

Nachdem die Euphorie verfliegen ist, die Architektur fast ausschließlich über die Wirkung des Objekts zu bestimmen, erscheint die Zeit reif, neue Möglichkeiten der Definition von Architekturqualität in den Diskurs zu führen. Architektur einzuordnen ist schon immer schwer gefallen, weshalb auch die Flucht in die Objekt- und Zeichenhaftigkeit, auf welche sich das Starsystem zum großen Teil stützt, verständlich ist. Ist Architektur den Künsten zuzurechnen, oder gar den Wissenschaften? Der Künstlerarchitekt hat sich als Erscheinung des Starsystems überlebt. Ist es jetzt eine wissenschaftlich begründbare Architektur, die in den Mittelpunkt des Diskurses rückt? Wird dabei ein naturwissenschaftlicher, ein geistes- oder kulturwissenschaftlicher Ansatz verfolgt? Oder gibt es da noch andere, in der Architektur selbst entstandene Ansätze?

**GAM.02 – Design Science in Architecture.** Mit Beiträgen von John An, Hans-Jürgen Burkard, Brian Cody, Christian Gänshirt, Susanne Hauser, Christian Holl, Nico Kienzl, Ulrich Königs, Luc Merx, Bert de Muynck, Jörg Rainer Noennig, Bas Princen, Hendrik Schomburg, Adolf Max Vogt, Gernot Weckherlin, Brooke D. Wortham.

Now that the first euphoria is gone regarding defining architecture almost exclusively via the effect of the object, it seems the time has come to introduce new possibilities for assessing architectural quality into the discussion. Categorising architecture has always been difficult, and it is all too understandable that we fled into the object and symbol characteristics the star system is largely based on. Should architecture be assigned to arts or to sciences even? The artist-architect as a manifestation of the star system has become obsolete. Is it now a scientifically based architecture that's being pushed into the centre of the discourse? And if so, are we pursuing a scientific, humanist or cultural-scientific approach? Or are there any other approaches resulting from architecture itself?

**GAM.02 – Design Science in Architecture.** With contributions by John An, Hans-Jürgen Burkard, Brian Cody, Christian Gänshirt, Susanne Hauser, Christian Holl, Nico Kienzl, Ulrich Königs, Luc Merx, Bert de Muynck, Jörg Rainer Noennig, Bas Princen, Hendrik Schomburg, Adolf Max Vogt, Gernot Weckherlin, Brooke D. Wortham.

ISBN 3-211-23767-4  
springeronline.com



9 783211 237670



## Design Science in Architecture



GAM.



**GAM – Graz Architektur Magazin** GAM – Graz Architecture Magazine

**Herausgeber** Fakultät für Architektur der Technischen Universität Graz **Editor** Faculty of Architecture at Graz University of Technology

**GAM.02 Impressum** Copyright page

**Redaktion** Editors in Chief

Urs Hirschberg (uh), Günter Koberg (gk), Jörn Köppler (jk), Roger Riewe (rr), Ullrich Schwarz (us)

**Redaktionsbeirat** Editorial Board

Friedrich Achleitner (Wien), Michelle Addington (Cambridge, MA), George Baird (Toronto), Shigeru Ban (Tokyo), Aaron Betsky (Rotterdam), Pierre Alain Croset (Torino), Eduard Führ (Cottbus), Andrej Hrausky (Ljubljana), Ernst Hubeli (Zürich/Graz), Bart Lootsma (Wien), Josep Luis Mateo (Barcelona), Didier Rebois (Paris), Arno Ritter (Innsbruck), Gerhard Schmitt (Zürich), Georg Schöllhammer (Wien), Kai Vöckler (Berlin)

**AutorInnen aus der Fakultät** In House Contributors

Koordination der Fakultätsnachrichten Coordination of the Faculty News: Georg Dornhofer (gd), Simon Nigsch (sn); Christian Fröhlich: „no\_LAb\_in\_feld“, „Künstliche Naturen“, „This Play“/Bix – Einleuchten“, „3Videosense Visuelle Kultur via 3G“; Eva Grubbauer: „Resize“; Gabu Heindl: „Günther Domenig – Recent Work“; Kai Uwe Holtin: „Architecture Française, Positions Actuelles“, „GAD Award 2003/2004“; Albert Kirchengast: „Adorno, Architektur und bei Eisenman in der Leere: Ein Gespräch mit dem Vorstand des Instituts für Architekturtheorie und Baukunst Ullrich Schwarz“; Raimund Köchl, Stefan Krestel, Alex Pirkebner: „Entwicklung eines Kielstegelementes“; Peter Schreibmayer: „Pro:Holz\_en bloc“

**Umschlagbild** Cover Illustration

Bas Princen, Belgrad

**Grafische Gestaltung** Graphic Design

MVD Austria; Michael Rieper, Christine Schmauszer, Georg Skerbisch, www.mvd.org

**Druck** Printing

Holzhausen Druck & Medien Ges.m.b.H., 1140 Wien, Austria

Gedruckt auf säurefreiem, chlorfrei gebleichtem Papier – TCF Printed on acid-free and chlorine-free bleached paper

SPIN: 11343820

**Übersetzungen** Translations

Susanne Baumann-Cox und Maria Nievoll von Y+plus

**Lektorat** Proof-reading

Karin Buol-Wischenau, Susanne Gmeiner, Margarette Stiehler

**Anschrift** Address

GAM, Graz Architektur Magazin, Rechbauerstraße 12, 8010 Graz, Austria

http://gam.tugraz.at, gam@tugraz.at

**Förderer** Sponsors

Fakultät für Architektur der TU Graz, Land Steiermark

**Fakultät für Architektur der TU Graz, Institutsvorstände 2005** Faculty of Architecture at TU Graz, Institute Heads 2005

Urs Hirschberg (Architecture and Media, Dean), Roger Riewe (Architecture Technology, Vice Dean), Irgard Frank (Spatial Design, Program Director), Ernst Hubeli (Urban Design, Vice Program Director), Brian Cody (Building and Energy, Research Director), Susanne Hauser (History of Arts and Cultural Studies, Vice Research Director), Hans Kupelwieser (Contemporary Art), Daniele Marques (Architecture and Landscape), Hrvoje Njiric (Building Typology), Hansjörg Tschom (Housing), Lutz Sparowitz\* (Structures), Ullrich Schwarz (Architectural Theory and History); \* ad interim

**Bildnachweis** Picture credits

Der Herausgeber hat gewissenhaft versucht, alle Quellen und Urheberrechtsinhaber zu ermitteln und zu kennzeichnen. Er bittet etwaige Bildrechtsinhaber, die nicht ausfindig gemacht werden konnten, sich mit dem Herausgeber in Verbindung zu setzen. The publisher has conscientiously endeavoured to identify and acknowledge all sources and copyright holders. We request that all those who hold picture copyrights, which have not been identified or credited here, please contact the publisher.

Das Werk ist urheberrechtlich geschützt. Die dadurch begründeten Rechte, insbesondere die der Übersetzung, des Nachdruckes, der Entnahme von Abbildungen, der Funksendung, der Wiedergabe auf fotomechanischem oder ähnlichem Wege und der Speicherung in Datenverarbeitungsanlagen, bleiben, auch bei nur auszugsweiser Verwertung, vorbehalten. This work is subject to copyright. All rights are reserved, whether the whole or part of the material is concerned, specifically those of translation, reprinting, re-use of illustrations, broadcasting, reproduction by photocopying machines or similar means, and storage in data banks.

© 2005 Springer-Verlag/Wien und bei den AutorInnen 2005 Springer-Verlag/Wien and with the authors

Printed in Austria

SpringerWienNewYork is a part of Springer Science+Business Media

springeronline.com

Die Wiedergabe von Gebrauchsnamen, Handelsnamen, Warenbezeichnungen usw. in diesem Buch berechtigt auch ohne besondere Kennzeichnung nicht zu der Annahme, dass solche Namen im Sinne der Warenzeichen- und Markenschutz-Gesetzgebung als frei zu betrachten wären und daher von jedermann benutzt werden dürften.

The use of registered names, trademarks, etc. in this publication does not imply, even in the absence of specific statement, that such names are exempt from the relevant protective laws and regulations and therefore free for general use.

Bibliografische Information Der Deutschen Bibliothek

Die Deutsche Bibliothek verzeichnet diese Publikation in der Deutschen Nationalbibliografie; detaillierte bibliografische Daten sind im Internet über <http://dnb.ddb.de> abrufbar.

Mit zahlreichen (farbigen) Abbildungen. With numerous (coloured) Figures.

ISSN 1612-9482

ISBN-10 3-211-23767-4 SpringerWienNewYork

ISBN-13 978-3-211-23767-0 SpringerWienNewYork

## On the theme of the 3<sup>rd</sup> issue: “Architecture Meets Life”

Reflexive modernism can no longer unquestioningly take modernism itself for granted. Modernism, too, has entered the stage of its “disenchantment” (Max Weber) or “disembedding” (Anthony Giddens). It is entering into a critical, observing relationship to itself, and it can no longer simply perceive itself in one dimension as a story of success and a guarantor of progress. Following the heroic phase of modernism, the ambivalences of the modernisation process are becoming increasingly apparent. Today, the “grand narratives” of classical modernism give rise to scepticism. This equally changes our perception of the future that we can no longer forecast on the basis of a linear model of progress. The complex dynamics of globalisation severely restricts the predictability of social development. The treatment of indeterminacy, openness and ambivalence is becoming a constitutive trait of reflexive modernism.

Architecture cannot escape this situation either. Today, architecture can no longer be perceived as an executor of utopian scripts for the future. The times of architectural thinking in terms of omnipotence and world-saving mega-projects are long past.

Architecture, too, must learn to cope with openness and indeterminacy. This relieves it of programmatic overexertion and changes the role of the architect as designer.

At the same time, the discernible dialectics of media architecture (“Bilbao effect”) has led to such a rapid consumption of images since the nineties that even the spectacular form of “signature buildings” cannot be an adequate answer to the problems of a radicalised modernism.

Against this general backdrop, as briefly outlined above, we would like to focus on two aspects in the next GAM that we might refer to as “The constitutive realisation of architecture in use”. On the one hand, the aim is to examine relevant design strategies (1), and on the other empiri-

cally to analyse the question of what has come of certain projects after five, ten, twenty or more years of use (2).

(1) At the end of the sixties, Roland Barthes and Michel Foucault compared the disappearance of the classical, omniscient author in modern literature with the birth of the active reader. It is the appropriation of the text by the reader that in fact creates the text. Meaning is a product of the interaction of the text and the reader.

Does it make sense to transfer this model to architecture? If so, how?

Even today, there are calls to move away from over-determined structures and focus on more under-determined structures.

The result is an architecture that is not completely and utterly defined and specified. It is open for interpretation and is constituted in specific appropriation. Indeterminacy becomes a condition for amenability to appropriation.

Empty spaces are not a lack but rather a prerequisite for undetermined use over time. The familiar models oscillate between philosophical critique (Eisenman), situational thinking in terms of events (Tschumi), and down-to-earth everyday theory. How can we evaluate these models, are there new strategies?

(2) The renunciation of the hypertrophy whereby architecture is an unchangeable, self-contained object implies the acceptance of the idea that every building is only realised and stands the test of time in the history of its use. Only architectures that survive their own history meet this standard. They are strong and open enough for a variety of different interpretations and appropriations, and they bear the marks of this as an enrichment of their quality. Other architectures have an extremely short life-span and are already technical and aesthetic ruins in just a few years. We are looking for telling positive and negative examples. The aim is to document specific projects in their actual history, along with the traces of their use, in pictures and analysis. The key question in the process is where to look for the structural reasons for success or failure.



