey of inhabitants became the ultimate essence of the design. Albeit at La Sainte Baume, there was a greater phenomenological force at play: fusion of historical narrative and the Natural. Le Corbusier’s deep affinity for both entities is captured in his interpretation of their relationship and the experience he imagined for users of the space, both visitors and locals alike.

While Le Corbusier was toiling away in Provence, a much larger scale project was brewing in the Far East. With the death of Matthew Nowicki in 1950, Le Corbusier joined the team of Albert Mayer and Clarence Stein on the design of Chandigarh, India. Mayer and Nowicki originally envisioned a fan-shaped city with government and universities in the north, a large business district in the center, and in the southeast, a smaller industrial area connected to the railway system. The major road network was adapted
curvilinear to the local topography as opposed to the typical 1800s grid patterns (Lefaivre, 2003). Focus and appeal of this plan, however, was on an urban village composed of three self-sufficient, mixed-use super-blocks containing a “small bazaar, primary and secondary schools and green open space. The middle block was to house a hospital, a theatre, a meeting hall, and additional shopping facilities... the area would function as a sort of medieval market square. The bazaar is a pedestrian zone and also contains a space for artisans and small businesses” (ibid: 40).

However, Le Corbusier failed to adopt all of Mayer and Nowicki’s urban ideas, specifically the bazaar which possibly led to a weak local economy and may have instigated an unofficial economy of recycling that became essential to facilitate flow of goods to the lower classes (Colquhoun, 2003; Lefaivre, 2003). He did maintain the concept of connecting all parts of the city with a continuous system of parks and kept the primary neighborhood unit (Figure 15). Renamed “sectors”, the center of each was reachable from the furthest confines within ten minutes. Schools, shops, hospitals, recreation spaces, and other public structures were located in green strips running north/south through all sectors, bordered by a routed grid where traffic was divided into categories ranging from regional roads to small roads and paths leading to houses (ibid.). Leaving no trace of his previous Cité Radieuse, the design was adopted from Mayer and Nowicki’s regionalist ideas. Whether his revisions can be seen as legitimately ‘regional’ and beyond underlying colonial reasoning for his involvement, Le Corbusier, like Aalto, in questioning general modern orthodoxy and his own oeuvre, attempted to offer a decidedly contextually responsive mechanism for a new urbanism.

He drew the master plan soon after his arrival in India and after a glimpse of the proposed site.

Transitions within a Colonial and Post-Colonial Context: From Algiers to Delhi

Years before Chandigarh, in the onslaught of France’s desire for Algiers to become the lustrous capital of North Africa and thus the epicenter of all their West African colonies (Djiar, 2009), Le Corbusier was invited there in 1931 for a conference focusing on the city’s future. Between that initial visit and 1942, without client, he produced multiple urban proposals (Figure 18), progressively minimizing the intervention scale and highlighting architectural development in the business district (Venturi, 2009). Although his Plan Obus schemes were rejected, they surely influenced Henri Prost’s official master-plan of 1937 (ibid.).

Indeed this plan had a huge impact on the indigenous culture of Algiers. By his observations, Frantz Fanon noticed that “the
typical member of the indigenous population maintains intact traditions which are completely different from those of the colonial situation, whereas the native intellectual throws himself in the frenzied fashion into the frantic acquisition of the culture of the occupying power and takes every opportunity of criticizing his own national culture” (quoted in Djiar, 2009: 171).

Despite resistances, significant structures such as mosques were being destroyed in favor of an advanced and progressive built environment. Although these actions caused great emotional stress and developing remorse towards the colonizers, Fanon detected a certain growing attitude of envy and newly formed ideals of spatial use and desire, describing a divergent situation where...

the settler’s town is a strongly-built town, all made of stone and steel. It is a brightly-lit town; the streets are covered with asphalt... The settler’s town is a well-fed town, as easy going town; its belly is always full of good things... The town belonging to the colonized people, or at least the native town, is a place of ill fame. It is a world without spaciousness; men live there on top of each other, and their huts are built on top of the other. The native town is a hungry town. The native town is a crouching village, a town on its knees, a town wallowing in the mire... The look the native turns on the settler’s town is a look of lust, a look of envy; it expresses his dreams of possession: to sit at the settler’s table, to sleep in the settler’s bed, with his wife if possible. The colonized man is an envious man. (Fanon as quoted in Djiar, 2009: 172)

In the mid 1950s, a major government housing initiative set to relocate the native people from the many mushrooming shantytowns of the city. This policy was seen as practical and psychological colonial solution, when it fact the underlying intentions were to thwart so-called terrorist enclaves and resistance and to win appraise of the natives (Djiar, 2009). Furthermore, it is believed that by constructing dwellings that contrasted the indigenous courtyard house, the move sought to permanently alter traditional community relationships and family structure, both sources of resistance (ibid.). Actually, it was in the post-colonial years that cultural consequences took substantial affect, escalating as once colonized groups began to inhabit structures of the foreign settlers (ibid.).
As large portions of natives began taking over the French houses, traditional areas of the city lost their significance, later resulting in a socially marginalized old town inhabited by deprived individuals. After independence, relationships between culture, man, and environment continued to deteriorate over the following decades (ibid.).

For various reasons, including size, dual space kitchen/bathroom, a lack of privacy from non-relation individuals, and physical degrading, the typical old town courtyard dwellings are insufficient in the current era. Of even more negative implication is the floundering of emotional and physical relationships between neighbors (ibid.). Where the courtyard historically provided a place to interact, for laundering, eating, it is now rendered useless as increasing individualism, general management, and generational culture gaps evolve in character. One positive phenomenon that is thriving and could suggest methods for a sustainable approach to design is the fact that roof terraces are, because of their configurative proximity, promoting social contact as the only truly shared space of cultural activity (ibid.).

Delhi, like Algiers, has witnessed segregation and distinction between its old and new cities. While Old Delhi is seen as essentially a case of indigenous modernities, labeled at once a slum and a conservation area where traditional buildings are adaptively re-used for current activities, New Delhi is found to be in “contradistinction to the colonial and postcolonial modernities” (King, 2004: 145). Development in Delhi was always the result of advanced British language and representation. The main residential area of colonial times contained 3,000 single-story houses or bungalows situated in rectilinear clusters, stylistically characterized as a “distinctively hybrid colonial third culture” and the fact that the bungalow style has been transplanted globally, signifies a major Indian contribution (ibid: 147).

More recently, hotels and high rise office buildings have been erected around Connaught Place (Figure 20), the primary consumer space of the old city. Many attempts have focused on the redevelopment of the bungalow zone but it was these bungalows, as Gupta suggests, “that made Delhi one of the greenest cities in the world” and “which were coveted by senior officials and ministers” (qtd in King, 2004: 147). King (ibid.) cites Menon’s claim that the Delhi Imperial Zone, as it was generally referred to, is the only urban area in the city that is basically protected from encroaching development, a virtue contributed to a supposed strong interventionist position of the State. However, this allowed an onslaught of mega projects south of the Zone, though interestingly enough the general structural topography, all the way to the city’s periphery, is a low density, horizontal landscape (ibid.). A thorough transport support system of various scales, including a proposed metro (2020 completion) and monolithic four and six-lane roadway illustrates attention to the middle and upper classes (King, 2004), a disparity facing a growing number of Indian cities including Mumbai.

![Aerial view – Connaught Place development, Delhi at sunset](image)

If the State has gone to great lengths at managing and instigating certain growth traits, it has yielded consequential result elsewhere. On the argument of urban built form, Menon further states that years of austerity, trigger self indulgent and flamboyant architectural styles in the private sector- ersatz palazzos and Spanish villas with icing-like decorations, pompous ducal crests, baroque moldings, curicued metal railings- the aesthetic ideals of Nehru’s socialism may have inadvertently reinforced the allure of foreignness in architectural design. (Menon as quoted in King, 2004: 148)

Menon’s account of what was occurring in Delhi points to a shift in the promotion and preservation of a definitively regional hybrid colonial architecture to an open welcoming of ‘anywhere’ surface style.

DLF City (Delhi Land & Finance Group) is the playground for such imitatively stylistic free will. By 2002, this development was far larger than the original colonial Delhi. Built to the
south of the original city, it is a mixture of vertical and horizontal residential and commercial superblocks, akin less to the colonial and post-colonial compound and bungalow language than that of metropolitan Chicago, Dallas, or Los Angeles (King, 2004). Complete even with an Arnold Palmer Golf Course, the ‘new city’ seeks to not only replace Delhi as the corporate capital but also become the entertainment nucleus of the nation (ibid.).

What has happened in DLF City, with its anywhere architecture and its self-sustaining, service-oriented, market driven, technological playground, entertainment and recreational spoils (ibid.) is the same manifestation seen earlier in ‘new’ regional Silicon Valleys (Castells, 2004). Shedding its past, Delhi has essentially replaced a once colonized, yet progressively regional hybrid urban paradigm with a new form of shallow global hyperbole, recognizing in the general urbanism debate, the questioning and tendency of inappropriate modernist reformations.

Figure 21
The diverse anonymous typologies of DLR City Phase IV

Attentive Transformations: Cultural Reinstatement in a Taiwanese Village

As in both the Algiers and Delhi cases, the conflict between indigenous culture and the marginalization stemming from authoritative decision has been felt by the Ta’u tribe of the island Pongso-No-Ta’u. There, in the 1970s and 1980s, the Taiwan Government, in a proposed attempt to modernize the local situation, demolished four out of six Ta’u villages, replacing them with standardized rows of concrete barracks (Hou, 2008).

In 1994, a team of advocate designers from National Taiwan University were called in to assess and remedy the situation. Already clear that the government project had psychological and communal implications, the group also discovered severe and unsafe structural issues within the dwellings (ibid.).

After consulting structural experts and staging a media protest in Taipei with Ta’u tribal leaders, demanding compensatory action, the team began planning and researching the village houses, hoping to instill traditional methods and local culture back into the new constructions (ibid.). The features and layouts of the island’s dwellings symbolize an owner’s social position, as revealed by house size, number of doors, and relationships. The designs also invoke cultural ideals and adaptation in the vein of local physical and climatic contexts (ibid.).

Achieved in a seemingly practical, seasonal migratory way...

The vahay (main house), submerged and protected by stone walls, shelters occupants from fierce winter winds. The half-submerged makarang (tall house) is occupied in spring and autumn. The tagakal (cool house) is where occupants live in summer. High above the ground, it provides ocean views and breezes. The inaorod (front yard) is a stone-paved open area in front of the vahay. The vahay is the most elaborate and sacred of all the structures, but the makarang and tagakal are also used for ceremonial and casual gatherings, and the inaorod serves as a place for important rituals and ceremonies, boat building, drying of the sacred flying fish, and daily family activities (Hou, 2008: 77).

This description explores the relationship between functional space, environment and strong local customs. However, in order to provide stable wind resistance and greater heights, new reinforced concrete structures had become the village norm. Traditional elements were still intertwined and thus a hybrid form was created, sustaining an approach that fused old forms with modern necessities (ibid.).

After initial proposal exchange with the villagers yielded mixed feelings regarding certain transformative elements, the design team was allowed to erect a prototype structure in the form of a classroom and ‘museum’ under the experimental hybrid motif.
The main building was sunken like the traditional vahay, yet the two story part was taller and attracted better light. Concrete was reduced to structural elements and wood was used for wall modules (ibid.). By this time government subsidies had arrived and the whole village was building in experimentally surprising ways. Prior refusal of professional recommendation had given way to similar incorporation of juxtaposing traditional methodology with modern function. In this way, even with the advent of modern amenity adaptation, villagers were able to re-adjust and maintain societal relations and the notion of home-building and presentation as primary cultural values (ibid.).

Conclusion
What I have attempted in covering this broad spectrum of history and scale is illustrate the many facets of the debate between global and regional forces and the consequences that arise within different contexts. Made clearer is that central to the unfolding of these situations is the impact on individuals, culture, and specifically the phenomenon of dwelling. Both Aalto and Le Corbusier shifted from a highly modern vocabulary to one that promoted and experimented with the contextual characteristics of material, circulation, narrative, and the overall human condition to exceed potential of a regional modernism. The colonial and post-colonial contexts of Algiers and Delhi reveal the cultural struggles through time that confound authorities and design professionals alike rekindling the question- how can urban development reattach to place rather than producing a simulacrum of space? Providing a solution to this question, albeit at a village scale, is the reconstruction of the Ta’u houses in Taiwan. Here, a team of dedicated professionals guided tribesmen in the building of uniquely hybrid dwellings, rekindling cultural identity and individual aspirations.

In all these examples, people and place constitute the primary foci of the event, suggesting the critical point of urban production as being a predominantly human experience within a complementary environment. This again raises the important question of how the urban professions continue to operate within complex and changing parameters- how they evolve their role and approach.
PART 4 BEYOND CRITICAL REGIONALISM: REFLECTIONS ON THEORETICAL PARADIGMS AND PRACTICE
CHAPTER 6 - REFLECTIONS IN THE MIDST OF URBAN DEBATES

Assessing a theoretical and practical state of urban affairs through readings and case studies provides a foundation for recognizing the most pressing issues perplexing the debate of urbanism. Short of offering immediate solutions, the investigation thus far has indeed highlighted relevant questions in support of the sustained debates that exist in order to keep at bay the forces of globalization and modern transformation. In this last and conclusive chapter, I shall first recapitulate the reasoning of the case examples in regard to their service within the urbanism arguments before moving beyond the particulars of critical regionalism to offer a glimpse into parallel implications and opportunities from a professional perspective. If consequences mentioned herein are the results of an array of ever-shifting complexities, then the course of action involves understanding cause and the posing of ethical questions that arise among professionals dealing with the built environment and those who manage its existence—seeking to ensure appropriate strategies for preserving cultural nuance and the promotion of contextually innovative work.

Case Study Technique as Theoretical Representation

Rather than assume their use as mere visual eye candy, the cases in Chapter 5 serve a distinct purpose as representing the theoretical and practical complexities and contradictions of the urbanism debates. Apart from sharing a necessary linkage between individuals and environment, each case is characterized by a degree of scale and represented through comparative urban topical paradigms ranging from mid-century modernism to colonialism and crossing the contextual borders between the West and the developing world, drawing parallels to the historic regional chronology and theory seen in Part 2. There in Part 2, ‘regionalism’, as a coined term was a direct response to the modernist movement, so the relevancy of supplementing theory with regional work by Alvar Aalto and Le Corbusier draws immediate contradiction, thus instigating qualitative questions regarding the regionalist vs. modernist paradigm. Was it therefore a ‘type’ of modernism rather than opposition? Both maintained strong experimental sensibilities, often advocating technology. And though they attended to material, site and method, their structures were not vernacular; less full-fledged attack and more an appropriate paradigmatic shift. Similarly illustrating inconsistency in the labeling of a ‘style’, something Mumford had alluded to, the Taiwanese village case raises an interpretive question along the lines of its traditional connotations. Cassidy (2007: 411) argues that critical regionalism, ‘in its attempt to abate the ‘apocalyptic’ thrust of ‘modernization’ the genre discounts all regional manifestations that celebrate traditional notions of regional identity.” Though debatable to the fullness of its claim, if we take his comments as a determining gauge, then attempt to restore a traditional village atmosphere could be seen as purely nostalgic return rather than advancement. However, the professionals assisted in the building of what appears to be quite modern dwellings that favor hints of tradition, over imitations. And looking at the degree of individual and community pride it supposedly restored, would it be wrong to suggest regional work due to its “effort to reflect and enhance the purposes and ideals which characterize a particular age and people’ (Mumford qtd in Lefaivre, 2003: 36)?

Apart from the regionalist style debate, I believe the village example poses another important question in terms of scale. Whereas this project represented a hundred or so people, the cases of Delhi and Algers held ramifications for tens of millions. As a contextual concept, regionalism must, at its very root, reject formula. So far though, little has been specifically suggested in regards to the theoretical treatment of contextual change. Can the prescriptive theory of critical regionalism, one highly confined, though not exclusive, to the architectural character of place, go beyond its limitations and simultaneously address development issues at the level of Delhi as it does within a small island village? Or is there need for a separate associative paradigm theory approach?

The transition made by Le Corbusier to the arenas of the developing world highlights this conflict. He had prior success in marrying building and site within the French region, but the idea of post-colonial societal planning raised many challenges in regards to applying regional principles at scale, especially when offering grand visions. Furthermore, his involvement in the developing world could be associated with the concept of Colonial Imperialism which is a cousin of globalization—indeed an early emergence of a global movement of politics and culture. As mentioned it is not difficult to recognize the affect of global events on the developing world. This again calls to mind the questions.
Can a practice negotiate the local and global at various scales? What are the ramifications of operating as a professional across regions?

The Professional Call to Arms
As uncovered in Part 1 and illustrated through relevant case studies, though still a place-based event, the manufacture of space and form is juxtaposed with the global, thus calling into question the way the built environment professions operate from an ethical and creative perspective. In a new era where the current global financial crisis threatens to upend neoliberalism’s streak, architecture and urban design will take new roles in re-shaping the “old, segregated landscapes of management, consumption, and production into more integrated environments that allow people opportunities for self-realization as well as participation in larger, diverse communities” (Dunham-Jones, 2009:26). Beyond this, as mentioned in Chapter 2, we should see a further collectivism over global issues such as environmental degradation.

In this unknown platform, the idea of global professional sustains frontal debate. Working in distant lands on significant projects is nothing new. However, referring to the suggested colonial comments made earlier alongside the examples of Algiers and Chandigarh, Le Corbusier, in some ways like the architects of the British Empire working in Egypt, India, or Jamaica, was in essence still working at home (Davis, 2009). The difference today is that imperial hierarchies have vanished, giving way to a leveling of culture. And what was once seen as a cultural gift, the exporting of imperial center standards long ago by the Greek and Romans and recently by the British and French is now seen differently (ibid.). In any case the ‘traveling’ of architecture is still at a point where you can find a building by Gehry, Hadid, Foster, or Koolhaas all over the world. The example of the so-called ‘Bilbao Effect’ makes a case for the effect of global trends and the possible lack of conviction in levels of governance or the private sector, leading to a questioning of ethics when one finds themselves in another domain.

Despite globalization and the homogenous tendencies that derive from it, cultures are still diverse in many ways. The defining characters of culture are in the “ways of doing” (Davis, 2009: 123), as witnessed in the Taiwanese village. Architects working outside of their home culture should be attentive to the nuances and question whether or not their own inherent set of standards will work in this new context. Principally relevant across all regions, this is paramount in the developing countries of the world where disparities in society are less understood. Here, industrialized countries have an obligation to lend resourceful assistance to the less fortunate. The question is how those resources are presented and how they enable recipients rather than impose inappropriate foreign products. It should be noted here that caution against cultural disregard extends internally, as illustrated in the Delhi case where the globally charged urban schemes of the DLF City eschewed astute hybrid evolution. If in fact we are globalized, then we share one world and “all ethics rest upon a single premise- that the individual is a member of a community of interdependent parts” (Leopold, 1966: 239).

Just as a person is part of communal interdependency, architecture too depends on everything outside itself (Till, 2009). The practice of architecture in history has continuously claimed a false sense of control, when in reality, everyday contingency convolutes processes. Till (ibid.) suggests that rather than retreat from these contingencies, the profession should engage with the inevitability of the real world, understanding this as an opportunity rather than a threat.

This idea perhaps coincides with Koolhaas’ ideas of the generic city where a neutralization of difference represents an opportunity of fantasy, free from nostalgia or habit (Duncan-Jones, 2009) and where architecture is “no longer a patient transaction between known quantities that share cultures...following its fright instinct, it runs away from the possibly ridiculous to miss a rendezvous with the sublime” (Koolhaas, 1995: 367-8).

Indeed one area from which architecture probably runs is in its most instructive role- academics. As a filterer of knowledge, education should be considered a frontline agent in the transformation of the profession into a socially and politically adapt field (Gamez and Rogers, 2008). Though as Till (2009) suggests, there are great disparities in the exchange between academia and the profession. Due to an artificiality in linear teaching methods, a re-thinking of education that reinforces political, cultural, and economic parallels is of great necessity, especially in the age of computer aided phantasm, a ‘tool’ Till claims confuses radical thinking with radical making (ibid.). This agenda recalls the basis of the critical regional argument, one that eschews society disassociation, technophilia, and artificial formal language for an
encompassing culturally informed approach. Challenging a status quo, a new call to arms for the profession can start with academic reform.

Conclusion
Recognizing the dense polarization of views and interpretations within the readings that provided the foundation for this paper, my investigation has been deliberately theoretical in attempt to uncover and better understand the basis for the debate regarding globalization and its affect on urban theory and practice. In this study, many questions have been posed, some of which have been addressed, some of which have been purposely left open to acknowledge the fact that the issue and debate is still ongoing and more importantly, that it should be sustained.

What is clear from this study is that globalization, for better or worse, has inflicted change on society, whether by cultural compression or decompression, urban fragmentation or de-frAGMENTATION, and/or architectural homogeneity or architectural freedom. The primary counterpoint to globalization discussed here- regionalism- for all its strengths, calls for a repositioning of the production of space that constitutes attention to all aspects of place and the influential forces that bind it and from which it flows forth. Though, as history and criticism proves, one paradigmatic approach is unlikely to be the answer. Presented in this last chapter, the first step to re-assessing urbanism lies in a recapturing of the profession and the academic foundations that seek its potential. As Ellen Duncan-Jones (2009: 27) optimistically states, though “architecture cannot change the economic machinations of globalization… we can modify the shape of the wave.”
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