Architecture is the act of Theorizing, Designing, and Building as long as ideas and arguments intertwine with the contemporary issues from a multidisciplinary trans-scalar approach.

I have lately questioned the purpose of architecture. What are the responsible actions that shape the world today? How can we contribute to the meaning beyond the mere act of construction? My studies at GSAPP opened the scope of my vision on architecture. It allowed me to understand the contemporary issues of the built environment from different scales and time frames while practicing a critical approach.

This portfolio is a form of expression representing various ideas and arguments explored during my time at Columbia between 2022 and 2023. It is my personal approach to how diverse ongoing conversations and narratives can be engaged. It is the beginning of a design practice that challenges the contemporary discourse of architecture. It is an exposition of thoughts and images that convey design and solutions but ultimately support ideas and intentions linked to global actions.
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As the largest city in the world’s most wasteful country, New York City produces approximately 14 million tons of waste annually, equivalent to the weight of 50 Empire State Buildings. 75% of New York City’s garbage spreads to landfills in other states. We seek to change the perception of waste, looking into the concept not as a noun but as a verb, the action when a resource is being squandered, as a way of proposing strategies to see this element not as an urban and environmental problem, but as an asset. The project looks into each category of waste, its distinct characteristics and life spans – currently treated equally and largely sent out of the metropolis – to design a system of in-situ local infrastructures that can turn its current spreading cycle into a full circle. An integrated system, managed through four agents, each aligned with a type of waste, informs an interconnected network of different scales, speeds, and conversions.

We selected the South Bronx’s area of Mott Haven for the prototype of this transcalar project. The neighborhood is one of the poorest areas of New York and also one of the dirtiest due to cuts in the Department of Sanitation. Instead of only designing a more efficient machine, this prototype desires to redefine the current system and New Yorker’s perception of waste, seeking to empower the community through an evolutionary program that promotes creative upcycling as a tool for economic autonomy. This redefinition involves new, multi-scalar interactions between waste and people by incentivising resource management as part of the urban landscape. Giving these materials a permanent but evolving space in the city, the proposal creates new opportunities for community engagements where the cycle of consumption and production occupies a greater role in NYC urban life.
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What are the issues of the present?
It is one of the questions we constantly face as a developing society. Throughout history, these issues have evolved, changed, and transformed, as well as their form of representation. As Mario Gooden addressed, “The problem of space was not just the issue of controlling territory and governing people within, but now concerned the spatial relationships between the exercises of power and territory brought on by societal transformations as well as social phenomena resulting from new technologies and new economic processes.” The development of projects and their way of representation are simultaneously areas of interest. Currently, we face the problem of spaces as a transboundary subject. In many cases, it is not anymore a territorial development but a worldwide issue with international implications. Air Pollution is one of the agents which has become a subject of research as a diffusion source regarding the fragment boundaries and territorial distinctions. In this sense, Air Drifts is an interdisciplinary multimedia project on air pollutants that closely develops the idea of transboundary media regarding two sources of development: trans-scalar opportunities in weather and climate conditions in worldwide ecosystems with its abstraction and representation of trustful data and the political effect of architecture through its media form.

The project develops a deep understanding of the territorial scale. It addresses the primary concern of a national and global environmental responsibility, with a stretch relation to air pollution and its consequences. The idea of moving across boundaries and looking at the issues as non-territorial distinctions show a topic related to politics and social structures. In terms of development, the project offers a methodology for presenting the information by creating new ways of representing air pollution and its relation to scale. The project proposes a sectional model, which shows the three-dimensional relationship between cities, air pollutants, and their worldwide occupancy. It transcends the known limits and presents an enormous panorama of a global, even planetary, concern. In this understanding of data and the way of representing it, it is of critical importance to address the source of information. In this case, its alliance with NASA and the specificity of information allows the project to become a collective common object established on separate grounds. If we open the perspective out of the ideas of borders, we can look at the complete picture as an act of a shared social agent.

Presenting a project as a form of expression regarding concerns about global environmental responsibility is a medium to induce architecture as a political and social agent for awareness of the present. These efforts are not only to show the reality of our times but also to enhance new forms of diffusion. Technology, history, and innovation have become sources of development and research for projects such as Air Drifts to communicate global awareness. In this sense, the project develops multiple ways to share the idea behind it. It uses a combination of architectural objects such as drawings and models combined with multimedia and technical information. The various sources and ways of expression allow the project to reach multiple levels and become a political object of diffusion. Nowadays, we find diverse points of interest in the form of media. The development of private projects concerning specific individual interests and the blooming of initiatives addressing global awareness and responsibility. Throughout history remains an ongoing relationship between architecture, politics, and forms of diffusion, which now has found a medium of expression regarding issues of the present.
While many contemporary practitioners frame the growth of cities as a completely new, unprecedented problem, architects have been grappling with this question for at least a century, though in radically different ways. These conversations are related to the approach in each intervention case and moment of history. Francisca de Gracia, for instance, addressed methods of understanding the Genius loci as “architectural practices as a relationship between an existing object with known boundaries and a new formal intervention defined as inclusion, intersection, and exclusion.”

Examples of these interventions have been developed in a wide range historically. Yona Friedman’s Spatial City from the 1950s explores the ideas addressed by Gracia on an urban scale. This paper aims to look at this project as a response to the expansion and growth of cities that continue in contemporary conversations. In particular, I focus on three areas of the project: its utopian purpose, its techniques of representation, and its contribution to a historical discussion.

Spatial City is presented as an elevated city with the possibility of different activities developed under a systematic process to enable the growth of the cities while restraining the use of land. The project is a multilayered structure supported by columns situated in the metropolis of Paris without the necessity of demolishing older cities to build new spaces. Friedman established, “The Ville Spatiale proposes empty ‘space,’ with no overall enclosure, no definite floors, no ceilings. A space-frame structure, a minimal one, is envisioned as an anti-gravity device simply for hanging volumes freely imagined by the user.” As a result, the utopian proposal is driven by the implications of the role of architecture as an agent for encouraging freedom and self-development space.

As a project dated in the 1950s, the process of development and its way of representation is a topic of research for its form of communication. Friedman uses the collage as a technique to enhance the distinction between the current cities and new developments. In his collage for the Spatial City Project, we can see the difference in color and technique between the current state of Paris and his proposal. These forms of representation emphasize the contrast between old and new. Also, as a technique for expression, the collages show the architect’s position against new developments with implications of demolishing ancient cities or spreading to the new land by looking at his work as an agent for environmental responsibility. Because of this historical background, Friedman’s collages became an inspiration for the position of Archigram, Superstudio, and more as a work of contrast and criticism to the growing cities and new developments.

City’s growth has been an active conversation for architects, and Friedman’s work has contributed to this dialogue with Manifesto de l’Architecture Mobile, which is a written example of his work. Presented in 1956 in the 10th edition of The International Congress of Modern Architecture (CIAM X), Friedman explains the willingness of a new “construction system that allows users to design and modify their spaces according to its dwellings.” Spatial City was a medium to explore the ideas of Architecture Mobile, with examples of flexible spaces to work and live regarding the people’s experience on the bodily scale. The development also expands to the urban scale, with models of mechanical systems for necessary supplies to transportation networks along the city. As an active actor in the 50s, Yona Friedman has an essential contribution to this conversation, and Spatial City is a real inspiration for further developments.

What are the benefits of new cities? Should we build on the infrastructure already developed, or should we create a new one? How environmentally responsible is the idea of new developments? These are some of the questions this conversation addresses nowadays. Looking back to Friedman’s work, there is a source of information and inspiration for these questions. In this sense, references and historical developments are a lesson for the future and the beginning of new conversations.
What is your position regarding the development of building facades since you mention the importance of the liminal spaces and the connection between the building and the exterior as a form of representation and manifestation for cultural, political, social, and environmental structures? This was the question raised to Frida Escobedo in the “Unfolding” lecture at Columbia GSAPP in summer 2022. The question is formulated to explore the implications of architecture in a Latin American context and its response to the current issues presented in cities, but also by looking at architecture as an agent of change for traditional practices in response to various topics of interest manifested and developed through architecture. This paper aims to expand on the answer from Frida Escobedo and her position by approaching three issues mentioned in the lecture and their relation to her work: Materiality in Serpentine Pavilion, Representation in Domestic Orbits, and Manifestation in Split Subject.

As first mentioned by Frida Escobedo, materiality has an enormous role in building facades. The choice of texture, color, composition, transparency, and porosity is not only the face of the building but a language to explore the current situation of the context. For example, the development of the façade in the Serpentine Pavilion in 2018 explores an approach to materiality as a continuous process for creation and position in time. “…my curiosity about how we define time and how architecture reflects it. This architecture without architects is more about what happens as an experience - this process of creation and accumulation that happens slowly but steadily, so it becomes a continuous flow of happenings, one after the other.” The Serpentine Pavilion is considered an example of locating time and space.

Located at 150 km from Quito, Capital City of Ecuador, is Hacienda La Cienega. An example of Land and space is where the encounter of nature, constructs, and artifacts negotiate the site in (dis)accordance with its inhabitants. Abandoned for over 50 years, today, nature has reclaimed the space and challenged the boundaries that limited its growth 250 years ago. The limitations imposed by the building have shifted by the natural development of the ecosystems to challenge the built conditions of the site. The saturated image shows the different elements in negotiation, redefining the site’s idea, and proposing an ecosystem of climate equity.

By Santiago Martinez
as a traditional Mexican element that is used to bring light and air to the interior. The project combines the local context through cement roof tiles as the primary material for the façade and the composition of celosias as a resource for the landscape to interact with the inside. By looking at this approach, materiality becomes a field to challenge current contexts and issues related to new forms of expression through architecture. Conversely, the manner of representation was brought to the conversation with the work explored in Domestic Orbits. From various examples analyzed in Mexico City, such as Casa Estudio by Luis Barragán, Condominio Varsovia by Mario Pani, Torre Cervantes by Fernando Romero, or Bosque Real Frida Escobedo explores the role and visibility of spaces designed for service and specifically for the occupancy of domestic workers. “While the apartment block is widely known and amply divulged, it has rarely been presented as an entire condominium, comprising more than one tower. The project consists of three volumes: the apartment volume in one corner of the plot, the office volume in the back, and the service volume to one side of the apartments. However, the circulation systems in the offices and apartments never mix with that of the domestic workers, who inhabit the tower next to the apartments.”

Condominio Varsovia is an extraordinary example with implications of social, political, and economic inequity in the exposure of how architecture allows these structures to develop and transcend. This is perceived in each building ground by looking at the distribution and articulation of the architectural program and its representation of the building’s form. The architecture, in this case, becomes an expression of the exclusion experienced by domestic workers. In this sense, Escobedo’s response concerning her position regarding the scope of a building’s façade suggests a desire for architecture to show and make visible these spaces as part of an intertwined interaction of social structures. A position that allows invisible programs to be part of the city while giving back the missing representation in society. It will enable architecture to become an agent of representation with a strong position against exclusion and segregation.

Finally, the implications of architecture as an agent of manifestations for cultural, political, social, and environmental structures were answered through Split Subject, an example of experimental work in Colonia Juárez in Mexico City. As Annie Ochmanek describes this work at LIGA, “Pressed between the building’s glass shell and the interior it encloses is a record of an unregulated development and accumulation at odds with the façade’s projected vacancy. The face of modern Mexican character, or what grew in the empty recess left by Modernism’s failure to deliver what it bespoke, is legible here. The logic of this structure has been populated with the disorder of reality — clarity is met with the scraps of necessity.” Escobedo’s interest in the building’s façade is a proposal of layers and the spaces in between, referred to as liminal space in the lecture. In this case, the decomposition and deconstruction of a building’s façade is understood as the moment of interaction between the activities inside the building and the external condition of the city. The façade becomes the architectural manifestation of societal structures and the point of interaction with the realities of the context. Frida Escobedo’s response regarding her position in the role of architects in the development of the building’s façade is understood as an intertwine event of architectural agents related to various facets of society. Materiality as a response to context, representation as an expression of inequity, and manifestation as empowerment of realities are some of the current challenges presented by the issues of cities. These topics have found architecture as a form of exemplification and, for architects, a form of inspiration.
Olive Trees have constituted and shaped the landscape of Tunisia for over 3000 thousand years since the Phoenicia civilization, and they are considered a reflection of its culture. Since industrialization in the 19th century, nearly 2 million hectares and over 82 million olive trees have become part of the country’s landscape, leading its economic activity as the world’s 2nd largest producer and the 4th largest exporter with over 350,000 metric tons per year. Its value is nearly 900 million dollars and constitutes 6.28% of the exports for the country’s economy. Exports depend on the EU standards, formed primarily by European forces, which is the organization that standardizes olive oil by quality. As a result, 20% of the Tunisian production is Lampante olive oil (LOO) which is considered ineligible for human consumption. Along the production line, the refinery and commercial stages deficit have a potential of 180 million dollars, furthering the benefits in social and environmental structures by looking at LOO as an asset.

The proposal seeks to intervene in the production line of Olive oil by addressing two stages. The first one is the implementation of new technologies as low-cost and eco-friendly alternatives, such as membrane tech and microfiltration for the refinery stage. The challenge is the lack of human resources to operate this process which requires high-level expertise and scientific knowledge in the specific production of olive oil. The second is the re-evaluation of local markets and the quality standards for the commercialization stage. The challenge is the re-valorization of local products to compete in the global market by adding aggregate value to the local production of olive oil through its different forms of trade. The project seeks to follow the architectural typology on site, which allows the support of institutions through the benefits of economic activities. The aim is to provide the space for the increasing community of experts and scientists through a local research and learning center, supported by the re-conception of the local market through traditional activities.
On typology is a piece of theory by Rafael Moneo as part of the 13th edition of a Journal for ideas and criticism in architecture named Oppositions. It was published in the summer of 1978 for The Institute for Architecture and Urban Studies by The MIT Press. The publication suggests conversations in the line of criticisms, history, archives, reviews, letters, and theory which place this paper as part of a thoughtful series of arguments. The document is developed in 25 pages with a double-row format and organized in 5 pieces. It contains 23 notes from a comprehensive source interleaved with 29 figures which graphically support the arguments exposed.

The format of this theory aims to communicate an idea in a compressed format with a combination of images and texts to allow the audience to challenge what is exposed. This specific design allows the readers to set a conversation around its topics under the formulations of questions and research along history, theory, and precedents rather than enforcing its arguments. The images perform another stage to expand the discussions in different scales and places. It presents another form to connect the topics with their context and a specific visual manifestation of what should be questioned.

The text begins the conversation by showing a figure of 72 diagrams by J.N.L. Durand showing building forms in 1809. It classifies buildings by their geometrical shape, divided into 9 rows that synthesize ambiguously pure geometrical forms with different variations by adding, subtracting, and combining the elements of the composition of each form. The diagrams follow two predominant forms (square and circle) and their different combinations. It uses a simplified plan as the primary representation and is presented as isolated objects with no context.

In this sense, Moneo opens this conversation by looking into architecture through its pure form manifested in buildings as built objects regardless of their site or scale. Moneo intends to approach architecture at an abstract level where everything can be compared by showing this initial diagram of pure geometrical distribution and form. Doing this also allows this theory to pick different precedents regardless of time. It intends to persuade with his approach as a thinking tool that has been part of the architecture, as much as the geometrical form itself, challenging its current purpose and evolution. The images perform another stage to expand the discussions in different scales and places. It presents another form to connect the topics with their context and a specific visual manifestation of what should be questioned.

The text places a conversation through history. The theory is recognized as a concept regarding time, but with significant changes, modifications, transformations, and interpretations over time. His approach suggests that the theory aims to be acknowledged as part of the architectural discussion over time. For his reason, he understands type as the challenge for architecture. This position is complementary to the first image shown, which proposes a more profound research and understanding of the form.

To define typology, Moneo uses a provocative question for the architectural work, regardless of time, place, and person. This suggests the concept of typology as one of the main arguments for architecture because it challenges its nature and the architectural object as an agent for a specific generation and its attendant problems. Moneo positions his theory in two different contexts to define a work of architecture. The first one is to consider architecture as an entity itself that cannot be classified and has its own characteristics and uniqueness. The second one is to look at architectural objects as part of a group of general attributes which can be identified by their similarities and, finally, by their ability to be repeated. In this sense, the concept of type is supported by the architectural language used to identify elements of objects under a group of similar objects with similar characteristics.

The intention is to allow the ideas to fit any architecture. It becomes a tool of analysis that should be considered in any case, its language can be regarded as argumentative because it
supports every example with thoughts and allows a more expanded analysis. As well as its vocabulary which uses specific tools to compare constructs. This approach suggests a theory with the flexibility to fit any architecture at any time and form. This is palpable in the examples used in the text. The variety in terms of time, scale, size, structure, purpose, and language is diverse. This range of projects is chosen on purpose as a method of work where this typology is, in fact, a subject of analysis.

Following this approach, Moneo defines typology as the beginning of the design process and the synergy of the two initial concepts of type. He describes “The design process as a way of bringing the elements of typology – the idea of a formal structure – into the precise state that characterizes the single work.” In this sense, his theory suggests type as the mechanism of development for the design process. Not only by the characterizations of a group as an initial approach but by working through the singularity of type through its history and uniqueness. This is the definition of the formal structure in a work of architecture. Formal structure is defined by different perspectives and supports the theory of type. On one side, it is seen as a classification by abstract geometry and an agent for social activity materialized in architecture. These classifications and the interaction between them is the definition of these concepts that allows the exploration of new typologies through the study and analysis of existing work of architecture. For this, the notion of change and transformation positions a new object with its contexts. It allows us to define type as a starting operation tool for change as a mechanism of denying the past and allowing the future.

In this definition, the specific vocabulary to explain its theory with a concrete description of terms and elements is intended for a particular audience. Moneo addresses the current practice of its time and its subjects. In this sense, a certain level of expertise and knowledge of terms is required to recognize the leading suggestions of his theory. However, the definition can be seen as ambiguous in many cases because it allows a wide range of examples to fit the analysis. Consequently, a precise interpretation is required by the audience to perform this theory.

To conclude the formulation of this theory, Moneo relates type to the ability for new architectural moments to happen. He describes this “When a new type emerges – when an architect can describe a new set of formal relations which generates a new group of buildings or elements - - then that architect’s contribution has reached the level of generality and anonymity that characterizes architecture as a discipline.” From here, type is placed as a tool and mechanism for new architectural interpretations closely related to its generation. It defines architecture as a discipline possible only through understanding the type and is valued as a contribution to the field.

In terms of audience, Moneo is not only persuading architects to follow his thinking process but also society as an agent with the capacity to recognize a specific contribution beyond architecture. The ambivalence in his vocabulary allows him to reach a level of abstraction to be understood by the general public, which allows this theory to be reachable to anybody. However, when explaining concrete terms, its vocabulary turns specific and aims to persuade architects. By doing this, Moneo intends to affect the current situation of architecture in its generation by placing their work as urgent to look after with the necessity to emerge new forms of thinking.

As a strategy to present the theory, Moneo uses and historical approach supported by precedents. This particular form of giving his view is intended to expand the reach where this can be applied. However, the choice for each precedent is specific and intentional. The chosen architects and their work are subtly exposed to support the ideas and promote the theory’s intentions. Also, the strategy is supported by the broad view of architecture, from the 18th century to its current moment.
By the 19th century, these definitions were used oppositely. Type at this moment was related to form and program with the ability to produce different models, known as compositions. This set the conversation of architecture as a field directly related to needs instead of the nature of architecture itself. It becomes a mechanism to solve a problem. It is defined as the ability of architecture to create complex entities by the composition of elements. This can be seen in the form of representation at that moment. The idea of manuals and handbooks for architecture developed worldwide includes lists of models classified by function and their different compositions. This definition allows Moneo to define the opposite of type and sets its boundaries and fields of conversation.

By this comparison, Moneo accepts both mechanisms of architecture but defines by language and definitions its differences. For the first one, the idea of type and form is supported by the willingness of architecture to connect to its history and transform it through the future. In the second one, the relationship in architecture is between form and program as a method of composition based on geometry, encouraging architecture to adapt to the requirements of society represented as a product as part of a doctrine. At that moment, the definition of type was avoided and disappeared.

The second point of comparison for Moneo begins with the 20th century. When architecture and the theories of the Modern Movement did not recognize the type, following the principles of what was established in the 19th century. At this moment, the design process was understood as a construction mechanism able to happen without historical references. This was the willingness of architects to fit in the world’s forms of conversation to describe the world in a new way. Many forms of architecture used the allusion to type, but only as an ambiguous relation. The main focus at the moment was the space as a mechanism to explore architecture.

As part of the Modern Movement, the social and political context shape architecture in the same direction as its society. Industrialization and its implications, such as mass production, were crucial for architectural development. In the same principals, “The same constructions for the same requirements.” It was the ideology adopted by architecture with the premise of a model for reproduction. This new approach of type denied the concepts established in the past. Moneo defines this shift in the idea from type to prototype.

Another type of argument was defined by the relationship between requirements and form. This was known as Functionalism. This_approach follows the ideology of rejecting the past as a form of knowledge in architecture. The principles of this understanding of type were around the conception of the method. In this case, the prime structure to study was the concept that followed the rejection of type. Although the type was not the central concept of architecture. Functionalism allows using this concept as an instrument by allowing established types to be transformed in favor of function.

Moneo analyses type in different forms and scales, sharing through urban development [ment a new understanding of type, which was conceived in terms of the city by looking at its formal structure and historical development. This approach emphasizes the relationship between elements and objects. The idea of type is conceived as the comparison and overlapping of certain formal regularities.

By the late ’60s, the architectural form was defined by the “type base on the juxtaposition of memory and reason.” This allows architecture to look at the past as an agent of history and memory, which retain a reason. It positions itself as the core for form and removes the idea of function. This aims to reconstruct the city and its historical value through new forms of architecture. On the other hand, another approach to type was developed, which followed the idea of architecture as a process of transformation within its society rather than a relationship between form and type.

Moneo exposes this concept as an approach by opening a new chapter for typology. Going through different moments of history and interpretations of types, he positions type in a moment that seems to appear again in architecture. Regardless of these efforts, he situates the architecture of the moment as an attempt to return to archi-
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To understand the question of type in each generation or architects. He uses different variables, forms, and contexts. This place type and architecture as a field without context and history. The issue Moneo approaches here is that architecture, in this sense, is defined as the possibility of finding its essential value through the interpretations of different variables, forms, and contexts.

Finally, Moneo attends to position typology in that moment of history. His approach begins with an explanation of the context for architecture, driven by society and its techniques. He defines, “It seems that type can no longer define the confrontation of internal ideology and external constraints. Since formal structure must now support itself without the help of external circumstances (techniques, uses, etc.),” this place type and architecture as a field that has failed throughout history. The issue Moneo approaches here is that architecture can perceive reality throughout history. This led to a moment of architecture where type is fragmented and placed as an object on a single identity that has failed throughout history.

In conclusion, Moneo closes its text with an open question about type. He wonders if it makes sense to speak of type today? This can be understood despite the failure of the romantic approach to architecture’s origins without following the thought process. As for that moment, Moneo says typology today has come to be understood simply as a compositional mechanism. The so-called typological research today merely results in the production of images or in the reconstitution of traditional typologies,” which relates to the work developed at the moment by looking at typology as a tool rather than as a concept.

One of the most significant assumptions in Moneo’s theory is to analyze examples and authors only from the occidental hemisphere, using its work and methods developed by the same interpretations. His theory only focuses on analyzing architecture through the eyes of the occidental world. The theory, in this sense, is taking for granted architecture that does not follow the rules, techniques, methods, and approaches of this theory. In this sense, the arguments follow in a circle line that conveys and intersects in the same topics multiple times in different moments.

In terms of the layout of the text, Moneo uses visual references to support the arguments around the historical background of the theory. The images differ from each other and use a form of representation according to their author and historical moment. The theory is not supported by images explicitly created for the text, but for pictures of buildings and photographs of cities and assessments. The content for the images is diverse, going from plans and facades, but one thing in common is the monochromatic representation of buildings. Another aspect to follow through, in theory, is the layout of the images throughout the text. It allows the discussion to have textual arguments supported by graphical content constantly. The use of hierarchy in this sense can be found in the size and quantity of images found in each example display which sug-

Following these words, Moneo’s understanding of type is a compilation of its different forms and a critique of its spectrum of influences. By looking at the language used in the text and his references to architects as part of the conversation, his intended audience is its generation or architects. He uses different moments of history and agents as examples of the success and failure of this concept. Still, he challenges his generation to acknowledge theory as part of architectural conversations. By doing this, he is sharing the theory’s contextual background and suggesting type as the central issue in architecture.

The theory of type is persuading the recognition of its arguments as the most critical problems architecture faces. Despite the walk through history and the shifting in the understanding of type, Moneo returns to its first argument of looking for the nature of architecture. He acknowledges the failures of this concept before but justifies this by presenting ideas for the lack of understanding of type due to social and political structures. On the other hand, he persuades us to look at the cases of success of this theory by redefining this kind of argument as a positive support for architecture.

To engage and support the theory of type, Moneo walks the reader through numerous architectural principles. Some follow assumptions for the reader, such as the contextualization of society in every example he explains. He takes for granted that history and its connotations are already well-known by its audiences. He exposes these concepts ambiguously, assuming they are already prominent in the conversation. Another assumption for Moneo is the context where the architecture is developed. Regardless, he exposes some examples of specific sites but does not engage the conversation with a particular place. By doing this, he divides the type from the area. This allows him to place his theory in any context.
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gests a different focus from others. To expand on the layout, it is essential to analyze the uses of different strategies to show images alongside the text. The theory moves from general to specific. Moneo opens the conversation with images that support its thinking from a broad architectural perspective, with examples on general topics. The use of glossaries, images of settlements, worldwide landscapes, and diagrams of comparison between buildings are the images that allow the theory to be placed in different categories. This intends to set the arguments in any possible condition and put it as a timeless tool.

Moneo moves to specific images to position its theory with examples close to its generation. He presents cases from the general to the particular to allow his audience to engage with each example. This intends to challenge and question the current practice of the architectural object. By doing this, many images show the specific development of architecture. Since its interest is to look at typology as the primary tool for architects, the specificity of images from many examples also intends to show the structural form he aims for. Thus, the images become a graphical language of his theory to communicate directly with architects using graphic examples as study cases.

As a strategy for the composition of these images, the hierarchy in how this is presented is a crucial element to explain the theory. For this, Moneo uses two approaches. The first is a group of images, combining plans, photos, and diagrams to allow the reader a broad understanding of its examples. The second is a specific image combined with text supporting a concrete idea. This combination follows the language overall in the paper. Moving fluidly from abstraction to concretion allows multiple audiences to engage with the text.

This piece of theory works on different levels of expertise. Regardless it places and challenges a specific group of architects in charge of bringing architecture from theory to reality. The questions presented by Moneo are intended to encourage conversation from a multidisciplinary perspective. It could be understood as a starting point for new interpretations in new generations and as a historical overview of architecture through a specific structure. These challenges begin in the academy and are a form to influence and inspire new forms of architecture in the world through different disciplines.

From the multidisciplinary perspective, Moneo suggests that architecture should be a collaborative discipline. This means addressing every field where architecture could have a voice and be an agent. However, a crucial aspect of allowing this to be manifested in architecture is the definition of the formal structure of the object despite its argumentation. As Moneo explains, the value behind the object is its way of performing, regardless of its field. Despite not giving specific examples of disciplines, he opens a new conversation for its generation to explore.

In terms of the object itself, as part of volumes from different topics and authors, the text is published as part of a series of conversations that take place in a moment of history for architecture to define its way. In this sense, the reproduction of these arguments falls under analysis. It is part of a collection of manifestos to dialogue within the architectural world to spread and reach as far as possible. The productions are printed on paper and distributed worldwide. The contributions of authors to this work also play an essential role in producing this content. It sets an atmosphere of precisely curated content with the participation of well-known architects and specialists in architecture.

Following this idea, the physical qualities and aspects of the media for the reproduction of this paper have fundamental reasoning for its reach. By using a method of media that allows this theory to be produced in large quantities, the intention behind it is to reach as much audience as possible with the aim to position this argument in his generation, but also as a manifestation of current developments. The psychical paper also allows this theory to be transcendental on time, intended to remain on time and be accessible anywhere. This supports the intentions of the theory to become an essential argument for architecture.

The platform used for the theory is also supported by the group of thinkers behind its work. In this sense, the idea gains value by belonging to this select group of architects because an expert group supports it. Also, being part of a journal means that the theory is open to critics since it is a space for an open conversation addressing architecture. Looking at the title of the journal “Oppositions,” the intentions behind the work are evident and how it operates. It presents a theory with critical narratives to architecture which positions a form of thinking to show new conditions to operate.

Finally, in conclusion, the theory of type presented by Moneo works as an agent of change for current and future generations. It describes its historical influences by providing examples of different forms, scales, and contexts to allow the theory to develop under multiple disciplines. Type as a concept can be understood and study not only in architecture, and Moneo defines and provides tools to look at architecture as a discipline of complexity and specificity. Following principles, many other contexts can fall under the same type of analysis. Architecture is an open question that can be deliberate in terms of history and developed according to society’s willingness and its generation.

By Santiago Martinez
As the most populous borough in New York City, Brooklyn settled back in 1634. By 1848 Brooklyn Borough Hall conceived the first governance space, which had become deficient by the city’s growth and necessity. The project seeks to change the perception of the new space for the hall by exploring the balcony and the wall as the architectural elements for excellent as a new governance space. The new site celebrates expression, but most importantly, the public and private entanglement as a new way of thinking, living, and experiencing the city. The re-invention of layers seeks to consolidate its functions and challenges the current structure of the hall as a dispersed organism in the city within the ordinary perception of multiple elements.

The selected area for this proposal is the intersection between Cadman Park, Old Fulton Street, and The Brooklyn Bridge. This space constitutes the “Civic Center” and the encounter of different infrastructures, scales, and bodies. The approach was not only to invent a governance space but to define what it means for the city and its people to be involved with the borough activities in everyday life. This redefinition involves new, multi-scalar interaction between residents and space by transparency and accessibility as part of multiple vertical relationships within activities and public space. By giving the inhabitants a space to take up the role of developing the city, the proposal creates a new opportunity for expression where the balcony and the wall are the agency for a more significant space in the heart of Brooklyn’s Urban Life.

The proposal intends to re-invent the layers of a new governance space by creating a type that allows the public and the private to relate to different forms and bodies. But also to consider the historical layers the site presents and link them with a new hall for the future.
Elements Catalogue: Balcony Type

Axonometry
The lithograph “The City of New York by Currier and Ives” from 1876 portrays the bustling and flourishing city of New York. The artwork was made to advance the place as America’s biggest and most critical city at the time. The lithograph highlights the social and architectural achievements of the city’s celebrated points of interest, such as the Brooklyn Bridge. In any case, the image served as a political tool by making a city of dreams. With the Civil War late finished, the government was trusted to draw in pioneers to the city. The lithograph exhibits the city as one full of opportunity, where anybody can make their fortune.

The craftsmanship presents the city as an image of trust and opportunity, persuading numerous individuals to move to New York. Overall, the map was a component made to advance the city as a confirmation of its culture and accomplishments and a capable political instrument utilized to entice individuals to move to the “City of Dreams.”

As such, this research paper will explore five distorted components from the reality of the initial map, like the New York City Hall, Battery Park alongside Castle Garden, The Brooklyn Bridge, Trinity Church Steeples, and the environment overall underpinning its political meaning and value for New York City.

The City Hall delineated in the map could be a distorted component from reality since it presents a picture far more unique than the building’s accurate measure, fashion, and form. The building is displayed in a neoclassical architectural style, with forcing columns and a domed roof, which suggests magnificence and control. In reality, the City’s main political building was humbler and utilitarian in the plan, reflecting its work as a metropolitan building for viable purposes (NYC, 2018). The choice to delineate the City Lobby in this way was a deliberate twisting of reality pointed at making an impression of a raised and influential city.

The lithograph was made as part of a limited-time campaign to bring development and speculation to Modern New York City. The representation of the hall as a towering, grand building was outlined to form a sense of awe and regard for the city’s teaching, projecting the picture of a prosperous, showy, and well-run city. The distortion of the City Hall building served as a more significant reason to promote the city as a desirable place to live, work, and visit.

Further, New York is offered as a place of architectural style full of opportunity and quality in its space. However, the city hall represents the most accurate representation on the map since it was completed by the date the lithograph was commercialized. As for the following examples, the distortion was astonishing.
it was a mutilated element made to advance New York and as a political tool.

Firstly, the site culminated with amusement and a happy remark to position the United States at the top. As an example of its architecture and development, it was a dynamic worker processing center and starting point for many needy and undesirables. In reality, Battery Park was a swarmed and boisterous place with long lines to induce nourishment, purchase tickets, and onboard the ships. However, this did not appear on the map, and the zone was displayed as a quiet recreational spot, it suggests being seen as a perfect place for everyday tasks, as a preserved monument for welcoming New Yorkers to the city of the future.

Secondly, the map appeared Castle Garden as a structure that looked like a pixie story castle. Nevertheless, the building was utilized as a mobilization center where individuals were packed into the building without legitimate offices. Immigrants were frequently abused, and families were isolated, which does not appear in the etching. The map did not capture the hardships and challenges those who passed through Castle Garden faced, the conditions of its surroundings and environment, or the political values of a monument that served many activities in the past.

Thirdly, the image of Battery Park appeared as a parcel of greenery around the Castle, with watercraft and ships coating within the adjacent water (Sioli, 2017). In any case, this was not the case, as there were few trees or bushes, and the public waterways of the region were only a bustling dock with grimy water littered with waste and contamination. The image was wrong in depicting the area’s appearance, reproducing a lusher, more sentimental picture of the city, but also taking advantage of many proposals presented to the public then.

Fourthly, the site within the engraving appeared as a recreational spot with a parcel of individuals getting charged out of different activities. But the reality was that the stop was, as it were, open to the city’s wealthiest inhabitants, and it was isolated. African Americans and other foreign bunches seem not to appreciate the park’s facilities in the way that appeared within the frame. The map was an apparatus to picture social agreement among the clashing classes and engaging people’s dreams and imaginations of the “city of dreams.” However, with the reality of Castle Garden being a foreign center and the park experiencing significant natural harm, the engraving failed to precisely delineate the range (Sioli, 2017). As a result, the picture served as a mutilated representation of the new city of dreams aimed at promoting Modern New York.

As a fifth element, the illustration of the Battery Park site failed to show the pollution level and natural harm the stop had persevered over the previous decades. The city’s inhabitants dumped all their waste, oil, and rubbish within the park (Sioli, 2017). Guests were often uncovered to heavy toxins and unsafe chemicals, which might cause significant hurt to human well-being. The map did not appear the fundamental issues, which thought little of the severity of natural contamination among the local inhabitants.

Ultimately, it was a misshaped component within the map. It depicted the area as a recreational safe house and an image of prosperity and concordance, which was not the reality. The engraving also worked as a political apparatus, reproducing a picture of social concordance among the clashing classes and engaging people’s dreams and imaginings of the “city of dreams.” However, with the reality of Castle Garden being a foreign center and the park experiencing significant natural harm, the engraving failed to precisely delineate the range (Sioli, 2017). As a result, the picture served as a mutilated representation of the new city of dreams aimed at promoting Modern New York.

The Brooklyn Bridge, also known as the East Bridge, was a significant deed of engineering and an image of advance in its time. However, within the map, the bridge was delineated as a mutilated element, used to create a more profound impression than reality and advance New York City as a city of fantasy (media, 2018). This reproduction was an instrument for marketing the city and a political device to shape open discernment. This exposition will explore why the Brooklyn Bridge was a mutilated component within the image.

Firstly, the image displayed the Brooklyn Bridge as a complete structure while still under development. The bridge was not open until 1883, seven years after the map was launched. The reproduction of it made sense of magnificence and achievement by portraying the bridge as completed, highlighting New York’s position as a city of movement and innovation, taking advantage of the progress made by the city at the moment but also placing this monument as a main attraction of the city. The hint is that the reproduction of the bridge was pushed to fit the Centennial Declaration of Independence and show New York as a Significant City and the world’s capital.

Secondly, the bridge’s estimate needed to be more balanced within the frame, showing up much larger than
it was. This communicated a sense of glory and magnificence, emphasizing New York’s status as a worldwide financial powerhouse (media, 2018). The map proposed that the city could accomplish the outlier by presenting the bridge on such a scale. The construction of such a bridge confirmed the city’s quality and resourcefulness. By looking at the materials and the mere design of the bridge, it is clear the city’s ambitions were that the bridge was not only infrastructure but a symbol of power and class.

Thirdly, the board portrayed the Brooklyn Bridge as an image of solidarity between the boroughs of Brooklyn and Manhattan. The bridge was shown as a single structure, interfacing the two boroughs in harmony and participation, when in reality, the bridge was a dead space between the bridge, Old Fulton Street, and Cadman Park.

Typically, the Brooklyn Bridge played a critical part in forming the open recognition of New York City in the 19th century. The picture was a device to advance the city not as a center of commerce and industry but as a place of power and opportunity (media, 2018). However, this construction came at the cost of mutilating the reality of the bridge’s development and the political and social pressures included. The lithograph shows that the Brooklyn Bridge was an image of advance, modernization, and solidarity. However, this came at the human cost of the city’s terrific routes, which we can still perceive nowadays.

By looking at the Brooklyn Bridge was delineated in the reproduction as a symbol of advance and modernization, but this came at the cost of the people who lived in the prompt region of the bridge. The development of the bridge caused broad uprooting of communities, especially in Brooklyn, and many individuals misplaced their homes and employment as a result. By displaying the bridge as an image of advance and accomplishment, the map downplayed the human cost of this advance, darkening the cruel substances that numerous New Yorkers confronted. Nowadays, those movements are still perceived. The Brooklyn Bridge is an infrastructure that disconnects downtown Brooklyn from DUMBO, creating a dead space between the bridge, Old Fulton Street, and Cadman Park.

Secondly, church steeples, as a prominent highlight of the horizon, were used to advance New York City as a reference point of trust and opportunity for
The City of New York: A Fostering Invention

The representation of the harbor within the map is another mutilation of reality. The pier is portrayed as a gleaming portal to the world, a busy port filled with exchange and commerce. However, the harbor was regularly filled with contamination, oil, and waste and was a site of cruel working conditions and exploitation. The choice to speak to the harbor in this way appears how the map served as a device for political and financial goals (NYC, 2018). The port was the lifeblood of New York City’s economic foundation, a center of transportation and exchange that was essential to the city’s growth and success. The representation of the harbor in the image was planned to present New York as a door to the world, a Catholic city with worldwide reach and significance. The impression sought to promote growth and advance the City’s political and economic desires.

The delineation of the city’s occupants in the engraving also distorts reality. The individuals within the map are depicted as differing and glamorous, with the most recent designs and styles. This representation is an idealized form of existence, disregarding the different and frequently challenging encounters of the city’s residents (Paranick, 2018). The choice to delineate the residents in this way was a portion of a more considerable exertion to portray New York as a city of limitless plausibility and opportunity. The inhabitants of New York during this period were different and often confronted significant challenges. Poverty, sickness, and segregation were everyday experiences for numerous New Yorkers (NYC, 2018).

However, the picture speaks to the city’s inhabitants as exciting and prosperous, projecting a view of an inviting and comprehensive city. In this sense, the image shows a tolerant city, and perhaps the map can be considered a political device exaggerating the advance of New York City and its living conditions. But the most intriguing technique is using only one type of human model. A variety that does not represent diversity nor the rushing reality the city was experiencing.

Another element of the map that distorts reality is the representation of the horizon. The image delineates a horizon of towering buildings and impressive designs, overlooking the complex social and economic powers that drove New York City’s development. The decision to center on the city’s remarkable skyline represented an idealized reality, and the city’s fantastic design was presented as an image of a prosperous city. In the frame, it is easy to find Central Park as an element of progress and many projections that
position New York as planned (Paranick, 2018). The city’s horizon amid this period was a confirmation of the city’s control and riches. The fast development of tall buildings and fantastic design strengthened the city’s image as a global pioneer in commerce and culture. Perhaps, the representation of the horizon pointed at anticipating a picture of a striking, innovative, and dynamic city. As a place for political and financial success, the city exemplifies progress and modernity, fostering innovation. The distortion of reality planned to advance New York City as a desirable place to live, work, and visit is palpable in many examples of the map. The New York City Hall, Battery Park alongside Castle Garden, the Brooklyn Bridge, Trinity Church Steeples reproduction, and the environment of the horizon, harbor, and occupants, were all distorted components, crafted to make a city of dreams that were ideal and provocative for welcoming new people to the town. (NYC, 2018).

The image served as a political device, advancing New York City’s picture as a dynamic city of the future with unlimited opportunities and wealth (Paranick, 2018). In this way, they made an ideal New York City, a vision that was as much an innovation as a representation of reality. The map from 1867 is an extraordinary example of what we know today as rendering. A craftsmanship element to promote, provoke, and attract new customers. A rendering that uses techniques to convey ideas into reality with multiple purposes as an entanglement of political, social, economic, and environmental structures.

The ultimate element that supports the hypothesis of the meaningful use of this map is its ability to be reproduced. Dated in 1867, this element is intertwined in many forms with the Centennial Declaration of Independence of the United States. Despite this image represents a city scale rather than an urban scale. At the moment, New York represented the most prosperous nation’s city and was presented as the world’s capital. By 1967, the Bicentennial Declaration of Independence, a Facsimile of the original map, was reproduced. Many of the mentioned elements, such as the Brooklyn Bridge, were already built by that moment. The act of reproducing the same image hundred years after its launch is not only a recall action or a nostalgic remainder. The Facsimile is proof of a promise. By the 20th century, New York became one of the most prosperous cities in the World. However, it looked completely different than the original map. It can be questioned that part of its success and growth was due to the political implications of the lithograph. A Facsimile that sustained a different value than the original, it was not anymore to promote. It was an element to admire and believe that the “city of dreams” was not a fantasy anymore and was proof of success.

Finally, the relationship between the purpose of the original map conceived as a promotion tool and the architectural aim in the current practices invites a profound conversation full of questions in the fields of architectural representation and history. Are maps mere acts of promotion? How do reality and fantasy convey to manage the liminal line between what is credible? Is the distortion of reality a responsible act of designing or a trivial act of promotion? This paper proposes these questions for further research by looking further than the profound value of this type of work.

In conclusion, “The City of New York” by Currier and Ives from 1867 can be considered an example of publicity and a dynamic city of the future with unlimited opportunities and wealth (Paranick, 2018). In this way, they made an ideal New York City, a vision that was as much an innovation as a representation of reality. The map from 1867 is an extraordinary example of what we know today as rendering. A craftsmanship element to promote, provoke, and attract new customers. A rendering that uses techniques to convey ideas into reality with multiple purposes as an entanglement of political, social, economic, and environmental structures.
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