Universal “memes” of the global style in architecture and the problems of identity and place
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This article deals with form and form elements in architecture as bearers of societal meaning and symbols of identity. Form is predicated upon triangular relationships of society, individual and building. Society is premised upon a dialogue on globalism vs. regionalism. Place is described as strong identity read through symbolic details, and architectural form as a holistic entity composed of mass/volume relations, formats, details and ornamentations. It criticizes the present state of architecture discipline on the grounds that forms are rapidly globalizing to the extent of losing their authentic meanings. It renders the results of an extensive survey on the global forms, formats and architectonic details of the recent architectural trends which nullify any societal or existential meaning whatsoever and it re-claims identity and place on primordial and perennial grounds.
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INTRODUCTION

The term globalization is multivalent and far from innocent. It signifies the hegemony of a worldwide capitalist system on the economic plane; the overruling of the primacy of the nation-state by transnational arrangements, on the political one; the emergence of new, networked information and communication systems, that is, the SNSs (Social Network Sites) which are comprised of still non-liberating social power strategies (Gur, 2009), on the technological one; and the advent of an increasingly homogenous consumer-oriented life style and mentality, on the cultural one (Jameson, 1991; Ockman, 2003).

George Soros and Joseph Stiglitz insist on its potential for beneficial results: Taylor (2003: p.80) quotes from Soros: “The salient feature of globalization is that it allows financial capital to move around freely... It is a desirable condition in many respects: private enterprise is more successful in the production of wealth” and from Stiglitz: “Globalization—the removal of barriers to free trade and the closer integration of national economies—can be a force for good and that it has the potential to enrich everyone in the world, particularly the poor”.

However, after 1990s the trade models and theories adopted by global economy began to fail. It had already caused distortion in the distribution of private and public resources. Especially the social security benefits of the underdeveloped nations have been narrowed down. Globalization could not maintain world’s peace as professed, reduce poverty, improve working conditions, preserve human resources and could not safeguard environment (Taylor, 2003). Also, from a traditionalist leftist point of view, it has been criticized for its suppression of difference, eradication of local traditions and heritages.

These observations suggest an antithetical and antagonistic relationship between globalization and architectural criticism as well: ‘Market’s contamination of every sphere of life, including the intellectual has cast doubts on the possibility of preserving any real objective or autonomous domain for critical practice’ says Ockman (2003). In classical criticism the concepts of place, function, distance and speed were important criteria. Globalization
brought about the same issues but accelerated speed, shortened distance, encumbered function and distorted the place by undermining the local traditions and eradicating cultural heritage.

Philosophers and critics express helplessness: Paul Virilio (1996) asserts that “the speed and the velocity of metamorphosis experienced in the physical and material world is openly leading to a state, which renders the traditional concepts employed in discussing architecture and city planning worthless and the physical world meaningless.

Many traditional values are being run down by the innovations set forth in the computer age. Traditional communal spaces of towns are declining and entrances to cities are vanishing. Architectural enclosure is reshaping itself in the thin and transparent layer of petroleum fibers, pneumoneutics. Architecture is disappearing in a homogenous membrane together with its solid and tangible meanings.

Sassen (2003) extrapolates from these critical state of affairs that ‘when the data becomes a denationalized geography, as such, the meaning of representations need to be re-discovered in a hierarchical scale of local, region and nation. Furthermore, the concepts of borders, limits and periphery which are conceived within the confinements of language probably require re-definition to incorporate the new reality. New international standards have been established in most organizations such as finance, law, accounting and communication which operate across borders. Under the influence of global economy global cities bridging the national borders form new geographies. Then the question: “whose town is it?” looses its significance’.

Looked at the standpoint of architecture, architectural practice has also been thoroughly globalized as architectural education. It is impossible to speak of pure local architecture any more. Sassen predicts that the forms of globalization may be more diversified in the future, perhaps implying a solution for identity problems Sassen (2003).

Convincingly it is said that globalization makes possible new rich configurations; it internationalizes the practice, which is also good. But at the local scale globalization, it means transformation (or rather devastation) of traditional settings by implanting non-serious new morphologies produced for marketing and by doing so it causes an immense loss of meaning.

For some people, unpredictable foreign implants in localities may help rejuvenate the urban life, that is, the Bilbao Guggenheim Museum by Frank O’ Gehry and the Graz Kunsthauw by Colin Fournier and Peter Cook Fournier (2003). But some cultures which import culture may duly be misinterpreted by the local culture. Transformed thing is never accompanied by its original arguments- the authentic mission of the building goes into oblivion’ Fournier, (2003).

Due to the impact of the economic forces of the dominating center(s) of globalization, the loss of identity, character and integrity is a much graver issue in the less developed “periphery”. The Modernization process with its radical interventions had and still has devastating affects on traditional settlements. Recent building practice have transformed, contradicted, and de-structured the essential character of traditional settlements on the one hand and according to many critics, have failed to produce livable new environments on the other.

In order to counteract the homogeneity, uniformity and sterility of contemporary urban environments conditioned by speculative tendencies of power and maximized technology, reconstructive ideas concerning urban transformation such as “urban surgery” or “urban acupuncture” are proposed in the hope of reinstating social-physical integration, continuity and sustainability. In addition, local values of building culture are advocated by many researchers (Duzenli, 2006). Attempts to deregulate power through participation and communication are esteemed. Sustainable ‘low rise-high density’ urban ‘mega forms’ are recommended as ameliorative urban transformation strategies (Frampton, 2000).

Architecture lacks any proposed strategy except for the evading term “contextualism” which found few followers under the stereotyping and devastating effects of globalization. Contextualism refers to a variety of relationships including those not necessarily grounded in physical proximity. It is architecture culture that relies on internal cohesion and diversity, bonds with values, attitudes and preferences of the local (Eggener, 2002).

Neither the palliative ‘Neo-rationalist’ Postmodern discourses which profess identity by revisiting social memory as a remedy nor the ‘Minimalist’ designs of the global “product-form” approaches offer critical solutions to “place-form”, a term used by Frampton to denote those forms growing from within the place and thereby sustaining its meanings (1997).

Nevertheless, Minimalist glass cubes keep on producing sterile environments. Global forms proliferate at every corner of the world (Gur, 2007; Erbay, 2007; Erbay, 2009). The more the forms of architecture are globalized the faster they loose their primary meanings. They have no memory and are therefore no more “memes”. Meme is the term adopted by Salingaros and Mikiten (2002) after Dawkins (1976) who coined the term with relationships of cultural memory and form. Memes are symbiosis between ideas, images, texts and biological forms. They employ it to indicate that each bit of form embodies a bit of memory from the past, hence familiar forms are more than forms; they are form/ memory units.

In order to safeguard livability and identity at every scale and meaning, cities and their architecture demand challenging approaches to planning, urban design, and architecture since their original structures have been
dramatically changed by the effects of modernization and globalization.

On the other hand, today we are able to bridge the distance, time and difference between the places. We are able to witness a global event from our locality and interpret it from our local point of view. Thus every global event gains a local character at once; architectural education, discipline and practice due to the quick distribution of knowledge become global and local at the same time in the age of globalization. This hybrid and syncretistic situation requires a totally different logic, new definitions of architecture, and of form.

Architectural form is a holistic entity composed of mass/volume relations, formats, details and ornamentations which used to reflect the physical requisites of immediate geography and urban context, local values and expectations, societal meanings of existence, and symbols of identity. Bourdieu eloquently demonstrates how symbol systems are formed and how they are very resilient and are closely tied to the maintenance of culture (Bourdieu, 1985). These representations and symbols predate our existence as individuals. Arts and architecture we develop as humans represent our social constitutions, organizations, institutions, etc.

This is reverberated by Gutfenschwager (1996: 246) in his powerful analysis of the late capitalist era: “As symbol, architecture implies social relations, particularly hierarchical ones, and here intersects with the social world in both a political-economic sense and a moral sense”. He renders a convincing and illuminating argument on the relations of the political-economic changes late capitalism is going through and states that ‘it cannot know whether its current restructuring will lead to another historic compromise (equilibrium) along some as-yet-undefined lines, there-fore, postmodern culture cannot proceed with an effective intellectual and emotional vocabulary that can be used to create a sense of community or humanity at the national and international scale necessary for a socialism to succeed.’ This state of ambiguity and uncertainty eventually reflects in all artistic fields and architecture. As a result forms drained of meaning hover in the sky to ooze on any local of the world. The state as such is pure formalism.

This issue is also brought up by many critics: that is, Kwinter (2001) observes that “the era of cultural production we are traversing is unarguably one of impoverishment and mediocrity... in the domain of architecture, first we have declared its Postmodern emancipation from Avant-gardist modernity, we have submitted to the cult of historical styles for some decades and subsequently to myriad, but often hollow neo and anti modernist intellectual postures such as collage, deconstruction and crypto formalist revivals of computer-aided modeling” and admits that “virtuosity of results often obscured their aimlessness” (p.6).

Gür (2007) on the other hand, puts the critical emphasis on the false identity promoted by postmodern practice, “discourses produced under the motto of Postmodernism which was purportedly a resistance to economic and technological monopolization lead Turkish architecture, among others, to a search for identity fuelled with political connotations. It legalized anachronistic motifs from the architectural heritage and combined them with the internationalized clichés of a makeshift architectural language... some examples turned into un-identifiable objects under the disguise of identity,” (p.39).

The era of cultural production we are traversing is pure formalism. It is the modality of our times because form is subject to marketing and designer attention all over the world. There is a strong tendency, even among the students of architecture to copy and replicate global forms instead of ideas.

Especially important for them is to adjust their design problems to fit into the forms created by the “star” architects. Design entries rather than being conceptualized, are formalized on existing popular models. Everything is everything. Form has lost its value as a paradigm of meaning and as a sign of identity.

However, “it is form we perceive, not process or intention. If form is the shape of intention and process however, form is not without significance. Form influences how we live, what we think and what we do,” says Treib (2007: 85).

But the journals of architecture which consider themselves ‘eminent’ have a tendency to avoid talks of ‘form’. In order to promulgate Western metaphysics and aspire for Positivism, still, they give a second order value to discussions on form. They prefer to discuss philosophies and tendencies rather than the ‘elusive’ form. As a result, no one in the discipline has ever investigated globalizing of forms in architecture, although everyone talks about it. In the following survey we dwelled upon the floating forms of the world culture in an aim to demonstrate how meaningless it is not to deal with the contrivances of context out of which may flourish the original.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

This survey was launched at KTU (Trabzon, Turkey). The method was that usually employed by historians, with one major difference: They study the traces left from the past, we studied the buildings brought to public attention by historians and critics from the history books and from the Internet.

The criterion of choice was ‘being worth published’. We usurped all the historical accumulation to date, and studied the similarities. Upon depicting the similarities among cases we identified alter- natives of forms (mass/volume relations), formats and architectonic details. We compiled over 1000 international architectural products in a compendium (Erbay, 2007). Altogether 62 identifiable properties were found: 15 forms, 33 formats and 14 architectonic details.

The reader may find some of these arguable. Besides the fact that visual discussions on form are deemed irrelevant, scholars refrain from discussing the elusive concept of form with visuals because anything made visual is very easy to argue with.

Due to the confines of "writing an essay" on a time-
Figure 1. Illustrations for forms; F1, F2, F3, F4, F5.

FINDINGS

Form
Form of a building can be considered as the general massing of the object. In this respect the study displayed 15 distinct approaches to massing which found diffuse use in contemporary architecture.

Minimalist- monolith vertical prisms (F-1)
These are purist forms whose flat roof line defines a perfect prism. They have either square or rectangular bases. Façades are plain reflecting the principle of Mies van der Rohe: They are popularly addressed as glass skyscrapers.

Vertical prisms, monolithic effect lightened (F-2)
As the plain minimalist prisms (F-1), looked much alike in time, some contemporary architects wished to distort the monolithic effect by various structural plays such as distortion of symmetry, dislocating the facial elements, displacing the mass/volume relations.

Vertical prisms with gothic roof finishing (F-3)
Another way to differentiate the vertical prisms is achieved by triangular roof shapes reminding the “Gothic” either by simple pitched roofs or stepwise regression of roof lines. Especially used in New York towers as a reference to Gothic elegance during the turn of the century as well as in the postmodern era.

Prismatic forms having a bending side face (F-4)
As a reflection of technological advances, the use of bending facial elements starting with Modern architecture is employed to interrupt the monotony of prisms.

Cylindrical masses (F-5)
These are towers with clear circle bases. While there were limited examples in 1980’s, they have been rather frequently used forms ever since (Figure 1).

Horizontal prisms side faces deaf (F-6)
Mid-rise rectangular prisms (popularly addressed as box architecture), with none or very small openings on the sides. They date back to Walter Gropius’s Bauhaus Building, and are employed very frequently in the 70s and continue to be used then on.

Horizontal prisms with three or four identical faces (F-7)
These are horizontal mid-rise prisms with rectangular bases three or four façades of which are identical.

Framing of the façade in a horizontal rectangle (F8)
Horizontal low-rise rectangular prisms, of which wide elevations are contoured with a thin concrete plate or is designed to yield this affect. This structure also appears as if it were a horizontally placed rectangular box (Figure 2).

Combination of vertical and horizontal effects (F9)
These are forms associated with Brutalism. Relatively
smaller and thinner rectangular prisms are added to the main mass. They are so emphasized to be perceived outside the structure. The exaggerated element could be a column, a ventilation chimney or a staircase, or yet, some smaller functional compartment of the building.

**Forms consisting of several masses equivalent in size (F-10)**

These are forms in which equally large solid geometric volumes are arranged either one upon the other or side by side symmetrically with reference to a certain virtual axis. These forms can also be called cluster forms especially when they consist of multiple recurrences of the same size elements. These configurations are frequently used in housing projects. Usually three masses come together and consist in a cluster.

**Masses with large voids (F-11)**

The general mass of the building is carved deep as if a large portion of the mass has been subtracted from the whole. The most striking and imposing examples refer to city gates or the victory arches of the past.

**The integration of rectangular prisms with triangular and/or trapezoid masses (F-12)**

These are derivative forms where triangular prisms are either employed alone or in a combination with other prismatic forms. These started to exist with the advance of building technologies (Figure 3).

**Integration of different solids resisting the gravity (F-13)**

These are forms in which triangular and/or crooked solids are integrated with rectangular prisms to make the massing look more complex. They are arbitrarily combined forms, pushing the limits of geometry.

**Configuration of right angled forms with organic or skewed forms (Gehry Style) (F-14)**

Bending or twirling of the Euclidian solids and combining them with regular or irregular forms as in Frank Gehry’s works.

**Kitsch models (F-15)**

These are heavy, showy and fake masses, sometimes even with an arabesque flavor (Figure 4).

**Formats**

Formats are pieces of general forms invented as solutions for specific situations. These patterns avail themselves for partial solutions of a work and can be freely employed when the need arises. For example, the Renaissance church entrances invented by Leon Battista Alberti Wittkower (1971): The smaller size pediment supported by two semi-columns on the sides of the main gate is a format adhered to by many renaissance architects and Postmodern designers. The study depicted 33 formats in contemporary architecture.
**Symmetric subtractions on the volumes giving a sense of depth (FM-1)**

This is the application of symmetric huge vertical openings on the façades. It is different from F-11 in that these cracks open up to the interior rather than to the sky, giving a feeling of depth.

**Asymmetric subtractions on the volumes giving a sense of depth (FM-2)**

They differ from the former in that subtractions are asymmetric.

**The use of cylindrical or undulating surfaces in the corners (FM-3)**

To elaborate on a regular façade cylindrical, undulating forms are employed, preferably on the corners of the building.

**Emphasis on a corner entrance by subtraction (FM-4)**

It is the carving of the corner on both sides by emptying or pulling backward. It is frequently used in buildings located at corners (Figure 5).

**Emphasis on the main entrance with a column (FM-5)**

Is an emphasis on the entrance with a single column. The column either carries the fringe or is placed somewhat inwards to foreground the corner.

**Emphasis on the entrance with columniation (FM-6)**

A series of columns, sometimes on a raised platform point to the main entrance of buildings, reminding the classical style.

**Entrance façade referring to the past styles (FM-7)**

Motifs from the past are haphazardly employed at the main entrance to give a traditional effect, usually formed with two columns on either side of the main door with a triangular or a semi-circular frontal over them.

**The use of circular and triangular elements as intermediaries between the main masses (FM-8)**

In order to denote the center and the entrance of a building at the same time, circular or triangular roofs span the space between two symmetric buildings to connect them (Figure 6).

**References to ancient pediments (FM-9)**

These are decorative roof endings with triangular forms.

**Organic roofs (FM-10)**

Either structural vaults or fake semi-cylinders are laid
The use of flat and slant surfaces together (FM-11)

Flat surfaces combined with slant surfaces with either few small openings or none (Figure 7).

Integration of dominant cylindrical volumes with others (FM-12)

Use of dominant cylindrical volumes among rectangular Euclidian volumes in massing (Botta style).

Single triangular prisms hanging from a flat surface (FM-13)

These are single triangular or semi-cylindrical bulges on the façades that indicate a specific function inside.

Multiple semi-cylindrical volumes or triangular prisms on a flat surface (FM-14)

Rhythmic repetitions of circular or triangular bulges from façades so as to form a facial texture.

Cylinders protruding from a flat surface (FM-15)

These are almost full cylindrical forms protruding from the facial plane. As opposed to the former, rather than forming a kind of texture, they create a sense of sharp verticality against a horizontal façade (Figure 8).

Cubic appendages on the façades (FM-16)

These are prismatic large volumes mounted on the faces of the main mass. Without deliberately pointing to a
certain function, they give the impression of being attached to the structure externally. They may sometimes be a balcony or a formally underlined part of the building.

**The use of architectonic elements to give the impression of column on the façade (FM-17)**

A lower rectangular prism cutting through a higher one and thereby causing an impression of huge columns on the sides.

**Façades vibrated by insignificant forward and backward rhythmic movements (FM-18)**

In order to make the monotonous elevations, vibrant regular forward and backward facial movements are employed.

**Façades vibrated by irregular forward and backward arrhythmic movements (FM-19)**

In order to create dynamic façades, significant irregular forward and backward movements are employed on the façade (Figure 9).

**Monotonous brick-based façades (FM-20)**

These are solid walls. Repeated small rhythmic windows on the face and flat roof endings are their typical characteristics. Although there may be several openings on the face they yield an impression of solidness.

**Façades built with paved marble (or an equivalent) (FM-21)**

These are solid façades built to yield a sense of solidness and monumentality. Buildings are not necessarily massive but they cause a feeling of inaccessibility.

**Integration of concrete and glass panels giving the impression of being intertwined (FM-22)**

These are formats where transparent and opaque elements are used in an intertwined fashion blending into one another.

**Combination of thin plates cutting, diving and passing through each other (FM-23)**

This is one of the most prominent characteristic formats of Modern Architecture which is adopted by architects like Wright, Rohe, Rietvelt and Neutra generously. Relatively thin concrete plates cut, divide, and pass through each other and cause a sense of dynamism (Figure 10).

**Façades formed by the repetition of a façade element (FM-24)**

These are façades created through repetition of the same element. Repeated elements form a rhythmic texture on the face.
**Larger mass created by the repetition of a unit creating monumental impact (FM-25)**

These are formed via the repetition of the same volume as opposed to the above, which is created by the repetition of a volumetric element. These are rarer than the above.

**Horizontal stripes made of reinforced concrete forming mass texture (FM-26)**

Reinforced concrete horizontal slabs form a prominent mass texture. They give the impression of stripes and are very frequently employed.

**Horizontal stripe windows forming facial texture (FM-27)**

Wide ribbon windows form a mass texture. The difference from the above is that the concrete stripes are prominent in the former where the glass stripe(s) are prominent in the latter (Figure 11).

**The use of renaissance windows as a texture (FM-28)**

It is the multiple use of Renaissance square windows to determine the whole mass texture. One part or the entire face can be shaped in this way. Neither verticality nor horizontality is dominant. Mid-rises give the impression of perforated boxes.

**Metallic grid textures (FM-29)**

These are tightly-knit metal grid faces that give a holistic impression. It gives the impression that the building has been dressed after being constructed.

**Balcony elements as texture (FM-30)**

The use of balconies to form a facial texture is adopted in hotel and housing designs predominantly.

**Prominence of color element on the façades (FM-31)**

Modernism refused to employ color on the exteriors with few exceptions, that is, Schröder House, in Utrecht. Postmodernism is for rich use of color, even in unusual ways (Figure 12).

**Forming of texture on the face with two basic colors (FM-32)**

Traditional use of two natural color brick stripes have been re-visited in Postmodern times.

**The organization of the façade with casual figuration (FM-33)**

This is one of the most characteristic formats of Deconstructionist architecture. It is the use of casual arrangements on the face, causing a dilemma of mass/face. Despite the fact that this approach could have fallen under the analysis of form we preferred to group it here because it can also be a part of a regular building (Figure 13).
**Architectonic details**

Architectonic details are either extra aesthetic values ascribed to the members of the structural system or elementary formal appendages on façades.

**Single or multiple circular openings (TD-1)**

These are windows similar to the rose windows in Gothic Architecture. They are used either singularly or in series so as to emphasize a certain point of the mass.

**Single or multiple square openings (TD-2)**

Repetitive square openings are employed to form a partial texture on the façade. As opposed to (FM-28), they do not determine the whole face but signify a certain function of the interior.

**Squares within squares (TD-3)**

Different size square windows are imbedded in larger and proportionate square forms to configure the façade and to point to a function inside, usually the staircase.

**Framed horizontal stripe windows (TD-4)**

These are framed stripe windows used repeatedly on one portion of the façade. Sometimes they span the whole width.

**Window ledges that are used at horizontal faces to render a vertical impression (TD-5)**

This is to balance the horizontal effect of the buildings with fake verticality (Figure 14).

**Corner windows (TD-6)**

Corner windows, which are one of the characteristics of Modern Architecture signify freedom from the support system.

**Shutters as façade texture (TD-7)**

Shutters are double purpose elements used for functional reasons of privacy and security, as well as facial textures.

**Pergola elements on faces (TD-8)**

The use of wooden pergola elements against climatic conditions as well as an ornamental element.

**The use of jalousies on faces (TD-9)**

This “brisse soleil” idea captured by the Modernists continues with full zeal, sometimes comprising the whole building, that is, Scandinavian Embassies in Berlin (Figure 15).
The use of diagonal metallic elements on the faces (TD-10)

Diagonal elements, which do not have any functional quality are frequently employed with metallic cages.

Emphasis on staircases (TD-11)

Use of fire escape stairs as ornamental tools.

The use of semi-circular and depressed arches on the façades (TD-12)

Semi-circular or depressed arches are used on the façades either to create a visual attraction or to signify something about the building.

Alternative eave details (TD-13)

Various shapes of eaves or cantilevers employed to pronounce that the entrance is a popular tool of differentiation especially in hotel and office designs.

The emphasis on roof lines with various forms (TD-14)

Different roof finishes are also popular tools for differentiation, especially in hotel, shopping mall and office designs (Figure 16). An exemplary table from this research is to be found below.

DISCUSSIONS

The above survey exposes the repeatability of architectural forms and architectonics in the globalizing world, although some may argue certain items (Table 1). Our concern is beyond their aesthetic value. Each pattern may have a beauty in itself. Otherwise it would not have been repeated by so many. What we refuse to accept is the refusal of values imbedded in sites, cultures, ‘habitat’s and differences which consist in the joy of living.

Solà-Morales (1998) once said that the absolute truth is impossible to discover in architecture but architecture must be grounded on something. That something perhaps should be the place rooted-ness, identity, variety, and pluralism thereof. Vattimo (1996) states that “We need the ability to engage in building and urban structure projects that satisfy these two conditions: Enrootedness in a place, and an explicit awareness of multiplicity” (p.154).

There are couple of architects who value the sense of place and show their appreciations successfully with highly abstract forms that convincingly blend with place (Ando, 1991; Pinós, 1992). We need to discover clever ways in which ‘place’ ideology can inscribe itself in the very forms of architecture.

Naturally place and identity concerns require serious efforts to understand the social values imbedded in a culture; to make use of the knowledge acquired from general and local history of architecture and to utilize the data related to the immediate geography, city and the surroundings. Only then our discipline can device a proper language to defeat undesirable effects of globalism.

Gadamer (1996) had said that the meaning of art is
Table 1. An example from formats (FM-01): Symmetric subtractions giving a sense of depth.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Examples worldwide</th>
<th>FM - 01</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gunma Museum, Arata Isozaki, Japan, 1974</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbus City Hall, SOM, Indiana, 1981</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>House Viganelli, Mario Botta, Switzerland, 1981</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humana Building, Michael Graves, Kentucky, USA, 1982</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Deere - Company Roche-Dinkeloo, USA, 1982</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medici House, Mario Botta, Switzerland, 1982</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Breganzona House, Mario Botta, Switzerland, 1988</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ten Peachtree Place, Michael Graves, Atlanta, USA 1990</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meteorology Center, Álvaro Siza, Spain, 1992</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Museum of Modern Art, Mario Botta, San Francisco, 1995</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Examples from Turkey

| Central Bank, Clemens Holzmeister, Ankara, 1933         |                              |
| Ankara Radio, Ankara, 1938                             |                              |
| Sports and Exhibition, Çeviklili-Şahingiray-Aysu, İstanbul, 1949 |                              |
| Limak Holding, Yatman and Yatman, Ankara, 1992          |                              |
| Ostim Offices, Başbuğ-İdil-Özbay, Ankara, 1993          |                              |
| Expertise Hospital Uygur and Uygur, Ankara, 1998        |                              |
| Mersin U. Campus, Şahinbaş-Fikirlier, Mersin, 1998      |                              |
| Borusan A.K.E.M.High School, Sağlıkova, İstanbul, 1998  |                              |

contingent with the occasion and that occasion is the culture. It is ontological and represented by ornament and decoration. Ornament is inevitable in the creation of high quality artifacts and every age creates its own particular ornament for the senses.

Ornament and decor have been viewed as peripheral, and as expandable appendages to the work of art proper after the Moderns. For the Moderns ornament and
embellishment signified a lack of morality (that is, Loos). ‘The idea still remains with us that while the plan as generator is conceived in the central realm of intelligence, ornament merely grows in the outer province of senses’ (Scalbert, 2007). The candor with which we increasingly acknowledge the demands of senses will eventually lead the sense of place and ornament grow from within the cracks of Modernism (Gur, 2002; Pallashmama, 2005).

Salingaros perceives ornament as a valuable component of architecture and arts that connects to human beings. For him the suppression of ornament results in alien forms that generate physiological and psychological distress. He also accuses the early 20th century architects for proposing stylistic changes without having full understanding of human eye/brain system works and states that “small scale ornament is essential to the overall coherence of architectural forms” (Ibid, p.63).

Architectural detail is a site of excess, a place where materials usually meet creating a problem of seams or boundaries. Conventions over solutions are part of architecture culture: The lead pipes and roof finishes of the Venetian house are duly noted by Louis Kahn in this respect (Dostoglu et al., 1986). A more abstract language of detail and ornamentation which stimulatingly connects to place is employed by Tadao Ando in his works such as Hokkaido Chapel, Osaka-Ibaragi Chapel, etc. This clearly demonstrates that properties related to identity and place need not be figurative either.

To summarize, architecture can serve as an active element of change, transforming the impersonality resulting from the political-economic inability to represent the larger social complexity into an identity of a rationalized hope. The new rhetoric of artistic form may be predicated upon the future of humanity and the world: Values of individual, family and community on the one hand, ecological balance, energy and sustainability on the other. Architecture can represent the emerging responsibilities facing the world and cultures and confer an appropriate symbolism on form with due respect for the context and place. What it did in the past, it can do in the future.
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