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ABSTRACT

Archeo-Tec's rediscovery of a historical ship in San Francisco provided a good starting point for this project and its theoretical exploration. It helped propose the site of this project, Chinatown San Francisco. Generally, the ship implies a temporal quality quite apart from its spatial functionality. The found ship opens up and orients this discussion on architectural space, historical concern, and philosophical speculation of time, space and being. The encounter of time, space and being inspires the theoretic construction in this thesis from the start and pervades its presentation. In the course of inspecting their encounters, we are forced to face the most primary and basic problems of human existence and its most palpable production, architecture. These primordial concepts are themselves privileged to differentiate the theoretical categories of architectural historiography. The subsequent result is an examination and re-classification of the role that these primordial concepts play in a selected course of theory, from classicism, through functionalism, to post-functionalism. The exploration of such primordial notions, however, are not the end, but a process to be used to condition further discussion on representation which can be defined as the means of describing and reflecting the human world in verbal notational system, and production which refers to the postulation that the interactive world is capable of producing and reproducing itself in a non-verbal language. The notion of production throughout the thesis deals with the violation of the limit of subject and object, rather than their interaction. This thesis has inherited the way of thinking—dialectics—from Taoism, a Chinese philosophical system, which is concerned with the totality of the universe that is maintained by a balance of opposites. Comparative study on Being and Tao is extended to subject/object and other pertinent relationships. The subject/object issue will also be amplified from biological to social, from bodily to urban, from space to architecture, and from particular to general. Through the discussion in the thesis on time, space and being, as well as object and subject, we come to face philosophical questions in the history of modern philosophy as addressed by epistemology, ontology and phenomenology. To enforce the ground of such theoretical exploration, three case-study projects are made in accordance with the gradation of categorized beings. These three cases are designed to cover the dialectical relationship
between representation and production at different levels, which involve the perceptual world, historicity and architecture as totality respectively. The gradual unfolding of dialectical representation and production leads to the production of an architecture of representation, the final product in this thesis. This project broadens the prior discussions to the vision of architecture in context of discussions on biological perception, historical phenomenon, cultural identity, urban pattern and life, and linguistic analogy. The validity of this proposition is based on its broad investigation and navigation of the sea of contemporary theoretical discourse, in hopes of understanding the functionality and value of tradition. This thesis also tries to find architecture's place and its livelihood through critiquing what it was and is, with an eye to what it will be.
CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION

In September of 2001, excavation at the corner of Clay and Battery Streets in San Francisco began under the supervision of the archeologists from Archeo-Tec. It had been long known that one of the most famous Gold Rush era storeships, the General Harrison, lay buried at this location for 150 years. The General Harrison measured about 127 feet in length, about 26 feet in maximum breadth, about 13 feet in depth and displaced 409 tons. Excavation revealed an 82-foot section of the bilge starting at the sternpost, with the bow of the ship still lying buried under the building at the west. (Archeo-Tec, 2002)

Downtown San Francisco is built upon the carcasses of hundreds of ships like General Harrison from the Gold Rush era. They were abandoned in the harbor in the mid-19th century, when both passengers and crew hurried for the gold fields. There was a shortage of buildings, so the boats were pulled onto the beach, their topsides cut off, and the rests converted into stores, warehouses and restaurants.

The General Harrison, however, is not the ship that conveyed Chinese from Guangdong Province to the new land of America. What it does do is to evoke memories of the formation of Chinatown, and bring another history into the light of speculation for this
project. First, it suggests the time when the first generation of Chinese immigrated to America and the ships that made the immigration possible. Secondly, it calls up a deeper memory of China in the 15th century, then the most advanced country in the world, which held the distinction of assembling the largest fleet to ever sail on the ocean. The rhetorical imagination implies both connection and contrast of the two historical facts. Although both of them involve the ways that the Chinese went from their country, their specific histories involved kinds of persons and ships radically different. In the first case, some Chinese peasants and merchants who could no longer bear famine and western imperialism in the country were driven to a land where wealth could be found. In the second case, when China governed the Pacific Ocean and the countries around, the distant fleets with hundreds of huge ships were essential to maintaining the existence of its power in the world.

In the early days of the Ming dynasty (1368 – 1644), that is, early in the 15th century, China had remained the most advanced country in the world. The emperor Cheng Zu ordered a vast fleet on a distant voyage of exploration in July 1405. The purpose was to establish tributary relations with foreign countries, to expand trade contacts and to look for treasures. Zheng He, a eunuch, was given charge of the fleet. Between 1405 and 1433, Zheng He had eight times been ordered to act as envoy to countries lying to the south and the west of China. In each of these trips, he led a troop of more than 20,000 men on more than 300 ships. Using evidence from maps dated before Columbus’s trip that clearly showed America, and astronomical maps traced back to his time, Zheng He should be honored as the first discoverer of America. In each of his trips, 62 major ships measured 475ft long and 193ft wide, holding 1000 people each, dwarfing Columbus’s ship (75ft x 75ft) more than 6-fold. (Lee, 2003) Those ships were also more advanced than many 19th century warships. When the first Spanish colonialists arrived in North America in the 16th century, they found many Chinese as well as wrecked junks. But the diseases the European colonists brought with them wiped out 90% of the Indians, and destroyed the Chinese influence. (BBC News, 2002) Ironically, the Ming dynasty turned to Confucianism and began a policy of isolationism that lasted 600 years.
Even the last feudal empire, Qing dynasty (1644 – 1911), had retained its unsurpassable global power into the 19th century. However, Qing’s foreign policy was also one of isolationism. Its government was conservative and arrogant, and it failed to join the industrial revolution that was spreading across the countries in the West. Sadly, these factors led to China’s decline and its falling more and more behind the developing world and the gap between it and Western nations inevitably widened. After the mid-Qing period, the dynasty failed to adjust as new problems arose. Rampant corruption, a steady decentralization of power, warfare, rebellions, overpopulation and economic disasters plagued the once glorious empire.
The establishment of New China in 1949 has led to the fact that China has successfully reconstituted itself from inside to out. New China looks forward with a deserved confidence while looking beyond the last decadent century to the former great lasting prosperity. It can be argued that China has begun a fourth period of great prosperity in history, following the Han (206 BC – 220), the Tang (618 – 907), and the early Qing (1644 – 1800). Now, nearly 600 years on, China is once again trying to restore its place as a global superpower and Zheng He is now seen as its hero.

Today, China is engaged wholeheartedly in modernization and has made huge achievements. Developing maritime technology once again becomes an important aspect in reviving this old country. The government has considered increasing its financial budget devoted to navigation, though it is not as important as before in terms of trade development, national security and maintenance of a peaceful global environment.

To some extent, the ship has become a symbol to represent national power and cultural superiority to the new China. The ship is a vessel for transporting people in space. An empire can use it for warfare and world conquest, while refugees can use it to seek a place for survival. It moves and floats on water, to and fro between the fragmented lands. The ship also implies a temporal quality besides its spatial functionality. Every ship is a concentrator of a piece of specific history. The juxtaposition of ships from different historical periods is a simplified history of this nation's economical, political and martial evolvement.

Archeo-Tec's rediscovery of the historical ship contributed this project's starting point. First, it helps propose this specific site of this project, Portsmouth Square in Chinatown San Francisco, virtually a piece of Chinese displaced land overseas. Second, the found ship opens up and orients the discussion in this project on architectural space, historical concern, and philosophical speculation of time, space and being.

Being is the essential problem of ontology. Generally speaking, being is the core essence of existing things. It exists deep inside, wrapped and buried under the abstract layers. Being (capitalized) is the primordial condition, which allows everything else (beings, with a small “b”) to come into existence. By recalling the beginnings of history when Being unveiled itself in the thinking of the Greeks, it can be shown that the Greeks from the very
beginning experienced Being and beings as the presence of the present. Heidegger breaks from the classic concept of “being” as an abstract pondering of existence and throughout this work refers instead to “being-there,” which implies a more thorough connectedness to the world that unfolds over time. As he states at the end of Being and Time: “One can never carry on researches into the source and the possibility of the ‘idea’ of Being in general simply by means of the ‘abstractions’ of formal logic, that is, without any secure horizon for question and answer. One must seek a way of casting light on the fundamental question of ontology, and this is the way to go. Whether this is the only way or even the right one at all, can be decided only after one has gone along it.” (Heidegger, 1962, p. 21)

Compared to Being, the philosophical concept Tao in Chinese Taoism is more indefinable and inclusive. Tao has to be experienced. It refers to a power that envelops, surrounds and flows through all things, living and non-living. Tao regulates natural processes and nourishes balance in the Universe. It embodies the harmony of opposites. It recognizes both being and non-being as complementary. Non-being defines being as dark outlines light. Being and diversity emanate from non-being. Tao is both being and non-being, and being and Non-being produce each other. Tao produces the opposition of figure and ground, whilst blurring the boundary between them. In the oldest scripture of Taoism Tao Te Ching, Lao Zi said: “Non-Being is the term given to that from which Heaven and Earth sprang. Being is the term given to the mother that rears all things. The two are the same. But after they are produced, they have different names. The two together we call the Mystery. It is the Mystery of Mysteries.” (Lao Zi, 2001, p. 4)

Both Heidegger’s being and Lao Zi’s Tao are something to be experienced. The former refers to qualities of the singular existence, while the latter refers to the relationships within and without beings. In this thesis, discussion of Being and Tao will be extended to subject / object and their pertinent relationships. The subject / object issue will also be amplified from biological to social, from bodily to urban, from space to architecture, and from particular to general.

To reinforce the grounding of this theoretical exploration, three case-study projects are made in accordance with the gradation of categorized beings. The first project explores the relationship between body and space and production of new space as a result of the
interaction implied in that relationship. The second project switches the focal point from physical event to historical phenomenon. The context, the object studied and the design methods applied in these two projects are different, but the structures and sequences of both study processes are the same. Either the physical event or the historical phenomenon is analyzed and represented with a designed language. The next stage is to turn the representation in “verbal” language to a space in nonverbal language. The theoretical speculations on time, space and being are examined and reinforced in these projects. Also, language as a tool and linguistics as a technical model are introduced, and they provide a new perspective in architectural study and new design techniques in architectural practice. Social geography as a complement of historicism plays a distinct role in the study process of the second project. The third project is an architectural design – Chinese Cultural Center in Chinatown San Francisco. This project broadens the prior discussions to the vision of architecture in context of discussions on biological perception, historical phenomenon, cultural identity, urban pattern and life, and linguistic analogy, etc..
Towards the Production of an Architecture of Representation
1.1 Diagram of the Theoretical Structure

The encounter of time, space and being inspires the beginning of the whole theoretical construction in this thesis and pervades the presentation. By inspecting their encounters, we are forced to face the most primary and basic problems of this human world and its first production, architecture. These primordial concepts are privileged to differentiate such categories in past architectural historiography. The result is an examination and re-classification of the role that time, space and being play in a selected course of theory, from classicism, through functionalism, to post-functionalism. By comparing and critiquing them within the development of a prescribed theoretical course, a proposed theoretical proposition comes into being, which will guide the process of discussion and designing. Being (regular) will be categorized into Being (capitalized) and beings (with small “b”). Being, in a limited sense, refers to the non-subject syntactic structure of existence, while beings refer to the surface structures of all existences. The notion of beings (with small “b”) is divided to a bodily one with physio-psychological self and a socio-cultural one with socio-cultural identity. The different theoretical categories and their influence on the proposed theory will be elaborated in the section Design Rationale in Chapter 2. It should be noted that the exploration of the primordial notions and proposed theory are not seen as the end. Rather they refer to a process to be used to condition further discussion on representation describing and reflecting the human world in verbal notational system, and on production postulating that the interactive world is capable of producing and reproducing itself in a non-verbal language. Three case studies are designed to cover the dialectical relationship between representation and production at different levels, which are the perceptional world, historicity and architecture as totality respectively. The gradual unfolding of dialectical representation and production leads to the production of an architecture of representation, the final product in this thesis.
CHAPTER 2
CASE STUDIES

An array of three case studies in this thesis is aimed to clarify, examine and support parallel theoretical discussions of time, space and being, together with representation and application of linguistic usage to it. They are organized to represent a series of philosophical speculations, cultural studies and abstract logos within together with visualization, spatialization and “architecturalization” of these thoughts. The case studies are placed prior to unfolding the theory component of this study in order to foreground their presence and to take them as both the starting point and the target of the following analysis. This kind of organization helps better understand this thesis and strengthen the connection between theory and practice, concept and design, as well as the particular and the general.

2.1 From Representation of Space to Space of Representation

This case is an autonomous analysis in the relationship of space, event and representation on small scale. It has no socio-economical context and other conditions. Its raw material is a movie clip. The case study has nothing to do with any other parts of that movie, and that clip is extracted without any special purpose. Although it is involved with description of a short story, the content of the story is only something general and can be understood within this clip without connecting to the whole movie. The case study is divided into two parts, representation of space and space of representation. Representation of space is referred to using a verbal system to document space and experiences in space, while space of representation is about production of space by the interaction between space and event. In the first part, the movement of a group of people in the event is mainly narrated and articulated in detail. A sign code is designed to represent the singular sequential movement separately. In the second part, besides the major concerned movement, the involved people’s psychological activities are also considered. Singular movements of each person are combined as a whole. The sequences of the event in light of psychological fluctuation are turned into a space as a final product.
Here is the description of that story. In the early part of the movie clip, a man who is dressed inappropriately walks out of an elevator. He turns right and suddenly stops because he hears some people coming along a corridor nearby. He doesn’t want to be found by others, so he turns back and moves along the wall secretly. He hides himself in a corner and stays there, when at the same time three people arrive at the elevator. They stand there for a while and talk to each other. After saying goodbye, two people walk into the elevator and one person goes back.

An abstract notation system is developed to represent the singular movement of each person in relation to space. The proposal of this technique borrows heavily from the previous work of Kevin Lynch in his book *The View from the Road*. It is a simple graphic technique of recording visual sequence. The perception of motion and space is analyzed in the parts of self motion, motion of the visual field and spatial characteristics etc. It can be easily understood and is able to communicate the sense of sequence. However, there are some disadvantages with this kind of technique. As Lynch points out, any abstract notation, however clear it may be logically, is never at first intuitively obvious. The reader should be warned that it will take time and some practice before any such system will seem to communicate the “feel” of a complicated experience of motion. (Lynch, 1965, p. 21)

The implementation of the second part relies on the theory borrowed from Bernard Tschumi in his book *Event-Cities 2*. Tschumi suggests that architecture can accelerate the events of everyday life through new forms of organization. Using various modes of notation ranging from rough models to sophisticated computer-generated images, he reveals the complexities of the architectural process and the rich texture of events that define urban reality today. As Tschumi said, there are ceremonies that determine space, and spaces that determine ceremonies. (Tschumi, 2000, p. 19) The movement of people and the interaction between them and space are the generators of the final product, space, which is a conceptual space different from the real space. Traces are left by their movement. Psychological fluctuation along with the process of motion gives influences to the reorganization of these traces, which transforms objective documentation into subjective narration. The sequential process is frozen into a pattern of lines. The representation of the event unfolded in space produces a pattern that is potentially able to be spatialized when the element of time is
removed. The interaction between subject and object, together with the psychological
influences among subjects, prefabricates the way that the pattern is turned into space.
Governed by these defining factors, the characteristics of the produced space, such as depth,
flatness, solidity etc., are generated to shape the space, which inversely reflects the
relationships within event and space. Thus a space of representation is produced.
Fig 7. Representation of Space
Fig 8. Space of Representation
2.2 From Representation of Historical events to Production of Space of Representation

This case study pushes the research forward and enlarges the scale of discussion on time, space and being. It switches to a dimension of historicity, a city and a collection of imaginative people. The historical event represented is a piece of the history of the city of San Francisco from mid 19th century to the early 20th century. A concept about decoding history in transparent layers of transformations and reconstruction in a non-Cartesian coordinate is developed, and Bernard Tschumi’s theory about space of representation is borrowed. Two representational products are developed from these two theoretical systems. The first representation is a representation of space (event), and the second is a space of representation. The common characters between the immediate world and the history allow for the application of the representation methods in the latter, which are developed from the former. Their differences make it necessary to transform those methods to fit into representation of history. This research project provides a new perspective to deal with issues of historicity. History is represented visually through a process of interpretation and reconfiguration in terms of time and space.

If motion in the tangible environment can be documented in a precise way and produce a series of instantaneous spaces of representation (implied by the theories of Iain Borden and Michel de Certeau), can the motional inhabitation of historical events in time and space be represented in a similar way with its slow and invisible transformational process visualized at the present moment and then translated to a space of representation? In this world, everything is in transformation and movement, subjected to the cycle of birth, growth, death, and regeneration. Historicism attempts to interpret history scientifically. It concentrates on a vertical study of the human experience and places each of its nodes precisely in a linear coordinate system. In conjunction of history and social geography, moments in the sequential human experience are displaced and associated simultaneously. The interplay of the present and the past reinterprets a slow but instantaneous space of representation in the same way as in the immediate circumstance and collapses frames of eclipsed happenings in the present. This research project will address representation of events
unfolded in a historical and geographic dimension. It tries to challenge the transformational
process of physical world and its attached social life beyond the immediate inhabitation of
daily life or even of a life span.

The downtown San Francisco is built upon the carcasses of several dozen ships from
the Gold Rush era. There was a shortage of buildings, so the boats were dragged onto the
beach, the topsides were cut off, and the remains were converted into a store, warehouse or
restaurant. The movement of the ship accompanied the shifting of the shoreline. There are six
typical stages of the change of shoreline: 1847, 1848, 1849, 1853, 1856 and 1906. The events
include the great fires of 1850, 1851 and 1906.

The transformations and movement of boats, shorelines and fires interweave and form
a fundamental part of the history of San Francisco. The boat floated on water only to be
dumped as landfill to expand the shoreline. The shorelines shifted year by year. Great fires
happened for several times. Transformations like these are only recorded in the collective
unconscious. The representation of these transformations is an action to bring the collective
unconscious to consciousness through an individual subject. Perception in unconscious state
acts out the physical world as a signification system and produces the form/space of
representation. Conscious involvement of the subject is to reinstate the collective memory, to
materialize the acting out, and to absorb unconscious perception into conception.

Since historical phenomena entail a lack of complete documentation and only partial
evidences are available, the imagination of the subject is demanded to fill in the empty spaces
between the discrete substantial collections. The remaining traces include information about
the most stable and inevitable moments of the past event. They reflect something capable of
enduring the erasure of time, so they constitute the structure of events that hold the identity
of a specific historical moment. By contrast, the erased information is part of the event that
has various alternatives and possibilities. The indeterminacy of this part of the event can be
recovered by reestablishment of larger wholes through the active agency of imagination.
Hence, the subject goes back to participate in the proceeding of the original event through
imagination, while the transformational process is synchronized into the present through
representation. The subject goes back and forth while the object is displaced in a reversible
course.
The evidences of the former presence of something are traces of what has been absent at present. They do not constitute previously existent objects themselves but are the present indication of those objects. Trace is composed of remaining evidences and the relationship or logic implied by them. Trace is the intrinsic connection between the present and the past, the immediate and its future. Trace is also the non-arbitrary intervention of the subject when constructing the fragments into a whole. Representation is about representing the relationship not only between the signifier and the signified, but also within the object in a syntactic system that is in form of figure or ground. The former refers to the symbolic meaning in the object, while the latter refers to the syntactic structure within the object. But the relationship between them becomes an object in representation. In representation, trace is materialized and becomes the form/space of representation.

Representation in this research will occur in a sequential process. On one hand, the process is in parallel with the sequential unfolding of the event; on the other hand, it is in relation to a syntactic structuring process from surface structure toward deep structure. The unfolding of the event also unfolds in the representation and the form/space of representation. A transformational grammar will be designed according to the nature of the transformations in the event. The transformational grammar functions as governing rules in transition from one stage to the next stage. It discloses the structure in the real world and structures the representation in a similar way. Symbolic meaning produced in a signification system will also concern this research. The nodes in the structure will be taken as a connection between the conscious and the unconscious. In everyday life, the conscious and the unconscious interweave, and this fact blinds the subject of the daily life to the existence of the unconscious state. The unconscious will become discernible only if it is detached from a bundle. The event thus unfolds in two differentiated levels, which are connected only via unreal nodes. The nodes act as force of disturbance in the level of the conscious. Through the nodes, the subject enters into the level of the unconscious and acquires semantic meaning.

The representation of the phenomenon in question is developed and theorized in two different directions, which lead to exploration in their own appropriate languages and final productions. The first one is originated from my creation, and the second is aimed to examining and reproducing Tschumi’s theory.
The essential concepts of the first representation involve constructing temporal events into spatial bodies and re-measuring the spatial bodies in a temporal dimension, that is to say, the analysis traverses from time to space and then from space to time. However, the last temporal body is not the same thing as the previous temporal event. Rather, the actual reality is an entity transforming over time. In the stage of time to space, different layers of transformation are singled out. In this case, they entail transformations of boats, shorelines and fires. Since these are historic events, only fragmentary pieces of traces are available. Each transformation is represented in a spatial dimension. The phrases of this transformation are then synchronized and reconstructed in the same space. The actual reality is thus divided into separate spaces. In the stage of space to time, different transformations are measured in the dimension of time. And some transformations are continuous, while others are discrete. In virtual reality, the three transformations overlap continuously. The things perceptible in actual reality are merely parts on the surface of the layers. Through the same unit in time, the transformations are integrated together, though represented in different coordinates due to their different properties. The entity of boats is composed of multiple objects, which has spatial relationship to each other. And there is relationship between the distribution of objects and time. The entity of shorelines is a continuous transformation of the same object. Fires happened discretely and there is no relationship between them. But there is probability of an event happening between each two fires, and it is determined by these two fires. The transformations are reconstructed in temporal dimension in spatial plates. Each transformation has a set of plates. The three sets of plates are established with the three different coordinate systems. There is no spatial relationship but temporal relationship between the plates even in the same coordinate. Spatial coordinate is redefined by the planes supporting each transformation.

The second representation employs Tschumi’s Space-Event theory in his *Event-Cities*. 2. The apparent, imaginative and ritualized movements of the boats, shorelines and fires in that historical period provide raw materials for production of space. The theory of layers of transformation in the first representation has been incorporated here in order to appropriate Tschumi’s theory with the particular characteristics in this case. Tschumi imagines a house by connecting three spaces produced from three different events. By contrast, in this case,
three interwoven transformational layers within only one event are analyzed separately and synthesized as a single body. Some information extracted from the records shows that the boats are pulled ashore and sunken later. The shorelines shift outwards in one orientation. It can be interpreted as if a line moves in an orientation rather than new lines replace the old ones. Each point on that line changes its position and leaves a trace when its original line moves. The movement of fires can be described as a shape that expands and explodes in size. Three layers together convey the information of the three events and construct factories of space production. Hence, three distinct spatial bodies are produced. Supposing that all the rest layers lay beneath this spatial body, I let a part of them show up in each other’s surface. The final product of this representation is thus a single spatial body comprised of three layers and their connection.

The implementation of this representational work requires an adequate amount of information recording the historical event. Methods that are used for the representation of daily life are not contradictory in application to the representation of historical events. Rather it is their common character that allows for mutual interpretation and translation. Indeed, theories need to be transformed in some ways because special problems will be met in the process of translation. This research deals with inhabitation, human experience, in a large scale of time – history. It provides a new observational perspective in face of issues of historicity. History is represented visually through a process of interpretation and reconfiguration in terms of time and space. The final products of representation reveal the history in a narrative format from different perspectives. History is never about something "there and then", but about something existing only with narrations in a variety of forms in the stories we tell about them.
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2.3 Production of an Architecture of Representation: Chinese Cultural Center in Chinatown San Francisco

The last case provides places for a continuing discussion of time, space and being, though these notions will be defined at a different level. With the connotations of time, space and being changing, the research will enclose a spectrum of dialectical inversion and conversion between representation and production, ranging from bodily and phenomenological experience to epistemological and ontological perspectives and criticism. All the exploration and speculation will give rise to the objective in this case, production of an architecture of representation. The architectural project is filled with social function and will serve as a Chinese cultural center in Chinatown San Francisco, the same site that I used in the second case study. Time is expanded to the level of history, and space to the presence and absence of place and displacement. Discussion on being will be extended to the relationship of subject - subject, object - object, and subject - object. To help implement the design process towards the production of an architecture and ground the discussion of time, space and being in that process, the concepts and methods employed will be framed in the sensibility of a critical post-modernism. Linguistic models such as structuralism and semiotics will be borrowed and at the same critiqued to maintain the proposed sensibility.

2.3.1 Background of Chinatown San Francisco

In 1849, shortly after the United States took California as spoils of the Mexican American War, gold was discovered on the American River. From a small Mexican village, Yerba Buena became San Francisco, transformed into a chaotic, cosmopolitan, frontier city. San Francisco drew thousands of profit-seeking Forty-Niners from all parts of the country and various parts of the world. So the Chinese, like other Forty-Niners, sought riches in California. These Chinese peasants and merchants had been ravaged by famine and Western imperialist intrusions. The people established themselves close to the wharf where they
landed — in what is now known as core Chinatown. In 1850, Chinatown comprised a five-block area, reflecting the need to service the growing Chinese immigration population.

It was in Chinatown San Francisco that the first Asians coming to America, Chinese, began their journey to Gum San Gold Mountain. Chinatown is the oldest Chinese Community in the United States. Existing for over 150 years, it is a living monument to the heritage of Asians in America. As the oldest part of San Francisco, its history also forms a major part of the city’s heritage.

Chinatown today consists of 224 city blocks that together constitute 428 acres. Based on the 1970 census, the Department of City Planning distinguished a core and a noncore area of Chinatown, which together comprises greater Chinatown (see Figure 13). Core Chinatown, a 17-block area bordered by Kearny, Pacific, Powell, and California Streets, contains the heaviest concentration of restaurants, shops, and Chinese residents. In 1980,
7,439 persons resided in the core area; of these, 92% were Chinese. In the Southwest corner of core Chinatown is Portsmouth Square, serving as a living room for this community. Grant Avenue is the street where most tourists enter, while Stockton Street, which runs parallel to Grant, is alive with local residents. In 1980, the noncore area of Chinatown contained a total of 44,070 persons, of whom 50% were Chinese.

In a city heavily dependent on tourism, Chinatown is a vital link in this industry. At least three out of every four of the three million visitors to San Francisco each year visit Chinatown (Loo, 1984, p. 30). Thousands of tourists pass through this area daily. Chinatown also serves as “capital city” for the larger Chinese American population. It is a shopping hub for Chinese goods and services. It also functions as a cultural center for Chinese institutions, both for the entire Bay Area and beyond (Loo, 1985, p. 56).

2.3.2 Design Rationale

This theoretically driven project is developed in a complex discursive environment where multiple interpenetrating subjects are covered to rationalize the speculative process leading to an evident conclusion. It is both culturally based and generally realized, so it is proposed to take an effort to address a Chinese system of architectural studies as well as global architectural theories. This proposition is taken with the expectation of a result. However, it also provides some influence on shaping the theoretical construction and the tangible design process, as will be discussed subsequently. Before reaching the proposed theoretical grounds for this project, we need to look back to the related historical change and embed the proposal into a piece of history. Through the comparative study, this research can be brought to join the argument on some contentious points thereby shedding light on the thesis’ exploration of its extended argument. In the argument, comparisons among Classicism, Functionalism and Post-Functionalism will be reduced to their differences in the design process. My understanding of the design process will be limited to the topics of subject/object relationships and meaning.

In the pre-industrial classical practice, architectural objects exist in a passive relationship with man. Objects are given significance when being related to something
significant to man, but put into obscurity at the same time. Objects are seen as symbol and medium of the conveyed meaning, which I call symbolic meaning. Objects are then sublimated until they are replaced by what they represent. In the illustration of classicism in Fig 14, an arrow points outward from the end of the horizontal arrow, which represents design process. The outward meaning is an output of the design process, that is, it provides no influence to the design process.

With the advent of industrialization, architecture becomes an art of social responsibility and focuses more on programmatic issues. Functionalism in art and architecture is an aesthetic doctrine developed in the early 20th century out of Louis Henry Sullivan's aphorism that “form forever follows function”. Functionalist architects and artists design utilitarian structures in which the interior program dictates outward form, without regard to such traditional devices as axial symmetry and classical proportions. Functionalism, together with other types of modernism, changes the architectural objects and the process of making these objects. The relationship between object and man has also been changed. Object making becomes an autonomous process without external references. In the illustration of functionalism in Fig 14, an arrow points inward at the beginning of the horizontal arrow. The inward meaning, which I call functional meaning, is an input of the design process. It acts as raw material to be transformed for formmaking throughout the design process.

Postmodernism not only opposes to the manifesto of modernism, but also denies that modernism is a revolution against classicism. As noted by Peter Eisenman, what was previously understood as the rupture between the classical and the modern can now be seen as aspects of the same continuity; first, in terms of the nature of the architectural object and its capacity to signify; second, in terms of the idea of the process of design. (Eisenman, 1971, p. 72) It might be said that if modernism equals functionalism, then postmodernism equals post-functionalism. Eisenman thus created a “post-critical” term, Post-functionalism, to negate functionalism and claim a new consciousness in architecture. In the illustration of post-functionalism in Fig 14, the only horizontal arrow alone means that architectural objects are not given significance, and that form doesn’t need to follow function and the like. As Eisenman remarks in his article Post-Functionalism, form is understood as a series of
fragments – signs without meaning dependent upon, and without reference to, a more basic condition. (Eisenman, 1976, p. 45) Post-functionalist architecture has only syntactic structure, uninvolved with whatever signification. The role of syntactic structure in architecture will change in the proposed theoretical alternative. It will act as a kind of meaning exchanger in charge of inward and outward connection, though it itself is still not of meaning.

Post-functionality does no more than to negate functionalism because it is merely a term of absence and manifests nothing. And postmodernism is not merely a substitute term for post-functionality. There is no term prepared for the theoretical alternatives proposed in this thesis, but it is surely a part of postmodern discourse. In the illustration of the proposed design process in Fig 14, the design process is divided into two parts and it is attached with three inward arrows and three outward arrows. The classification of these two parts is determined in light of application of linguistic tactics. That architecture is taken as language and architectural object as sign distinguishes the strategy with a prominent character. Different from the prior diagrams, in the proposition there are both inputs and outputs of significances in the process. Besides symbolic meaning and functional meaning, a new significance, syntactic meaning, is added in the first half of the process. The first part represents a process structuring architecture as syntax. The input of syntactic significance implies that architecture is a part of a totality, the city or something else. The syntactic structure of the totality preconditions the deep structure of the syntax in architecture. The output of syntactic significance supports the hypothesis that internal architectural structure has an impact on the structure of the totality. The added output of functional significance strengthens the relationship between architecture and social settings. Function is not only seen as a social requirement but also as an architectural event, which pulls architecture back to the social setting. The added input of symbolic significance characterizes the second half as a process of semantic construction. An architectural object is not just signified to something else, but is also transformed from something else with significances. Symbols extracted from the conventional system are materialized and turned into objects. A process of deconstruction and reconstitution transforms them, which detaches them from the origin, associates them inside architecture and builds a new reference in the end to the outside.
Functional meaning and symbolic meaning come to concern the second half of the process, just as architecture is exclusively concerned with syntactic transformations during the first half. The input and output of the same significance render this new architectural consciousness dialectical in terms of symbolic connection, function and structure. This dialectical architecture has origin, but is not the origin itself. It also has end, but is not the end itself.
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Fig 14. Design Process in Classicism, Functionalism, Post-Functionalism, and the Proposed Theory
2.3.3 Linguistic Tactics

The application of linguistic tactics will be elaborated in the two main components in the design process, syntactic structure and symbolic connection. Why can linguistics be thought to provide methods for investigating any symbolic system such as architecture? As Jonathan Culler points out, in the case of linguistic signs the conventional or ‘arbitrary’ basis is obvious, and therefore by taking linguistics as a model one may avoid the familiar mistake of assuming that signs which appear natural to those who use them have an intrinsic meaning and require no explanation. (Culler, 1975, p. 5) Compared to linguistic signs, the meaning of architectural signs seems much more natural, so we need to view them with a certain detachment to understand that their meanings are in fact the products of a culture replete with conventions. We can refer to structuralism and semiotics in order to understand how general cultural sign system is studied in light of the linguistic model. Some concepts in this thesis are borrowed from these two disciplines. Criticism of them, however, is more important to the relevant questions for this thesis than rote adherence to them.

Structuralism and semiotics can be said to be identical, because each system draws certain rases from structural linguistics. Structuralism designates the work of a group of twentieth century French language theorists whereas semiotics, first postulated by Ferdinand de Saussure, refers to any work which studies signs. Both are based on the postulation that if human productions have a meaning, there must be an underlying system of distinctions and conventions which makes this meaning possible. An element’s meaning can be explained by its place in the network of relations rather than in a chain of cause and effect as claimed by functionalism. Like linguistics, structuralism and semiotics constructs a system of signification and a set of rules and conventions that governs the function of cultural objects. However, this science of signs has many, perhaps too many, limits and does not succeed because of its over-ambitious program. It is unrealistic to build a vast system of all knowledge. It is also conservative to simply construct an account of conventions rather than to produce new interpretations. An enclosed system is imperialistic because rigid signifying systems freeze the relationship between objects and their meaning, as well as syntactic...
structures and semantic interpretations. Deconstruction provides an insight to the problems of paradoxes and indeterminacy in signification system and becomes a way to invoke the force of a post-structuralist age. In his book *The Pursuit of Signs*, Culler observes that the insights deconstruction offer into the functioning of language and texts constitute the most important modern contribution to our understanding of signification. (Culler, 1981, p. xiii)

This thesis expects to try tackling those problems, at least at the level of conception. The signification system needs to be opened, weakening its origin and end. The project will not be treated as an autonomous cultural system, but as a process exchanging and transporting messages and objects along with production of architectural objects and their meaning. Deconstruction is employed here as cause and, at the same time, effect of a series of transformations. Meaning, in turn, will be detached from the structure and be reconstituted to reattach with it. Based on this motivation, the design process is divided into two parts, of syntax and semantics.

2.3.4 Syntactic Structure

The first stage of the design process is to infer a syntactic structure regardless of cultural context and any signification implication. Before connecting linguistic concepts with architecture, we need to have a basic understanding of the original concepts in linguistic field. Renowned linguist Noam Chomsky defines syntax as the study of the principle and processes by which sentences are constructed in particular languages. (Chomsky, 1962, p. 1) In language, syntax is the study of grammar, rules whereby words or other elements of sentence structure are combined to form grammatical sentences. Grammar is autonomous and independent of meaning. The relation between semantics and syntax can only be studies after the syntactic structure has been determined on independent grounds. Two levels of sentence structure are postulated to capture the linguistic phenomenon of grammatical sentences. Linguist Edward Finegan remarks: “One level is represented by the linear string of words as uttered or written. It is called the surface structure. Surface structure encompasses both the linear order of the constituents which is obvious from inspection and their hierarchical order which is not expressed explicitly but is understood. The other level of structure is an abstract
level underlying the surface structure. It is called the deep structure or underlying structure.” (Finegan, 1999, p. 163) From an underlying structure, a surface structure is generated by a series of syntactic operations, which are known as transformations. This situation can be represented as Fig 15.
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Syntax in linguistics has its architectural equivalent in material and spatial ordering. In classic architecture, such ordering is capable of conveying meaning. And it is nothing more than placing parts of the structure in the correct order or organizing spaces in the correct way. Architecture can been seen as an assemblage of basic elements into a composition. Here, syntax bears no meaning and is not conventionally based. There is no pre-existent criterion for judging whether the structure or ordering in architecture is correct or not. But the transformational process in linguistics as a model will be put to use. Syntactic structure is no longer seen as an immaterial component underlying in the human production. It becomes the production itself, and also the connection with otherness. It is semantically independent, but it is produced from the deep structure which is underlying in the habitation where it is situated. Syntactic structure exists in a dynamic state, in the process of its formation and its impact upon its habitation.

In this thesis, the syntactic structure of architecture is inferred from the urban pattern of the city of San Francisco. There is a stunning similarity between the city’s horizontal and vertical pattern. The aerial photo of this city shows that two street grids in different orientations divide the city along the Market Street which runs from northeast to southwest. One grid system is placed north-south, while the other is angled. Some angled, superimposed streets indicate that these two grids are overlaid with each other. The surface feature of the city ground shares the quality of angled-ness with the city plan. The city has a complex topography because it is established on several hills. The north-south cut of Chinatown
across the project site represents this typical topographical feature. The commonality between the horizontal and vertical layers of this city forms the deep structure of the architectural syntax, from which syntactic structure will be produced. Based on this deep structure, the common feature between the plan and the section of the architecture is decided. First, in the layer of section, architecture is seen as a part of the uninterrupted continuity with the city ground. A continuous zigzag line, which is constituted with lines in two orientations, is the first production of transformation from the deep structure. Fig 17 shows that how the section is developed with a series of syntactic operations. The continuous zigzag line in fact cuts the space into two, with each of them separated onto each side of the line. The next operation is to transform the single line into a double line, that is, a line copied from the original line and displaced is the result: a space is produced between the two lines. The transformation can also be understood as a solid separation turns into a spatial connection. As the sharp angles of the zigzag lines are not prepared for architectural usage, the structure is enlarged and cut at both ends. A basic syntactic structure on the layer of section is thus produced. As mentioned above, the deep structure has determined that the section and the plan share a common feature. Hence, the sectional structure is used to produce a similar effect on the layer of plan. The project site is located at the southwest corner of Portsmouth Square, the center of Chinatown. It is an L shaped three quarters of a square. The beginning of the design process is to put the sectional structure on the top of the square. Then it is enlarged, displaced, and cut to fit the L shaped plan. The later development of plan and section has kept the basic feature of the syntactic structure, though social function and symbolic signification are added to the process of production.

The syntactic structure is a timeless existence, a “Being” which gives the primordial condition for “beings”, things in a surface structure, to come into existence. Time is related to issues of history, cultural continuity, flow of space, and inhabitation of events, of which syntactic structure is devoid. Time, then, is taken into account in the semantic stage of the design process. In this stage, the notion of space has been taken into account, though spatial issues related to cultural displacement are not included at this moment. Syntactic structure has the spatial connection with its habitation, in the form of continuity or mimetic capability. In this project, the syntactic structure has both such spatial connections
2.3.5 Symbolic Connection

As the design process moves to the second stage, architecture as language also shifts its concern in a detached sense from syntax to semantics. Similar to classicism, architecture in this new consciousness has symbolic connection with its social and cultural habitation. However, the symbolic connection in classicism is limited to a simple signifier/signified relationship, which can find its linguistic equivalent in semantics, the study of relationships between signs and symbols and what they represent. Symbols in architecture point outward to what they represent, meaning. This mono-directional communication between architecture and its socio-cultural habitation is restricted by the conventional rules and at the same time reinforces conventions through practice. Classical architecture has a relatively static lexicon of architectural symbols. Alternatively, symbolic representation has long been vilified by the modernism. But when reviewing the history of modernism, we find that modernism did not really deny symbolic representation system, but instead created its own lexicon. Indeed, when modernism became a style, it fell into the trap of this static modernist lexicon. In my proposed architectural consciousness, symbolic representation system is inherited, but it is an open system because the connection between signifier and signified is relational, subject to change for all possible reasons. Furthermore, the symbolic connection between architecture and its habitation is bidirectional. Symbols in architecture point outward to what they represented without being limited by a conventional lexicon; meanwhile architecture receives the symbols from a conventional system pointing inward. The symbols adopted are treated as raw material for a chain of transformations. However, they are also subject to deconstruction and reconstitution to construct new meanings that architecture proposes to covey.

As mentioned at the beginning of this thesis, the excavation of a gold-rush era ship in Chinatown and the recollection of 15th century Chinese ship in global navigation together offer inspiration to the project’s siting and other pre-design feasibility. The ship is seen as the raw material for constructing symbolic connection in this project. In the plans and sections of my cultural center, the ship is not obvious and the symbol does not refer literally to what was related to the ship. In the process, however, the ship is converted into a part of the
architecture, as it loses its original shape and meaning. The two ships referred to represent a contrastive and paradigmatic relationship in a semiotic sense, because one is meant to look for survival and the other to conquer new lands. They are signs not to be selected at the same time in a linguistic sequence, that is, at least one of them should be outside of the temporal sequence. But the proposed linguistic discourse, which supports representation of indeterminacy and controversy, allows for coexistence of paradigmatic signs. Consequently, the distinction and boundary between syntagm and paradigm is undermined, which unavoidably leads to a semantic ambiguity. Through such linguistic operations, signs taken from the conventional system are alienated, and historical references are shut down. History, not historicity, can be deconstructed, which gives a vast flexible space for the subject who has an explanatory privilege. Semantic ambiguity, in some sense, is also semantic vacuum. Signs taken from history and convention are put into an irreversible production line. As they shut down a connection with the past, those signs are thrown to the future, a battlefield occupied by subjects with both interest and value. The reconstitution after deconstruction is a process of identity construction. Identity is a core attribute of beings. However, here it is understood that identity is not a mirroring representation of the subject itself, but the representation of what information in what format the subject is willing to convey. In the process of reconstitution, the contrastive signs of ships start to lose their shapes, only to be melted into this new architectural habitation. They also start to lose their contrast and be merged into one, though the contrastive meaning is reserved for reference.

We still can find some vestiges of those signs of ships in this architecture. Looking from the south along the Grant Ave., the cultural center resembles a ship at sail. The three-story high main building looks like the ship hulk. The housing tower looks like a sail of the ship. And the tilted columns look like masts, in contrast to other columns which stand vertically. Looking from the Portsmouth Square, we feel that the tilted floors continuous with the wall resemble the massive curvilinear external skin of the ship. The floor on the site’s bottom tilts the ground in a reversed orientation, which gives rise to the imaginary sense that the building seemingly extrudes from the site. Analogically, the building as ship thus floats on the water. As the building is transformed from two zigzagging lines, the interior of the main building is divided into two parts different in half floor to each other. In one part, the
floor is flat and the ceiling is tilted, while in the other part, the floor tilted and the ceiling flat. The extended components of floors in both parts reach their complements on the other side in the form of ramp or bridge. This gives sense of getting on ship from the bank. The distortion within a structured order of this building is the same quality as that of a ship.

The architecture also presents other cultural symbolic significances, such as paper handicraft and Chinese calligraphy. It seems as if the building is made of several pieces of paper. Paper handicraft has a quality of continuity, though the shape is very complicated and three dimensioned. A piece of paper, after a series of operations such as cutting, overlapping etc, can become a three dimensional artwork via manipulation. This building has just such a quality. Its floor, wall, ceiling are in a continuity, but constitute a complex form and space. The zigzagging shapes of the paper architecture are totally exposed on the side of the building along the Clay St., which makes the building appear solid and skinny but with one side opened and transparent. The moving sense of the zigzagging architectural elements is akin to the posture of a special type of Chinese calligraphy.

Traditional symbols such as ship, paper handicraft and Calligraphy are inputs for the identity construction in the design process. What are read from the final appearance of the architecture are just vestiges of those raw materials in the production. Production creates symbolic connection with the world in a new signification lexicon, as well as some byproducts and surplus of raw materials. In the most agreeable sense, Chinatown San Francisco is a piece of land displaced from China. So the production of architecture in that site is also a production of Chinese cultural identity, which can be read from what information in what format. The product in this process, what is signified to by the generated symbols, will goes hand by hand with the demand of Chinese cultural identity.

2.3.6 Social Function

Social function had not been the most important concern in architecture previous to the advent of functionalism. Functionalism, however, takes architecture as a product of the formula form-follows-function. Social function becomes not only the input of the design process guided by the functionalist formula, but also the predominant factor in controlling
architectural design. This sociological imperialism comes under attack by the successive postmodernist architectural discourses. In architectural consciousness, I propose that social function as a formal determinant is not discarded, but instead has been granted a new significance. Its metaphysical aura is dislocated so that it becomes associated with architecture in a more real sense. Social function starts to be concerned in the second design stage, namely semantic construction. Social function here is seen as a kind of significance to architecture, which will be built upon the syntactic structure acquired previously. Its significance here is named functional meaning, in parallel with syntactic meaning and symbolic meaning. Social function is not only the input of design process, but also the output, as architecture is viewed as a social event which is interactive with the social setting.

There is no space without event, no architecture without program, as is supported and critiqued by Tschumi. (Tschumi, 1994, p. 139) The influence of the social setting to architecture is that it provides a program that needs to be actualized by architecture. In architectural practice, program is always superficially regarded as client’s demand or an abstract list of names and sizes of functional spaces. Program is more than that. It is an empirical form of social setting, a social event happening locally which has capability to produce space and architecture. A social event is to a social setting what a speech act to a language. Social events act out the language in the form of architecture. Architecture is not the end of this linguistic practice in a social scale. The actualized form of architecture is not only the backdrop holding the happening of social events, but becomes social event itself, and hence a part of the social setting. The dialectical speculation on event and architecture will be elaborated in a later section of this thesis, *space, event, and movement*.

As a result of the change of the role of social function in design process, the notions, time, space and being, get a new definition and connotation. In functionalism, the temporal property of social function is eternal, or, there is no temporal property at all, because social function is seen as a metaphysical existence which is dissociated with the perceptual world. Here, the process from social function, social event to architecture is measured in an immediate way. Architecture is seen as a contingent existence. Besides its immediacy in presenting functional significance, time in the social layer of architecture has the same dehistoricized property as that in syntactic and symbolic layers. The object of concern is an
architecture of the present. In functionalism, social function is a preexisting metaphysical autonomy, which stands superior to architecture. It doesn’t have spatial property, or, it is located in an abstract space of social setting which is totally irrelevant with architectural space. Here, social space and architectural space are associative and interactive. Social function breaks the exclusion of architectural space and converts to an on-site social event. Its involvement of the subject is another difference from functionalism, which negates the role of subject in the whole design process. Here, social function as a social event represents the participation of a collective subject. The architecture produced here also comes to represent a distinctive subject which will participate the larger event of the whole social setting.

The complex social setting of Chinatown San Francisco claims a series of social functions in this project. The architecture is a museum to display and collect the Chinese art works and archeological findings of this world. It is a civic place to provide cinema, theatre, food etc. to the public, due to its special attachment to the outdoor public center, Portsmouth Square. It is a shop as the building is deliberately located on a commercial street. It is also a housing to provide residence for the expanding Chinatown with the problem of inadequacy of space for various types of inhabitants. These various social functions are converted to events that will interact with the syntactic structure and produce space, rather than occupy space produced.
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CHAPTER 3
METHODOLOGY AND THEORETICAL GROUNDS

Contemporary Chinese Architecture is not delimited by national boundary. A sense of belonging to this collection of the imaginary comes from the attribution of one or several properties common to all members. This collection, sorted by identity that is a mental process of identification, is comprised of imaginary senses rather than physical objects. The processing of the imaginary constitutes the major contribution of the identity construction by which architectural individuals with a representational resemblance are grouped together. According to the representation of its belonging sense, the buildings in the Chinatown at San Francisco can be equally assimilated into the category of Contemporary Chinese Architecture. The space containing buildings and life are shaped by the place’s remoteness, in time and space, from the tradition experienced by the first immigrant generation. The identity born by the contemporary generation is inherited and brought into the light of consciousness in the process of identification. Identity is precisely a discourse of tradition. And one of the privileged names of tradition, in contemporary societies, is precisely “culture”. The resemblance to and the difference from the cultural experiences of mainstream China gives rise to the complexity attached to the task of constructing identities. If resemblance can be used to explain the effectiveness of an identity, difference is the practice of the forms and representation of the identity within a larger world. Identity is often described as being what expresses the differences from outside and is at the same time taken as a deep structure from which different surface structures could be derived. The deviance from the orthodoxy together with the contradiction inside the identification process elucidates the transformation of human existence from a basic formative mode, articulated in time, space and being, into a complex and ambivalent state.

3.1 Time, Space, and Being

The linear progressive movement assumed by modern thought is open to dispute. The historically privileged dimension of time preconditions the linear progressive thought. From
a diachronic and historical perspective, the evolution of Chinese culture has experienced several ruptures or mutations in its historical discourse, unparalleled in other cultures as to extent, scale of involvement and the problems left behind. This fully developed tradition witnesses various phases in its process: external destruction, self-criticism, and renaissance. Chinese culture has never reached the point of being able to break away from tradition either ethically or technically. This national obligation is confronted with a new modernity and the prioritized spatiality of social life entailed by post-modernity which unavoidably faces upon a deconstruction and reconstitution of modernity itself. The resulting transformation of basic human existence in contemporaneity gives new definition to notions of time, space and being. Historical facts now are treated as signs and projected in the present stage. Everything is historicized as the linear, progressive time of modernity is slowed down and lagged. Brought to a standstill, time is beyond consideration, and the quality of timelessness is enlisted to reveal the transparency of the past and the present along the axis of a lagging temporality. Parenthetically, cubist theory works best to represent how synchronic study produces meaning for identity construction. The discussion on Cubism will be elaborated in a later section Cubism devoted specifically to this topic.

The specific histories of cultural displacement, accompanied by the global media technologies, make the question how culture signifies a rather complex issue. It makes one increasingly aware of the construction of culture, the invention of tradition, the retroactive nature of social affiliation and psychic identification. The deconstruction of the sign and the emphasis on the indeterminate in cultural and political judgment transform our sense of the subject of culture and the historical agent of change. The culture-as-sign is deconstructed, prior conventions losing their validity in response to the production of meaning. The culture-as-function remains indeterminate and renders identity problematic. In the deconstructed system of signification, meaning is not only explained by prior conventions, but also by acts of imposition. That is to say, a signifier can be assigned a signified politically and temporarily with reference to new context. The status quo culture of contemporary China inherits directly from tradition while having created a significant new part since the revolution.
Chinese culture in Chinatown San Francisco distinguishes itself from mainstream Chinese and other Chinese communities all over the world. These cultural branches seek to identify themselves with mainstream China, which is not based on a loose cultural attachment with China that characterizes the national cultures in Japan, Korea, Vietnam, and other southeast countries. Chinatown San Francisco is a member of the Great Chinese cultural family. The diversity of members in this family renders cultural signification system dynamic and creative. A system that predetermines meaning is thus subjected to deconstruction.

The reconstruction of Chinese culture in Chinatown is grounded on the combination of critical human geography and historical narrative in social sciences. For at least the past century, time and history have a privileged position in the consciousness of social science. The theory of postmodern geography is an attempt to deconstruct and recompose the historical narrative and promises that it is space more than time that hides cultural consequences from us. This thesis provides an occasion to rethink the critical postmodern geography and once again reconstruct the logic which ties together the basic and formative dimensions of human existence: time, space and being. Postmodern critical human geography was built upon a radical deconstruction, and a deeper exploration of those critical silences in the texts, narratives, and intellectual landscapes of the past. It is also an attempt to reinscribe and resituate the meaning and significance of space in history as well as in historical materialism. However, spatial deconstruction should also be sufficiently flexible to avoid the simplistic defense of anti-history or, even worse, a new spatialism which stands as polar opposite of historicism. The objective of postmodern geography is a politically charged historical geography, a spatio-temporal perspective on society and social life, not the resurrection of geographical determinism. Deconstruction alone is not enough. It must be accompanied by a reconstruction grounded in the political and theoretical demands of the contemporary world and able to encompass all the scales of modern power. In his book *Postmodern Geographies*, Edward Soja said: “This reconstituted critical human geography must be attuned to the emancipatory struggles of all those who are peripheralized and oppressed by the specific geography of capitalism – exploited workers, tyrannized peoples, dominated women.” And he argued further: “Flexible deconstruction and reconstitution will
not be easy, for it must contend not only with a continuing ‘Late Modern’ resistance carrying
with it the privileged baggage of the past, but must also deal with a rising neo-conservative
postmodernism using deconstruction to draw even more obfuscating veils over the
instrumentality of restructuring and spatializating, reducing both history and geography to
meaningless whimsy and pastiche in an effort to celebrate the postmodern at the best of all
possible worlds.” (Soja, 1989, p. 74) Deconstruction dethrones the ever-dominating elements
in the old ideological structures, while amplifying the importance of the marginal elements,
and revealing an uncanny logic masked by convention. Reconstitution redistributes the new
system and thus temporarily stabilizes the deconstructed world under the control of a new
transitional convention. The revalued elements are then assigned their new roles. In his book
Critique of Everyday Life, Henri Lefebvre argued: “The most extraordinary things are also
the most everyday; the strangest things are often the most trivial, and the current notion of
the ‘mythical’ is an illusory reflection of this fact. Once separated from its context, i.e. from
how it is interpreted and from the things which reinforce it while at the same time making it
bearable – once presented in all its triviality, i.e. in all that makes it trivial, suffocating,
oppressive – the trivial becomes extraordinary, and the habitual becomes ‘mythical’.”
(Lefebvre, 1947, p. 84) It could also be explained by Derrida’s “differance”, which is both a
difference and a differing, designating a passive difference always already in place as the
ground of signification and an act of differing which produces the differences it presupposes.
The linguistic difference and the arbitrariness of the sign turn into a struggle for the historical
and ethical right to signify and a critical practice of social authority. In this sense, claims to
identity should not be nominative. Deconstruction attempts to overcome the nominalism of a
linguistic imperialism. The hegemonic normality given by the discourse of modernity should
also be engaged with a special eye to cultural difference, social authority and political
discrimination.

Deconstruction can be carried out at three levels:

1. Domination / oppression. The oppressed is emancipated from the control of the
deep structure. It is the most deconstructive case, always accompanying political, ideological
and social change.
2. Trivial, uncanny, everyday / mythical, extraordinary. It is the result of spatialization and displacement, removing things from their context.

3. Alienation: self / other. On the one hand, the division of labor causes the formation of individualism. One the other hand, Dionysian alienation infuses the individual into the many. As noted by Lefebvre, -- for us, in our society, with the forms of exchange and the division of labor which govern it, there is no social relation – relation with the other – without a certain alienation. (Lefebvre, 1947, p. 26)

Figure 34 represents the state of being in relation to time and space, and identity, an attribution of being, taking into account the change of time and space. Past and otherness, which are opposite to the present self, are independent of each other, but start to conflict with each other in the discourse of modernity and traditional linguistic system. Soja remarks: “Marshall Berman broadly defines modernity as ‘a mode of vital experience’, a collective sharing of a particularized sense of ‘the self and others’, of ‘life’s possibilities and perils’. In this definition, there is a special place given to the ways we think about and experience time and space, history and geography, sequence and simultaneity, event and locality, the
immediate period and region in which we live. Modernity is thus comprised of both context and conjuncture.” (Soja, 1989, p. 24-25)

Conjuncture means a crisis produced by a combination of circumstances. It coexists with context to protect existing conventions and authorities. Similarly, semiotics guards against the deconstruction of the conventional based signification system. Universality is a bridge constructed to connect differentiated signification systems, but the conflictive spatiality resulted from conversion and inversion of displacement and transformation is overlooked therein. The dominance of a historicism of critical human geography takes shape. The importance of history should not be dissolved, though it is undesirable. The interplay of history and geography, the ‘vertical’ and ‘horizontal’ dimensions of being in the world should be freed from the imposition of inherent privilege. Post-modernity claims for a compression of the two coordinates into the origin, resulting in a tense interplay between the present with the past, and the self with the otherness. In this position, identity falls into a problematic state posed by the conditions of timelessness and displacement.

3.2 Generative and Transformational

![Fig 35. Generative and Transformational](image)
Figure 35 represents the corresponding solutions to the problems generated in Figure 34. The relationship between the generative and the transformational gives an insight into rules inherited in linguistic system. In the generative process, facts are gathered and abstracted to be a deep structure. Meanings are designated on this level. In the transformational process, various surface structures evolve on the basis of the deep structure. On this level, meaning is untouched while forms are developed following the rules of transformation. A deep structure can have several surface structure manifestations. And the same surface structure can be derived from more than one deep structure. A transformational rule specifies which elements can be added, deleted, or rearranged to a deep structure to produce a specific surface structure. The integration of the synthetic generative process and the analytic transformational process gives a structural explanation of language and other cultural systems. The deconstructive operations are carried out on the deep structure so that meaning can be captured for revision and the act of imposition. The conventional code is violated, and the radical indeterminacy and the violations are codified in turn. Hence, a highly artificial and conventional device is inaugurated to produce meaning. The ensuing reconstitution takes action in the transformational process and results in a new representation of identity as formed in the preceding phase.

Transformation is not a revolutionary process. It is a creative implementation of a designed or existing rule to actualize a deep structure or a ‘supercode’ system. As noted by Lefebvre in his book *The Production of Space*, a theory can only take form, and be formulated, at the level of ‘supercode’. Knowledge cannot rightly be assimilated to a ‘well-designed’ language, because it operates at the conceptual level. (Lefebvre, 1974, p. 17) A space can be decoded, though there is no general code of space. Lefebvre further remarks: “Without adducing supporting arguments or proof, the notions of message, code, information and so on can not help us trace the genesis of a space; the fact remains, however, that an already produced space can be decoded, can be read. Such a space implies a process of signification.” (Lefebvre, 1974, p. 17) Generative process explains how the spaces are supercoded, and helps recognize the genesis of spaces. Transformation is not applicable in the face of anything other than the interpretation or operation within the existing code or supercode systems. However, transformation can be imitated as a model in the process of
reconstitution, because the resignification exerted by reconstitution should be assumed to work as a signification though the new signification has not as yet been generated.

3.3 The Role of Language and Architecture as Language

The issue of human identity has always been intertwined with histories of different kinds: personal psychic history, genealogical family history, tribal history and national history. Language plays a critical role in constructing identity, because the use of language is involved with the transmission and conception of human histories. In the process of constructing and seeking an identity for a particular individual and culture, language serves as both bearer and creator of formative histories. Language can be defined in written, oral or pictorial forms. Cultural identity, then, became linguistically and semiologically attached to the meanings behind words. The nature of these meanings can be easily ignored and even obliterated by other meanings based on words. Because identity relies so heavily on the significance of a combination of linguistically transmitted histories, it is precariously subject to the intrusion or influence of other histories, other identities. Hence, whether the identity could survive depends on the degree to which the cultural histories can be retained. We can see that language in various forms acts as both a destroyer and a creator of identity.

Not only does language itself play an important role in histories and identities, but also language as a science of linguistics offers a scientific model for constructing meaning and identities in architecture or other form making activities. The linguistic analogy gives to architecture a theoretical framework and a vocabulary of criticism. Meaning will not only be embodied in symbols or decorations, but will be tied deeply with architecture. Hence, architecture is not just represented in a pictorial way, but in a linguistic way, which is much more persistent and powerful. Architecture, like language, is potentially infinitely expressive and communicative, though with very different degrees of precision and definition. Architecture as language can be explored on many levels. On the one hand, the signs of architecture can be constructed into a system of signification, because architecture and language share similar semiotic and semantic powers. The intricate relationships between architectural and linguistic signs have been clarified in Deborah Howard’s analysis of the
communicative powers of Scottish sixteenth and seventeenth century baronial architecture. Howard said: “Language is a medium of communication, whereas the text is its content, or meaning. According to linguistic terminology, this meaning in turn consists of semantics, the content understood by everyone in the community, and pragmatics, the implications arising from a more informed awareness of the context. In making the analogy with architecture, we must remember that the language of building is simply the system of signification, not the signified. Without a text, the language is devoid of meaning.” (Howard, 2000, p. 169)

Architecture is not text but language. But the relations between form and content in architecture are ambiguous. And the use of language depends on both the intention of the architect and the anticipated audience able to decode the implications. On the other hand, the final product of architecture has an internal structure and architecture is the output of a set of transformations from a basic structure, because the identification between architecture and language also lies in the structural and non-mimetic character of both discourses. The similarity may sometimes be extended to noting that both systems use vocabularies of elements organized by some kind of syntax or grammar. We can identify architecture as a system of communication and expression, though architectural significance doesn’t have semantic precision as the natural language. The form and image of architecture is relatively ambiguous, unlike the arbitrariness in written texts. To overcome the difficulties brought by the ambiguity of architectural language, powerful tools in linguistics can be employed to identify the rules hidden in the form. Then, architecture becomes a formalistic transformation governed by rules. The rules perform as the conventional system that constrains the operational process. However, the rules are changeable and never fixed because the convention is subject to change in different time and space.

3.4 Genealogy of Diagram

Stanford Kwinter looks at the concept of diagram historically and brings the historic development of this concept together. He takes it from Kant, Goethe, Deleuze to the creator of Cybernetics. The different definitions of the diagram reflect how the understanding of the world changes over time, and constitute a family tree of the evolution of a discourse that is its
genealogy. From Kant on, the diagram is thought as a synthetic explanatory device in relating the material reality to a formal system that shapes reality. However, the role of the diagram as connection between reality and subject, perception and conception, is different. Also, the distance measured between the two extremes is also subjected to change.

Kant theorizes the world as a combination of a material and a formal component in a certain way. The material refers to the object whereas the formal refers to the subject. His notion of 'schema', similar to the concept of diagram, stands only for the side of the subject when encountering the object. To him, the diagram represents one aspect of the world in dichotomy. Goethe rejected the rigid concept of diagram by Kant and initiated the modern reconfiguration of this concept. He thinks that the diagram is not just a mirror of reality or something translated from the objective world in another language. Rather, the diagram is an active engine that generates influence in the formation of form although it does not produce form directly. The diagram moves from the exclusive region of the subject and shifts to a place in between the subject and the object. It opens up a new horizon of the form as a process and moves from the later part of the process or documentation to the early part or engine of form production. Deleuze goes further than Goethe. He moves the concept of diagram inside reality and diminishes the government of the subject in terms of both diagram and the formation of the object. He thinks that reality is comprised of both matter and organization, the former of which is the visible form while the latter is the invisible 'force', also abstract machine, which is an agent orienting from the abstract to the concrete.

Cybernetics is a scientific study of the way in which information is moved about and controlled in machines, the brain and the nervous system. The science of Cybernetics brings about a new understanding of diagram. It pulls back the concept of diagram to the domain of the subject, but together with the object. It is an information processing world rather than a corporeal world. The idea of cybernetics insists on that diagram is a part of the reality, but it argues that it is a virtual reality, which is material although not corporeal: It differentiates the concepts of the real and the actual. The diagram is not placed in between the subject and the object, or the material and the 'force', but in between the actual and the virtual. The diagram is not thought as a machine that transposes from idea to real, or from subject to object, but as a passage that links reality in different states. It functions as transformational agency in terms
of integration, organization and coordination underlying the world. The diagram is the materialization of the transformational process of the formation of things in the world.
CHAPTER 4
DISCUSSION

4.1 Time: Tradition and Traditional

Tradition is not just a reservoir of what happened in the past. On the one hand, the preserved historical facts can coexist diachronically with current surroundings. They are alive in our everyday life because of its physical accessibility and the application in terms of either utilitarian or symbolical function. On the other hand, the memory of the historical facts of both the erased and the preserved is the determinant factor for constructing contemporary culture with some special identity. The prototype stored in the memory is untouchable but gains new life or renaissance in the way of transformation into a new form and adaptation to the contemporary context. From this point of view, tradition is a dynamic concept rather than a static picture of what has already happened in the past. We can interpret tradition as a memory with reference to the matter of fact that it has been disarmed by new times. We can also read tradition as one constitutive of the current world with regard to the preserved objects, inherited customs, and the transformed existences. Here, we should differentiate the concept of “tradition” and “traditional”. Transformation activates the soul of an old culture and gives it a birth in a contemporary form, which can be called “tradition” instead of “traditional” because “traditional” in general refers to something resistant to the zeitgeist.

4.2 Space: Pan-nation Culture

What have long been considered as regional, heterogeneous identities has slowly and methodically been restructured into a more homogeneous identity due to nationalism. The whole nation is grouped into a single amalgamated unity. Such a body is constructed from the inside, aiming to bring about a single entity of strong solidarity from various diverse groupings. It is questionable to repeat what is past. Of course, histories themselves cannot be ignored. The histories are the constituents of a deep structure, from which a new identity can be derived. When a race’s history is erased or ignored, so then is its potential for a continued
construction of identity. The past and the present can be linked, however, via linguistic tools. Resemblances between regions can be constructed to be a structure, while differences or singularities of regions can be regarded as the attachments to that structure.

A model is designed to help create this particular Pan-national culture. In this model, time is analogous to space, and history is analogous to geography. The question on the link between the past and the present turns to be the question on the relationship of there and here. Given a group of objects in a remote place, this method is about how to represent them in current place. I need to clarify that the group of objects in a remote place is the analogy of the juxtaposition of the sub-cultures in the past. Coming back to the model, we can assume that the configuration, structure, organization, texture and color of the remote group of objects are all unclear to the observer. One way to represent them is to seek help from telescope, which is to bring things closer. This method has the same effect as moving the observer closer to the objects. Nothing is changed. The quality of distance is suspended. An alternative way is to acknowledge the distance and to represent the distance itself and its qualities. Hence, the first image we got is an ambiguous mixture of the objects and this is the true reflection of the reality of space and being. Based on the picture attained, we can sharpen the picture similar to what we do in Photoshop. In so doing, its parts are unified and structure is reconstituted. Ambiguity is removed and a definitive structure is constructed. The refined picture bears the identity of the original objects and the quality of distance. The visible result is not simply copying and falsifying the original objects. Rather, a new thing is generated from the relic. In this process, details are omitted. Syntax is constructed to connect what was related weakly. This method may help build a relationship between the groups and create a new syntax to structure a complete entity. The syntax should be clarified and has the power to organization.
4.3 Relationships of Being

4.3.1 Subject-Subject

4.3.1.1 Discourse of Identity

The terms “self” and “identity” are used extensively in this section, but they are always employed in a generic sense without being differentiated from each other. To discuss the notion of identity, we need to concretize the distinction between self and identity. Some dictionary definition of the self points to a person or thing referred to with respect to complete individuality. Gecas and Burke (1995, pp. 41-42) defined the self as the process of reflexivity or self-awareness, namely, the “ability to be both subject and object to oneself”. Reflexivity is a special form of consciousness, a consciousness of oneself. Identity is always understood as the state of fact of remaining the same quality under varying aspects or conditions, or as the sense of self, providing sameness and continuity in personality over time. In postmodernist literature, the self is defined as multiple, not fixed, and always under construction with no overall blueprint. The area of identity has been predominantly investigated in the work of psychologists and sociologists. Generally, psychologists tend to look at identity within the individual. The individual is held responsible for the identity, and therefore identity is that person’s property. By contrast, sociologists tend to assume that identity is not exclusively the property of the individual, but rather something that is “realized strategically and circumstantially through one’s interactions with others”. (Weigert, Teitge, & Teitge, 1986, p. 23) For sociologists, identity is both internal and external to the individual. It is internal because it is subjectively constructed by the individual; it is external because this construction is in reference to objective social circumstances. Sociologists study the issues of identity from a structural, sociohistorical and cross-cultural perspective. James Cote and Charles Levine commented the psychological and sociological perspectives on identity as: “Thus, although looking at the same field, psychologists and sociologists generally do so from opposite positions. Like the blind men and the elephant, their particular perspectives lead them to draw different conclusions regarding what identity is.” (Cote &
Levine, 2002, p. 67) The two perspectives can be integrated to give us a more multidimensional understanding of identity.

![Fig 36. Discourse of Identity](image)

Figure 36 depicts the relationships involved in the construction of identity. Self is an individuality in a collective. The collective is the source of the identity delivered to each individuality and is also the terminal of the constructive work of identity formation done by each individuality. Self finds its resemblance with fellows in this collective while speaking to them. It is aware of the resemblance to bear this identity without losing its singularity. The contact or encounter between this collective with the outside world is driven by a mobility governing the universe. Things of the world are excited to movement, in the result of being drawn together or being forced away. Identity speaks of the difference from others and assimilates that difference, while the possible communication rests on the passage built out of the resemblance with others. “The identity of things, the fact that they can resemble others and be drawn to them, though without being swallowed up or losing their singularity – this is what is assured by the constant counterbalancing of sympathy and antipathy. It explains how things grow, develop, intermingle, disappear, die, yet endlessly find themselves again; in short, how there can be space (which is nevertheless not without landmarks or repetitions, nor without havens of similitude) and time (which nevertheless allows the same forms, the same species, the same elements to reappear indefinitely).” (Foucault, 1970, p. 24, 25)
4.3.1.2 Passage

Properties can be transmitted among different entities by means of learning, confronting, grafting and quasi-grafting. Learning is to internalize the outside interest and localize it so as to obtain some properties of others. Similitude is constructed between two independent entities and communication is launched along a new passage. Learning is freed from the limits of time and space. It is a positive, open-minded way to be involved with the world while itself remaining in the central position. Confronting finalizes an increase of opposition while alienating itself unconsciously as a result of conscious resistance. In postcolonial culture, people become foreign to themselves before and also their fellowmen. Confronting gives rise to a passive and even unconscious transformation in response to an external imposition traversing space. Grafting is a training process in a material and empirical way. An exotic entity or a part of that entity is placed into an entity existing in its own order. The newcomer starts to deconstruct the initial order and thus creates a conflict between the new and the old, as well as incompatibility between the elements in the old sequence. Elements adjust to each other, defending themselves and incorporating to the structure in a comfortable position. New order comes into being, new relationships connect elements and new compatibilities and oppositions are generated.

Quasi-grafting is not about grafting entity B to entity A, but about grafting entity C to entity A. Entity C is standing opposed to entity B but is inscribed to the documentation of entity B because of its conventional combination or accessory to entity B. While entity C is grafted to entity A, it causes A transforming in the sense of attaining a property of B. It is C that builds a bridge between A and B even if no real communication is propelled by the force of C. The constructed relationship is an illusion. C can be regarded as an inauthentic A. But C is authenticated to be a part or a speaker of B in the conventional system. While C is deconstructed from B, a symbol of B is separated from context. C is displaced in the veil of B and colonizes in A. In the new context, the inauthentic B is again authenticated. The illusion
is given a physical form. Any detail of B, or the third object C can be a medium to construct identity of B in context of A.

Transition is a passage connecting two or more figures which separate from each other in a distance of time and space. An identity in question is always seeking survival in the course of changing, modulating, and regenerating. It speaks with its past, its adjacency, and an exotic world. It is a transitional process, playing with destabilizing and stabilizing, constructing and deconstructing, replacing and assimilating, alienation and narcissism, \textit{zeitgeist} and nostalgia.

4.3.1.3 Indeterminacy and Imposition

Here, given a finite space humanized by two figures, it is always shaped with two underlying opposed logic systems, which are two coexisting and conflicting invisible determinants. One comes up while the other goes down, and vice versa. Different in recognition, commitment and effort, they operate inversely to each other; one logic system is a false formulation of the other. At this moment, the two logic systems and the two figures which represent their operations exist in pairs, interactive and inseparable. The dominance of the two systems indicates the privileged position of the figures. One logic system prefers the priority of one figure, while the other logic system represents the resurrection of the other figure and the transition of power. The two logic systems go up and down in an advancing process. The space of existence is always subject to change, but the attached pairs move like object and shadow in the light along the temporal axis. Object will lapse into shadow while shadow will be transcended to be object. Moving forward in time, the light changes in terms of strength, color and angle. The complexity of the change of what one might call a “figure / ground” relationship accompanies the complexity of the light, which makes possible the visibility of the former and reflects it in a dynamic mode. The combination of the two complexities blurs the structure of an abstracted model of life. It is a de-modelling of the model of life by revealing its fuzziness and indeterminacy. However, it is not a direct delineation or sketching of the real life, but rather an operation upon the model. It is not only a demodelling of model, but also a model by the model, that is, a meta-model. Instead of
looking at the surface of the exterior world, it attempts to dig deeper in order to touch the fundamental layers of the lived life.

That theorization of life doesn’t come to an end. Time moves on and never stops or retreats. Instead, relationships in space come to a new stage. Attachment is loosened and then disassembled, and a duel of logic systems ensues. Until now, the conflicts and oppositions of the two totally different systems do not force complete destruction. They bear upon each other until one finally takes the throne while attempting to annihilate the other. The seeming harmony between the two figures disappears. Implicit in this mutation is a violation of the convention / law. The ultimacy of one logic system is the cause of the violation. The violation of the convention gives rise to the deconstruction of the order of things. Deconstruction is an internal mutation and brings about the risk that everything will be out of control and become unmanageable. Life will potentially fall into a nihilistic state. An imposition of control from an external agency provides salvation to this nihilistic world. The disassembled figures are detached absolutely. The power managing the internal circle of things is taken over by a more permanent, more legitimized, more distant of life, and stronger institutionalized agency, which is the source of imposition. At this moment, the imposition orders no contact between the two figures in any way. The communication between them is broken. They become neither paradigmatic nor syntagmatic elements in a sequence. They cannot be inserted into any sequence at the same time. They move into two separate and distinguishable worlds, without any sense of each other. In the two worlds, each isolated figure breathes different air and takes different lives. No resemblance can be added between them, nor difference that can be constructed into a chain. No contact brings about alienation of themselves in a new world and also alienation between the two figures. They will not change fundamentally inside out, however, they will change leaving remnants. The remnant is the guarantee for the possibility of future reattachment although reattachment is not the necessary result. They may become strangers to each other forever. However, the most interesting thing will be the confrontation of the two in reattachment. Nothing could be staged again if the relationship is put into an end. Reattachment between the two figures is actually a reconstitution of the structure or syntax of a newly-formed sequence / order. They won’t go back to the original position because the ongoing structuring will come up with
what cannot be anticipated. They look for their desirable positions and appropriate them in
the new conditions. However, the remnant left in their interior slows down the competition.
The competence of new things depends on both the rules reconstructed and the remnant’s
inert qualities. The natural reattachment and imposed recombination practice in a different
way. The natural one is simply a perfecting process, leaving out conflict and maintaining
harmony. The imposed one is a fact of the decrease of produced conflict, and then the
sequential step is similar to the nature one. In whatever case, the duality of both logic
systems and figures will be diminished and converged into one. It will be more or less the
stable end of a cycle, or the beginning of a new one.

4.3.2 Object-Object

Cubism

To study the object-object relationship, cubism ably illustrates how objects can relate
to each other. When we relate cubism with architectural research, it is worth noting the
similarity between cubism and structuralism. Structuralism analyzes large-scale systems by
examining the relations and functions of the smallest constituent elements of such systems,
which range from human languages and cultural practices to architecture and literary texts. In
contrast to structuralism, cubism has no concern with the construction of a system, though it
studies the relations of elements which are not positioned in a system. Cubism can be
borrowed to build an architectural methodology, without the burden of taking the observed
world as a system like a language.

Classical painting represents 3-dimentional world in a 2-dimensinal canvas. Using the
technique of perspective, it copies the observed world from a still viewpoint which is outside
of the canvas. Cubist work overcomes the limit of still observation. It can represent
simultaneously multiple viewpoints of observation which may be inside of the canvas.
Although the canvas is 2-dimensional, the painting gets a quality of 2.5-dimensionality, with
its dynamic redistribution of figure and ground of the observed world. The comparison
between cubist painting and the represented physical reality can be interpreted in terms of
completeness and totality. Reality has completeness because everything stands for itself, but
does not have totality because of such relative exclusion. Cubist painting has totality because
everything is reconstructed and embedded into a structure, but loses its completeness because
the elements cannot just stand for themselves but become a part of each other. If cubism is a
worldview that improves 2-dimensional representation to 2.5, the new methodology in
architecture is to reduce 3-dimensional representation to 2.5. Both of them seek to overcome
their respective natures with self-critique and alienation.

Physical reality is composed of figure and ground, which has been long studied in
painting or architecture. My new concern is a third thing, the interrelationship among figure
and ground, such as figure-figure, figure-ground and ground-ground. This interrelationship is
neither figure nor ground, so it is not physically existent. Representation with the new
concern is to materialize the nonphysical relationship, which can be found in such terms as
passage/shared contour, transparency and ambiguity. In an example of representing the
relationship between object A and object B, passage/shared contour refers to the overlapping
of a (a part of A) and b (a part of B), where a is equal to b. Transparency refers to the
overlapping of a and b, but a is not equal to b. Ambiguity refers to a new thing C, which is
the combination of A and B, or a and b, where all A, B, a, b lose their distinctness.

Cubism changed not only the meaning of space, but also the meaning of time. The
process of the reconstruction of time can be depicted as from changing diachronic physical
reality to synchronic painting, and then to diachronic reading or spatial practice of the
painting. In this process, cubism employs a series of transformational grammar to operate
this change. The process can also be interpreted as from reality A to cubist painting, and then
to reality B which is the result of spatial practice.

Cubism has its own distinct signification system, in which multiple signifiers point to
a signified, because signifiers are held together by a structure. Each element cannot find its
signified until it finds its relationship with other elements. Surrealism has a reversed
signification system, in which a signifier points to multiple signifiers, because elements are
floating freely and each element has a strong symbolic and allegorical power. Cubism is
concerned more syntax instead of semantics. Cubism and surrealism can be used in the
different stage of the proposed design process.
As John Berger said, Cubism changed the nature of the relationship between the painted image and reality, and by so doing it expressed a new relationship between man and reality. (Berger, 1969, p. 15) The work of cubism articulates more about the object-object relationship. But cubism is far more than that, because it also changed our views on the subject-object relationship, a part of our worldview.

4.3.3 Subject-Object

There is a historical transformation of the roles of the subject and object in architecture and other arts such as painting and sculpture. Alberti is more like a painter or sculptor, representing nature in his architecture. In the classical period from Palladio to Durand, architects’ interest shifted from their relation to the exterior world to the internal organization of the object itself. In the modern period, the role of the subject becomes critical and is the primary force to determine the object’s form. However, in his projects House I to House IV, Eisenman refused to mention the presence of the subject as a reaction to the explicit subjectivity of the Modern Movement. As truth would tell, he nonetheless does preserve the notion of the subject as ‘originating agent’ in both classical and modern architecture. Like Chomsky’s model, which he adopted and began from, Eisenman focuses on the subject’s knowledge of the structure of language and its capacity to generate an infinite number of sentences. His architecture is concerned with communication, a linear communicational relation established between the form and the subject as well as the user. The implicit linearity enables the reader to enter a reversed situation as the subject’s syntactic transformational process. Starting from his House V, the subject starts to become self-critical. By adding a traditional notion, centrality, to the linear sequence, the unity of the sequential and exhaustive system breaks down. The imposition of this traditional concept is a powerful destructive force urging transformation of a unitary formal structure. The initial model is subjected to testing and questioning, finally leading to an entirely new structure. A humanistic subject is substituted for the vanishing subject, which is a post-humanistic notion posed by Foucault. Within this post-modernism, the subject as creator of a system becomes the destroyer of this system. The dual functions of the subject are overlapped in his latter
work, latent in House V and fully evident in House VI. In House X, with the boundaries of
the syntactic domain retained, new ideological system is opened up to criticize the original
forms of Euclidian geometry and Cartesian spatial grid. The agent of this change is the notion
of de-composition. De-composition overturns both synchronic structure and diachronic
process in the syntactic formal system in the first houses. Both the overall structure and the
elements are fragmented, so the internal logic becomes more complicated, which traps
traditional readers with false clues and false image. Through self-deconstruction, the
enclosed system of pure syntactic organization is opened to a semantic place, having a new
logical system because rationality and humanism are at the same time destroyed.

4.3.3.1 Spatial Practice of Everyday Life

When being lifted to the top of the skyscraper, one escapes from everyday life, and
enters a godlike world. He is transfigured to be a voyeur, seeing the city as a whole, in the
same way as reading a map. Time is dehistoricized, and differentiation is redistributed a
seemingly synchronic state. The totalizing image of the city transfigures it to be a pure
picture with a high legibility. However, the picture is inaccessible, as one cannot materialize
the map or live in it. In the world down below, the everyday life of a group of people in
motion produces city space and conducts spatial practice diachronically, although they are
normally blind in this fact. They make selections in the procedures of their movement. If the
city is taken as a language system in the godlike world, the walkers act out the language of
the city in the everyday world. Each walker spatializes the places and collages his
fragmentary experiences in his memory. The intersection and interweaving of the paths of
walkers create the city fabric. The city only exists in the experiences and memories of its
users. Movements of its users materialize the city, as speech acts act out the language system.
There are two fundamental stylistic figures, synecdoche and asyndeton, in the everyday
expression of spatial practice. Because of the indeterminacy of the structure of the city in
everyday viewpoint and the blindness of its everyday users, the users, by their walking
rhetoric of asyndeton, skip over conjunctions and parts, make selection and fragmentize the
spaces. To walk is to lack a place, and to be absent there where he is. The other walking
rhetoric, synecdoche, is to complement the deficiency of the users. In this fashion, the walkers take the fragments as the totalities, and construct the enlarged parts in their own memories. Synecdoche and asyndeton present two inverse directions to and fro between the part and the whole. The combination of these two stylistic figures is a dialectic process in reading the city.

Walking itself is a continuous process, by which one changes his or her location in the space over time. But space is only produced when one’s subjectivity interacts with the place he perceives by eye and mind. Even though one tries to sense the place consciously, his perception of the place is still indifferent because he is in it and can see only a partial of the locality at one moment. Hence, the space produced between the place and him is disconnected as fragments. One sees a block of housing, a piece of grassland, a bridge, a river, a big building, trees, etc.. Sometimes one doesn’t look at the surroundings at all. In every shot of one’s looking, some objects are named singularly and focused while other objects are missed or blurred in his eye. The conjunctions of each fragment are always omitted. Although there is always a group of objects that attracts one’s eyes simultaneously, they are disconnected with other things out of view. This is the asyndeton-like reading the places. One gets numerous shots of the places that are fragments of a larger-scale place. However, one never gets lost though he only captures limited information of the places. When one sees some building or even a tree, he gets the sense of where he is. It is a moment of synecdoche that the singular image is enlarged to substitute for the totality of the whole place he is in. The interconnection of these fragmentary images constitutes the overall space one experiences from one point to another. This combination of synecdoche and asyndeton deconstructs the places and reconstitutes them in one’s mind. The reconstituted place in one’s mind is the same thing as that in the physical world. But they are forms and representation in different systems of spatial production.

4.3.3.2 Dialectical Production of Space

In the dialectical production of space, the body is spatialized, and the spatialized body internalizes space. The interaction between the body and the external world blurs the
boundary of them, and deconstructs the completeness of the individuality that makes them separate. Space is not a mere container, but becomes part of the structure of the body. In a reciprocal way, the body is alienated and deconstructed by the external world, by which the body enlists in an intrinsic quality of spatiality. As Henri Lefebvre notes, a body produces itself in space and also produces that space, along with its motion; a body, not bodies in general, nor corporeality, but a specific body, is capable of demarcating and orienting space. The complex movement cannot be completed by the aid of the subject’s visualization of the otherness involved exclusively. At this point, the mind plays the critical roles to handle the movement. Otherness is internalized, and the sensuality of their bi-directional engagement integrates them into a whole thing, revolving around the center of mind in a weightless state. In the process of engagement, the body interrogates the other in order to gain knowledge and then gains the power to take control of the space within and between the self and the otherness. Hence, both the self and the architecture are erased in this process. Their identities are destroyed because each one displaces itself to the other and absorbs the other into itself. Architecture is the mirror of the body that sees itself where it is physically absent. Meanwhile, it directs its eyes toward itself and reconstitutes itself where it is. At the point of erasure, the physiological function of visualization is removed from the spatial practice. But at the point of reimaging, visualization is pulled back to reconstitute itself, space and architecture by virtue of their implicit unity. Thus, space is produced dialectically between the body and the architecture. Architecture does not exist by itself exclusively, but interdependently. Architecture becomes part of its user in motion and internalizes the movement of the user reciprocally by representing the spatiality and temporality recreated in their engagement. All kinds of movement produce space. The city is not regarded as a huge place preexisting for containing a huge number of bodies, but as a collective representation of the confrontation before individual bodies. Each body in motion produces and reproduces the space and itself in the process of engagement with the city. The city is erased and re-imaged by the bodies individually and collectively. The inhabitation of the bodies creates a space while reproducing the bodies in space.
4.3.3.3 Communication and Methods

Robert Venturi regards Las Vegas as a communication system, in which communication dominates space as an element in architecture and in the landscape. The dominance of signs is just one of the phenomena of architectural communication. Venturi also mentions that the same method is employed in a drive-in church and a drive-in restaurant although their contents are different. Communication and method are two different categorical properties in architecture, but there are some connections between them. Communication refers to how the object sends information to the subject and the subject understands the information received, while method refers to how architecture’s organizational system structures the event of its users. Both communication and method concern the interaction between object and subject. Communication, however, inclines to cover the surface and to direct symbolic aspects in architecture, and method is more about the invisible and structural aspects. A specific communication system could allow for various methods, while the same method could be applied to various communication systems. Since these two notions of Venturi parallel each other in the same way as Tschumi’s space and event do, their relationships can also be characterized as indifference, reciprocity and conflict. For example, the customer’s method of using McDonald’s and its big sign have an indifferent relationship, because they by no means impact each other, although the big sign is able to attract more customers. A cloverleaf crossroad and its sign system have reciprocal relationship, because the sign system is extremely helpful to guide the driver’s use of the road. But if a cloverleaf crossroad only has a non-sign communication system, then the communication system is in conflict to the traffic organizational system, leading to misuse of the roadway.

4.3.3.4 Order and Image

When analyzing the commercial strip in Las Vegas, Venturi finds that two types of order contrast on the strip: a shared and obvious order of street elements and an individual and difficult visual order of buildings and signs. In The Image of the City, Kevin Lynch states
that there is a public image as well as many individual images of any given city. The notion of image and the notion of order share similar meanings in many ways. Both reflect a basic configurational structure of a city. However, they differ from each other in some ways. Venturi’s order is concerned with how the subject reads the object in categories, while Lynch’s image is about how the object is reflected by the subject’s categories. And either Lynch’s public image or individual images have been rationalized into categories, such as paths, edges, districts, nodes and landmarks. Venturi’s order could be assimilated into another category in Lynch’s image, and the categories in Lynch’s image could be employed to analyze Venturi’s order. Also, the words ‘shared’ and ‘individual’ used by Venturi do not mean the same as Lynch’s ‘public’ and ‘individual’. The former pair is addressed to the object, the architecture and city, while the latter pair is addressed to the subject, the observer.

4.4 Space, Event, and Movement

There is no architecture without program and no space without event. In *Architecture and Disjunction*, Bernard Tschumi defines program as a predetermined sequence of a collection of events in a whole. Architecture includes or implies at least three sequences: transformational, spatial, and programmatic. Spatial sequence is fixed as the final product of the process of transformational sequence. Through transformational sequence, the surface structure or final product is generated from a deep structure via a series of syntactic operations. In this process, program applies a dual significance, actual and metaphorical, to the genesis of architecture. The preconceived program participates in the production of architecture as raw materials to be actualized into architecture. Similar events proceeding in a temporal sequence, space and architectural elements, transform themselves in a ritual movement complying with some governing rules. Architecture is characterized by program and as program itself. Any subsequent events can be turned into the program if they are formalized to be rituals and then fixed to be custom. Hence, program is not just suggested historically from the past. It is always about the present, but only when the events are customized.
Space and event are tied together to constitute architecture. They interact with each other in different modes: indifference, reciprocity, or conflict. Space and event are juxtaposed without either of them being tied to cause or effect. The relationship between them is complementary rather than sequential. Tschumi states that architecture ceases to be a backdrop for actions, but becomes the action itself. In contrast, Iain Borden and Michel de Certeau argue that architecture implies a relationship of space-event-space. These three items are not in parallel, but in procedure. In Skateboarding, Space and the City, Borden remarks: “Architecture is at once erased and reborn in the phenomenal act of the skater’s move.” In the process of the skater’s appropriation of the actual architecture, reality is internalized into the body’s movement and transformed into an instant reality in the mind. Hence, event transforms space into another space. The new space could be represented in the form of Joiner, which freezes the moment of spatial production and mystifies everyday life in a surrealistic way. The world is both real and surreal in the conjunction of objectivity and subjectivity. In The Practice of Everyday Life, Certeau states that the act of walking is to the urban system what the speech act is to language or to the statements uttered. He draws an analogy between actual architecture and a signification system. The movement of body acts out this system and produces space in a similar way as Borden’s skateboarding. The space produced is always the present in an instantaneous existence. It is a moment of intersection between space and time, because this space has a temporality itself. It is produced along with the body’s movement and disappears promptly. Tschumi compares actual architecture with literary context. Event is included in the literary context awaiting to be unfolded by the reader.

Two concepts, the representation of space and the space of representation should be differentiated. Representation of space concerns employment of verbal sign system to conceptualize actual space. Lynch’s The View from the Road is a good example of representation of space, but he stops at this point. The space of representation is exemplified by the latter space in the sequence space-event-space. In the actual space, inhabitants appropriate the physical reality, making symbolic use of its objects and thereby producing a new space. The produced space is a non-verbal sign system. Photographic joiner, which is a
montage of fragmentary photos, and Tschumi’s *Event-Cities* 2 are good examples of representation of space of representation.

The final meaning of a sequence, however, is dependent on the relationship between space, event and movement, as stated by Tschumi. There are a lot of differences between the notions of event and movement. Event is associated with space while movement of body is more detachable. Event is not present without the concurrent narrative of space, and it can be transcended to program when it is formalized. Movement only refers to the body and is independent of the existence of space. It is abstract without preconceived meaning. Event refers to using and acting out space. For example, a woman bends down to pick up a book from the shelf. Movement is dissociated from the context, but it doesn’t mean that it is not affected by the context. Rather, movement is the discourse of body. The same situation of the preceding example can be described as: she bends down, extends her arm and withdraws it after a movement of her hand is done. Movement is always the present and instantaneous. Event can be predetermined, but present events can be formalized and then be turned into program. Movement is a part of a specific event. Through movement, a new space is produced in that event happening in that space.

The relationship between space and event can be characterized as indifference, reciprocity and conflict. Event is to space what utterance is to syntax in the verbal system. Syntax is independent of the meaning of the utterance. Rather, it is the structure of a sentence. Here is one of Noam Chomsky’s famous sentences: Colourless green ideas sleep furiously. This sentence is grammatical although it is not interpretable. In this light, the indifferent combination of space and event is still grammatical because the event doesn’t violate the spatial structure of the sentence. The reciprocal combination of space and event is both grammatical and semantically accurate. The conflictive combination is ungrammatical because event happens in a wrong place. Its linguistic equivalent can be illustrated by this example: This sentence no verb. However, this combination will be legitimatized when it is accepted and turns to be a new custom, as some historically ungrammatical sentences are grammatical today.

Here is an example to illustrate the space-event relationship. In an area, smoking is not allowed in a public building, but there is a room reserved in the building for smoking.
Smoking outdoors is allowed, but the relationship between smoking and an outdoor space is indifferent because the event of smoking is independent of that space. Smoking doesn’t justify what that outdoor space is. Smoking in the public building is a conflictive case because it violates the convention that prohibits that event in that space. Smoking in the reserved room is a reciprocal case. The event of smoking justifies that the reserved room is devised to accommodate that event. In return, that space also supports that event because it is conventionally designated and programmatically designed for that event.

4.5 Form VS. Function, Use, Program and Event

The four notions, function, use, program and event, differ subtly in terms of referential oppositions such as prescribed / self-motivated, and intrinsic / extrinsic. But their similarities are more obvious and significant in opposition to their counterpart, the formal system of architecture. They are agents of social conventions by which meaning in architecture is delivered to and from the form. For Tschumi, spatial sequence and programmatic sequence juxtapose inherently in architecture. Program or customized event generates meaning in architecture and even becomes architecture itself. Architecture to him is a literary context awaiting to be unfolded by the user. Borden argues that inhabitation legitimizes the existence of architecture and the use of architecture rewrites architecture in a new format. Certeau makes analogy between the use of architecture to architecture and speech act to a language system. The form as signifier is guided to the signified by using of the form, and consequently is matched with meaning. However, Eisenman sheds a different light on function and meaning in his architecture, especially as he moves from House I to House IV. He discards the signification systems built by either humanism or functionalism. Instead, he constructs an enclosed syntactic formal system in his architecture. Functional meaning, which originally directs the generation of the form, is excluded in his pure formal system. He thereby dispels semantic meaning from his architecture. Any reading of his architecture rests upon form exclusively.
CHAPTER 5
CONCLUSION

The preceding chapters present a complex story on theoretical construction and application, and their relevance to this thesis project. The validity of the proposition is based on its broad investigation and perception in the sea of contemporary theoretical discourse, as well as its effort in positioning the functionality and value of tradition. It also tries to find its place and claim its livelihood through critiquing what it was and is, towards what it will be. However, the proposed theory by no means has pursuance for a definite end. It has a structure, whose constituents are inter-penetrable, and capable of changing their own statements to adapt to the necessity of ceaseless dynamic construction and reinterpreting others to reinforce their own statements. It has a process, but there is a dialectic interaction within the process and the environment it inhabits. The process avoids becoming formulaic by breaking its rationality with inputs and outputs, and creating infinite results with the involvement of the subject. It can be put into application at various levels, perceptions in the physical world, historicity and architecture. In different applications, the input and output of symbolic, functional and syntactic significances can have different weights in our consideration. It also implies architecture can be anything and anything can be architecture.

Through the discussion in the thesis on time, space and being, as well as object and subject, we come to face philosophical questions in the history of modern philosophy posed by epistemology, ontology and phenomenology. The proposed theory supports a part of the view in phenomenology, but contains quite a lot of differences and even oppositions. In brief, epistemology is the study of the nature of knowledge or how do we know truth; ontology is the study of the nature of being or metaphysics; and phenomenology is the study of all phenomena as experienced in human life without prior conception. The decisive turn towards epistemology characteristic of modern philosophy from Descartes through Kant was renewed at the beginning of the 20th century by Edmund Husserl, the founder of phenomenology. As formulated by Husserl in his book *Logical Investigations*, phenomenology is the study of the structures of consciousness that enable consciousness to refer to objects outside itself. Husserl presumes the abstract content of the acts of mind such as remembering, desiring and
perceiving is meaning. Such meaning enables an act to be directed toward an object under a
certain aspect. And such directness, which he called intentionality, is the essence of
consciousness. (Husserl, 1900-1, p. 13)

All phenomenologists follows Husserl’s slogan “To the things themselves”. But
Martin Heidegger, one of his successors, broke the traditional concepts of being and replaced
it with “being-there”. He claimed that phenomenology should make manifest what is hidden
in ordinary, everyday experience. For Heidegger, one is what one does in the world. That
being is put into the act of realizing projects is a more fundamental meaning of being.
Heidegger insists that philosophy must turn away from epistemology and towards ontology.
Phenomenology resolves the problems inherited in epistemology and ontology. As remarked
by psychologist Nini Praetorius, the epistemological problem is how we can be certain about
the truth of our cognition and description of material reality outside our minds, while the
ontological problem is how it comes about that conscious awareness or knowledge of the
world can arise out of biological and physical process in our brains and their causal
interaction with things or stimuli in physical reality. (Praetorius, 2002, p. 35) Heidegger
claimed for an ontological structure and an ontic structure in his phenomenology. The former
is metaphysical, while the latter refers to the physical everyday behavior and thoughts. These
concepts are in common with deep structure and surface structure in syntax, which have been
articulated in the preceding chapters. Through mediating the problems and contradictions of
epistemology and ontology, phenomenology constructs a relational nature of knowledge and
the interaction between object and subject. Material and mental, object and subject which are
the fundamental concepts of Cartesian dualism, have been intermingled by phenomenology.
This relational whole of object and subject all give rise to the totality which is sought in the
proposed theory.

In his seminal book Being and Time, Heidegger assumes that being is expressed
through time. But he fails to ground being through spatiality and correlate spatiality to time.
In this thesis, being is expressed through both time and space. The spatial and temporal
relations immediately suggest extension and continuity. However, as articulated in the
second case study discussed above, time and space are not necessarily measured in the
Cartesian system. Time and space are subject to deconstruction under a certain situation; for
instance, time can be discontinued and disordered, and space can be displaced and rescaled. Deconstruction here is meant to break from the pure ideas of epistemology or ontology, and a relational interaction of object and subject. Phenomenology constructs the relational interaction between object and subject, but it fails to undermine the conceptions of object and subject themselves, that is, object is object and subject is subject. As opposed to the restraint preoccupied in phenomenology, this thesis posits that a subject can have an objective existence and an object can have a subjective existence. Under some situations, the subject becomes the receiver of consciousness, while object becomes the giver of consciousness. For instance, the objective world and event are supposed to produce spaces themselves, when the objective world has its subjectivity and the subject in the event is treated as object. The notion of production throughout the thesis deals with the violation of the limit of subject and object, far more than their interaction.

This thesis has inherited its way of thinking, dialectics, from Taoism, a Chinese philosophical system. Taoism is concerned with the totality of the universe which is maintained by a balance of opposites, Yin versus Yang. The universe is unitary but always in change. First, the dialectics in this thesis are embodied in the opposites of subject and object, as has been conclude in the preceding paragraph. Second, the dialectics are implemented in this thesis’s attitude of criticism and continuation toward history of theory and history in design. In terms of history of theory, the proposition in this thesis is based on its dialogue with historical lines from classicism, through functionalism, to post-functionalism, from structuralism, through semiotics, to deconstruction, from Cartesians, through Husserl, to Heidegger, as well as a spectrum of theorists including Venturi, Tschumi, Eisenman, Lynch, Lefebvre, and Soja. In terms of the history in design, the attitude toward historicity has been articulated in the second case study. Third, the proposed theory is concerned with the dialectical relationship between historicism and social geography, as well as time and space. Fourth, these dialectics also rest on the complementary views of totality and fragmentariness. Architecture is herein seen as a part of the world and at the same time as a world itself.
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