

Madalina Ghibusi

Architect and PhD candidate in the Architectural, Urban and Interior Design Programme at Politecnico di Milano, she collaborates in various research projects with the Department of Architecture and Urban Studies of the same University.

Maryam Khatibi

Architect and PhD student at Politecnico di Milano, she has conducted undergraduate and graduate studies in architecture and sustainable development. In 2017, she graduated from ETH, Zürich in master of advanced studies in housing and architecture.

Chiara Pradel

Architect and PhD student at Politecnico di Milano, she graduated at IUAV di Venezia and received a postgraduate research Master of Advanced Studies in Architecture of the Territory at Accademia di Architettura di Mendrisio. Her professional experience revolves around Landscape Design.

From park through gardens and arriving to objects might seem, at the first sight, like a big leap between these three different notions that we propose to call scales, as they are going to be treated by their ability to measure and orientate.

This is what the discourse of this publication aims to highlight: that interior design can reach and enrich on multiple levels. These levels will arrive to some touchpoints in a few cases only to continue afterwards to go in other directions, proving how the research in design and architecture can become a never-ending resource for future inquiries.

Madalina Ghibusi
Maryam Kathibi
Chiara Pradel



SCALES OF INTERIORS

parks gardens objects

ii inclusive interiors is a series of studies that – in the attempt to build the foundations of an adaptable environment that meets the need of intercultural dialogue determined by the current phenomena of transnational migration – aims at outlining the most relevant architectural experimentations on collective interiors, in order to highlight the most innovative strategies and tools of “inclusive design” in this regard. In doing that, it collects multidisciplinary critical contributions focusing on the new spaces and architectures that respond to the change of social sphere in a society marked by the intensification of the mobility of people as well as information.

Scales of Interiors

ii inclusive interiors 07

ii inclusive interiors
#07

Scales of Interiors

Parks Gardens Objects

edited by
Madalina Ghibusi Maryam Kathibi Chiara Pradel

ii inclusive interiors Peer Reviewed Book Series
#07| Scales of Interiors: Parks Gardens Objects

A cura di / Edited by
Madalina Ghibusi Maryam Kathibi Chiara Pradel

Comitato scientifico / Scientific Committee
Giovanni Attili | Università La Sapienza, Roma
Luca Basso Peressut | Politecnico di Milano (Chief Editor)
Daniel Cid Moragas | ELISAVA, Barcelona
Irene Cieraad | Delft University of Technology
Arianna Dagnino | University of British Columbia, Vancouver
Christoph Grafe | Bergische Universität, Wuppertal
Hidenobu Jinnai | Hosei University, Tokyo
Susan Yelavich | Parsons School of Design, New York

Comitato di redazione / Editorial Board
Imma Forino (coordinator) Jacopo Leveratto Pierluigi Salvadeo | Politecnico di Milano

DAStU | Department of Architecture and Urban Studies, Politecnico di Milano
AIMAC | Interior Architecture Museums and Built Environment Research Lab at DAStU
AUID PhD Course, Politecnico di Milano

ISBN 9788891638830

© Copyright 2019 Maggioli S.p.A.

Maggioli Editore è un marchio di Maggioli S.p.A.

Azienda con sistema qualità certificato ISO 9001:2008

Maggioli Editore is part of Maggioli S.p.A

ISO 9001:2008 Certified Company

47822 Santarcangelo di Romagna (RN) • Via del Carpino, 8

Tel. 0541/628111 • Fax 0541/622595

www.maggiolieditore.it

e-mail: clienti.editore@maggioli.it

È vietata la riproduzione, anche parziale, con qualsiasi mezzo effettuata, anche ad uso interno e didattico, non autorizzata. Diritti di traduzione, di memorizzazione elettronica, di riproduzione e di adattamento, totale o parziale con qualsiasi mezzo sono riservati per tutti i Paesi.

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be translated, reproduced, stored or introduced into a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form, or by any means (electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise) without prior written permission from the publisher.

Complete catalogue on www.maggioli.it/university area

Il catalogo completo è disponibile su www.maggioli.it area università

Finito di stampare nel mese di Dicembre 2019 nello stabilimento Maggioli S.p.A, Santarcangelo di Romagna (RN)

Printed in December 2019 in the plant Maggioli S.p.A, Santarcangelo di Romagna (RN)

Index

- 7 ii inclusive interiors Book Series
- 11 Introduction
- 15 Fullness and Emptiness
Maurizio Vitta
- Parks**
- 27 The Exhibition Parks
Luca Basso Peressut
- 43 Lawrence Halprin and the Dancing City
Annalisa Metta
- 59 Singapore Green Spray: A Metropolitan Exhibition Park
Matteo Umberto Poli
- 71 Michel Desvigne and *urbanité à venir*
Francesco Repishti
- 85 Memory and Sublime in Post-Industrial Parks
Chiara Pradel
- Gardens**
- 103 The Gardens of Carlo Scarpa
Orietta Lanzarini
- 121 The Inhabited Garden: The Spatial Experiments by
Bernard Rudofsky and Tino Nivola in the Nivola Garden
on Long Island
Alessandra Como
- 135 Urban Gardens
Imma Forino
- 151 The Fair of Nature: Wild as a Norm of Beauty in Gardens
Silvia Maria Mundula
- 167 Contemporary Swiss Urban Garden Strategies
Maryam Kathibi

Objects

- 185 The Object Dimension of Architectural Space
Pierluigi Salvadeo
- 197 How Do Objects Redefine Public Space?
Xu Xin
- 209 Objects, Bodies and Open Space: Reflection between Art, Design,
Landscape and Architecture
Federica Marchetti
- 223 Light or Dense: Evolutive Visions
Francesca La Rocca
- 241 When Objects Act as Urban Catalysts and Social Critics
Madalina Ghibusi

Apparatus

- 253 Profiles of the authors
- 259 List of illustrations

ii inclusive interiors Book Series

ii inclusive interiors is a series of studies that – in the attempt to build the foundations of an adaptable environment that meets the need of intercultural dialogue determined by the current phenomena of transnational migration – aims at outlining the most relevant architectural experimentations on collective interiors, in order to highlight the most innovative strategies and tools of “inclusive design” in this regard. In doing that, it collects multidisciplinary critical contributions focusing on the new spaces and architectures that respond to the change of social sphere in a society marked by the intensification of the mobility of people as well as information.

Scientific Committee

Giovanni Attili, Università La Sapienza, Roma
Luca Basso Peressut, Politecnico di Milano (Chief Editor)
Daniel Cid Moragas, ELISAVA, Barcelona
Irene Cieraad, Delft University of Technology
Arianna Dagnino, University of British Columbia, Vancouver
Christoph Grafe, Bergische Universität, Wuppertal
Hidenobu Jinnai, Hosei University, Tokyo
Susan Yelavich, Parsons School of Design, New York



The Object Dimension of Architectural Space

Pierluigi Salvadeo

Today, man seems to have a new innate centrality. Geologists tracing out the stratigraphy of what is called the Anthropocene, mark out the current geological age as being characterized by a different awareness in man of biological, physical, and chemical processes that take place on the surface of the Earth. Today, more than in any other age in the past, man has been able to bring about far-reaching changes in the various ecosystems of the Earth, giving rise to processes that modify the Earth, the atmosphere, and the seas (Crutzen 2005). Without wanting to judge this in any way, as this is not the right setting, for better or worse of contemporary man, who is now conscious of just how much his actions effect the biosphere both immediately and in the medium and long term. Man is therefore ever more aware of his role and the real incisiveness of his action on the Earth, and, in fact, of his centrality in relation to the Universe, at least for the portion of which he is a part. However, one must remember that the wish of man to be the center of the universe is an expression that is neither new or typical to our age.

The Vitruvian Man

Already at its time, the Vitruvian Man expressed the need for human beings to take a central stage, proposing the ideal image of an abstract man, harmoniously fitted into the perfect dimension of the circle, which represents Heaven and divine perfection, and of the square, which symbolizes the Earth (Magnano 2007; Bussagli 1999). This is an evolved conception of the role of man on the Earth, which surpasses that inherited from the Middle Ages, with its conception of a theocentric world, that put God at the center of the Universe, and therefore seeing Him as the starting point for all reality. In

this view, man was therefore seen as a weak creature, whose efficacy on the Earth was always subject to the will of the Creator. At the time, life was seen as being completely transitory, with the purpose of attaining a much higher end in Heaven, for everlasting peace and beatitude. This conception has been completely superseded by Humanism, as a different vision has come to the fore, that outlines a more certain man, who is the artifice of his own destiny. Man that can control himself, just as he can dominate the outside reality, for which he is knowingly responsible. Therefore, one no longer finds any opposition between spiritual faculties and the material form of the body. On the contrary, they are two dimensions that live together in harmonious balance, which exalts faculties of man, allowing him to better carry out every action potentially inherent in his very being. The circle and square of the Vitruvian Man must be read as being symbolic, alluding to man being halfway between divine and earthly that, in the renaissance view, makes him the perfect go-between, able to unite these two different entities, which can be superimposed on one another, just like the circle and square. This is a mainly contemplative, abstract view of the condition of man, and of the anthropocentrism that should have characterized him, that inasmuch as it put man at the center of attention, did not relate to his real nature and real needs.

Enlightened Man

Even enlightenment, to which common opinion gave pride of place to reason over every other form of human expression, had a definition of reason that is far removed from the classical prevalently contemplative definition, containing within itself a strongly abstract component. The same also applies to architecture and the space it generates, where, on the one hand, there is a primarily representative instance of reality, whereas, on the other hand, it includes a reformist component in the form of proposed imagined models, explicated in presenting possible architectures or hypothetical cities. All of these proposals are founded on instances of reality, but full of propositional and inventive values of change, in order to solve some of the most dramatic shortcomings in society of the time. Thus, opposing models living side-by-side, that, paradoxically, in the eighteenth century, spring from the primacy of reason, fed by scientific and rational urgings used to resolve some of the most concrete needs of the society, such as hospitals, cemeteries, water and sewer systems, public areas, and etc. When controlled by reason the entire city undergoes precise, crude dissection, changed in a propositional sense, for adequate, more functional use by man.

But it is this very discourse on the city that, in its great desire to propose, cannot get away from making use of a utopian tension. Revolutionary architects, Étienne-Louis Boullée and Claude-Nicolas Ledoux, transfer all of this to the level of laying out the spaces, and their ideal city takes shape by expressing lifestyles by means of its strong materialness, which is somewhat utopian, based on humanity called upon to reside here, and for whom their architecture is intended. There, buildings were like ideal models of perfection, and were designed to portray and bring discussion to a city designed around a new community, with new moral and civil values (Kaufmann 1973, 1982). A meeting place of reality and imaginative, that tries to find, in architecture, the tool for giving concrete form to the ideal. And in truth, the two quests, that focusing on reality and the other more ideal and abstract, do not seem to clash with one another, but rather complete each other. In fact, while on the one hand utopia comes out of determining what is real, and the cases of need that arise from it, on the other hand, the theoretical square itself feeds off that pragmatism and trust in reason that, in the eighteenth century, was able to translate the ideal to the real plane.¹ The utopian but real architectures of these two architects, have the same nature: social and collective utopias, designed by composing forms full of primary and substantial civic values. However, this superimposition of reason and abstraction was to develop further at a later date.

Modern Man

The Modern Movement overcomes any utopian tension, and finally seeks to look at the real lives of the people, in order to respond to the real needs of man. It is a form of modern enlightenment, in which architecture seeks to express ideals of truth and transparency in its construction processes, in the certainty that this new way of reasoning gives it the capacity to fully meet the needs of man, on both the physical and the psychological level. The five points of Le Corbusier use an articulated system of definitions, and presume to ensure a rational distribution of the internal functions of a building, while at the same time expressing the ambition to improve its entire relationship to the outside space. But this common space has always been the foundation for a large part of the critiques of his reasoning. It was Max Risselada, who, in 1987 organized a memorable exhibition entitled *Raumplan versus plan*

1 – On the relationship between reason and abstraction the doctorate thesis *Architettura e illuminismo: Filosofia e progetti di città nel tardo settecento francese* is particularly interesting. Research doctorates in *Studi storici per l'età moderna e contemporanea*, 35th cycle, Università degli Studi di Firenze. Author: Irene Brancasi. Adjudicators: Prof. Rolando Minuti (Università degli Studi di Firenze), Prof. Jaques Revel (École des Hautes Études en Sciences Sociales).

libre, in order to propose a different, more in-depth reading of the Modern Movement, seeing a more abstract, less determining component in it than current critiquing was stating. Risselada tackles his analysis by maintaining that the work done by Le Corbusier, the greatest exponent of the Modern Movement, is characterized by the fact that space, mass, objects, and the human figure are no longer can be put in a hierarchical order, but rather in what he defines as a sort of “reciprocal determination”. In the architecture of Le Corbusier, he highlights a real spatial continuity that clearly shows the hierarchy of the various parts that go together to make up the composition of the building. Within the same composition, man undergoes a fate similar to that of all the architectural elements, merging as one of the parts of the whole. In a certain sense, the disappearance of the perspective idea of space results in many no longer being at the center, giving rise to a different way of treating space and the things it contains.

Starting from these more general considerations, Risselada goes into the compositive logics that are intrinsic to the work of Le Corbusier in greater depth, beginning his breakdown from the famous five points. Of these, by way of example, he deals with those of the lengthwise windows and the clear façade, which provides some points for reflection of particular significance, which are not unique. For Risselada, the lengthwise windows of Le Corbusier do not supply any suggestion of what functions, there are behind the facade, and do not give a comprehensive declaration of what parts open and what parts are closed. Likewise, the clear façade made possible by the cantilevered floor, hides the construction elements seen as the main clarifiers of the construction of the building, and therefore also the distribution aspect of the building. And so Risselada concludes by stating that the facades of Le Corbusier are a type of beauty treatment for the building that is not related in any way with the real life of the people inside.

An approach, that is, disconnected, an abstract architectural composition, the freedom of which inevitably dissolves the bond of dependency of the space constructed in relation to man, declared in strong terms by Le Corbusier in his loudest propaganda proclamations. But Risselada goes on to investigate the composition of some buildings, including the significant Maison Cook of 1926. Here the same abstract approach sees Le Corbusier inventing the traditional vertical layout of spaces, typical of a single-family home (ground floor/entrance, first floor/living room, second floor/ bedroom area), without any apparent reasoning behind it. The ground floor is free, the first has the bedrooms, while the second has the living area. This means that the entrance is not part of the formal formulation of the facade, hierarchies are lost, and the elevation has a pure composition without giving any account

of any space or function inside the building. This approach is even more accentuated in the even earlier *Maison Domino*. In these, Le Corbusier explicitly designs an unexpected constructive structure as a conformable question, in which the horizontal plane becomes the dominating element, whereas the facade is merely a continuous vertical element, known as the clear facade. Risselada points out how, in any case, the latter cannot be interpreted as being a cross section of the building, like some element that clarifies its distributive logics, or even of the construction principles of the entire composition, that is, the reasons for its organism. Like the clear plan, the clear facade is also governed by its own specific compositive laws, by an autonomous regulating outline, that can reasonably be said to be abstract. Clear facades and clear plans are therefore *sets* with their own aesthetic and compositive rules, and they could even be said to be against one another, adversaries of one another (Risselada 1991).

A different evolutionary line

In the scenarios outlined thus far, man has, in fact, been removed from his presumed central position of significant reality, despite being the reference and main objective to which the center of the scene is dedicated. Some sort of getting away from the anthropocentric dimension that, paradoxically, is evoked always and continuously. In the twentieth century, an interesting attempt was made to put man back at the center of the scene, but this time attempting to really meet the instances of his real needs, which was certainly the case with the Arts and Crafts movement, committed to reforming the applied arts. Before the experiences of Le Corbusier referred to, which came about as a reaction to the industrialization of the end of the nineteenth century, this Morris-led movement and the subsequent German *Werkbund* movement clearly expressed the idea of affirming the “social character of art”. A different evolutionary line on man and his relationship to architectural space and his real significant role began from here, no longer merely referred to abstractly, but experimented with in an authentic, far-reaching way. An idea of gregariousness that does not set itself up as an end to be achieved, but rather as the element by which this art itself is identified. It is from this supposition that the minor or applied arts, if you like, take on a retaliatory approach towards the so-called pure or major arts. And so the artistic deed does not serve to interpret reality, but rather takes cognizance of it and reorganizes it in order to explain its social reason, as the final aim. Albeit in the different view of industrial production compared to artisanal work, the subsequent *Werkbund*, just like the former Arts and Crafts, also looks at art as a social product, of collaboration in this case, during which

everything must be thought about, organized, and resolved beforehand. And so the executive moment, which is a result of the ideational moment in Arts and Crafts, must be dealt with fully in the latter in *Werkbund* (Argan 1951). Doing merges with the act of thinking and in this merging, man has a pre-eminent position, not only because he is the thinker and come up with the ideas, but above all because the entire construction process is generated around himself and for himself.

The space of things

Here we have a further decisive passage in this account, in which man plays a leading role, now finally put at the center of a scene that is no longer abstract, but real and made to measure around him. Man playing a role in which, besides being the leading actor, is also the director and author. This is a Copernican revolution that puts man on another level compared to the past: in the so-called age of sharing the presence of man is no longer abstract, but real, involving, and wide-ranging (Arena and Iaione 2017). As one further element for reflection we can say that the participatory character of the life of man, today also changes his relationship to both space and things, of which he is both the user and the inventor.

Jeremy Rifkin, the economist, sociologist, and activist in the pacifist and environmentalist movement back, in 2000 spoke in his *Age of Access*, about the loss of importance of owning physical assets, compared to the great value acquired by the possibility of accessing these same assets, or the services they produce. This is the so-called sharing economy that, in certain ways, can be deemed to be the result of the information society (Rifkin 2000). Accessing an asset and using it, means entering its space, which is very often not only virtual space, but a real physical space with a multiplicity of characteristics. In the sharing economy items are finally able to describe and delimit their space, starting from their use and the actions of people. For this very reason it opens up to many possible solutions, takes on various connotations, is flexible and performs, it goes beyond its own original essence but, above all, it is connotated by an open, on-going generative process, by means of which the user establishes a more direct relationship with things that generate that space.

The sharing economy changes the idea of space, and a close, original relationship is generated between the user and the objects that come to them ready to use, the object universe of that surrounds us that, in scale and nearness to the more minute actions of our lives, represents a real connection between us and the world we live in. The objects are able to adapt themselves continuously and to specialize in relation to our lives, defining the spatial

qualities best suited to our needs around them. This gives rise to a type of superimposition between the idea and physical space, as handed down by the history of cities and architecture, and the idea of object, taken to mean a device able to define its own specialized space by means of its use.

The designer user

We therefore talk about the “user” being an “active consumer”, able, by means of their actions, to promote different forms of space and usable objects with which they come into contact. A very much more direct and involved relationship has now been set up between space and man, in terms of which the latter is no longer a mere passive user, but ever more often he controls the quality of the places, sanction the uses, and organizes its interactions with other places and other users. One could say that today the user is a real designer, able to extend their action from the objects to the space, through to digital tools and virtual space that they are able to describe. This is a complete paradigm shift, in terms of which the debated question of the centrality of man loses the ancient abstraction that marked him from Humanistic times, and finally finds his new expressive form, putting a human being in a new light, able to act as they like in relation to the scene of their own existence. I am talking about a user playing a leading role in the processes of forming and modifying the world they live in, which inevitably overlaps the role of the professional designer, up to now seen as the only intermediary between the expressed needs and the possible spatial solutions. This is like some sort of reassigning of roles within the work chain between design and implementation, by means of a more complex process of dialogue between concrete practices and thought. But this is not a condition that suddenly has shown itself in our time, even though the digital technologies and communication tools certainly speeded things up and increased exponentially over the last two decades.

More than thirty years ago, without even talking about digital technologies, in his book *L'invention du quotidien* (1990) Michel de Certeau, pointed out how use could turn the original sense of space upside down, charging it with other meanings and converting it again within a constitutive process that is both constant and ongoing over time. De Certeau highlighted the active consumer as someone who uses space and things in their own way, and is therefore able, by their actions, to determine new forms of space as “Space practices that relate to a specific form of operations (‘ways of doing’), to a ‘different spatiality’ an ‘anthropological’, poetical, and mythical experience of space), and an *opaque* and *blind* dependency of the city they

live in. A *transhumanizing* or metaphorical city, therefore makes its way into the clear text of what is planned and legible” (de Certeau 2012, 146). It is, in fact, a new city made up of the actions of individuals, that de Certeau is talking about, defined by the infinite actions that, in essence, are the driving forces behind the processes that make up the space. For him, space is thus if applied in practice, and it is practice itself that makes it possible to define it as space. The modernity of de Certeau lies precisely in having grasped the potentialities inherent in the ways people use city spaces, before the others. That is to say, the capacity of individual and collective actions, which he himself defines as “astute, dispersed” activities, to produce space, infiltrating it on a broad scale, not by means of tangible “own products”, by giving rise to change processes. “Basically, space is a formed place” says de Certeau (de Certeau 2012, 176), and one must admit that, today more than ever, with the extensive use we make of digital technologies, this definition seems to have been verified.

The contemporary user has now consolidated their active role in many decision-making processes, promoting processes that are able to produce new scenarios, by means of their involvement. This active involvement on the part of the consumer is creating space, that goes beyond the now established concept of “involvement”. One could even talk about co-production, a further step that even better describes the degree to which the consumer is involved in the various stages of creating space and things (Dujarier 2009). Whether it be via social networks or direct imposition, ultimately the user suggests and lays the basis for setting up the space, and its most suitable form. There is a real design action that lays out the lines that make up the space. This is a new, different relationship between production, consumption, and space that inevitably raises questions about the form of the design and the role of the designer, which Ezio Manzini very clearly defines as follows: “Any entity, individual or collective, is a designer when they work on the world in a knowing form. (...) You can see that this definition of a designer is very wide and takes in not only all of those who work as designers in an institutional sense (to which I will refer as ‘design experts’, but also all those who, albeit not being officially designers, act in the way just described” (Manzini 2018, 61).

The object dimension of architectural space

The notion of involvement extends the array of possible design solutions that, by way of the actions, have their most immediate and direct relationship with space in things. Things that are transformed into-real “devices for defining space”. Objects are therefore able to provide the user

with an insight into the spaces that are most suitable for their actions, the user himself acts in his turn designing spaces by means of his behavior that, viewed in perspective, represent real strategic designs. As this process becomes clearer, a sort of “civil intelligence” is generated (Arena and Iaione 2017, 49) that, on the contrary to what occurs for so-called smart cities, based mainly on a storyline of a technological type, relates directly to the willingness of the people to work together, propose, discuss, and act, in order to produce space that can immediately be seen to be authentic living space. Design, seen as an individual’s action, puts the concept of empathy in the center, allowing people to remain connected to the environment, creating modification processes in the form of involvement and collaboration (Arena and Iaione 2017). And this is why the practice of designing crosses the confines of the discipline, to take new more varied and complex paths, that are able to meet the wide-ranging needs of our continuously transforming societies more effectively. The cases in which the sense of the design lies not so much in the spatial, formal or material qualities of the object, whether it be a building or a space, but above all in the constitutive process that generated it, are ever more frequent. And is by no mere chance that some international exhibitions in recent years have been dedicated to reflecting on the space of architecture, starting from related practices or even practices other than architecture.

At the Venice Biennale in 2010, *People Meet in Architecture*, the curator Kazuyo Sejima has put man’s space center stage, along with the inventive capacity of people when it comes to imagining their own living spaces (Sejima 2010). Once again at the Venice Biennale in 2014, Rem Koolhaas revisited the role of small scale within the processes of creating a space, drawing attention to the more minute components of the design – those that, due to their being closer to man and due to their capacity to interact more immediately with him, determine the most suitable form of the space lived in (Koolhaas 2014). At the Triennale di Milano in 2018, Stefano Mirti exhibited one of the widest overviews of questions on living, highlighting how each space originates from an action, the object of which is the component closest to man. *999: Una collezione di domande sull’abitare contemporaneo* talks about a home, no longer seen as a place, but rather as an experience (Mirti 2018). Finally, also at the Triennale in 2019, in his *Broken Nature: Design Takes on Human Survival*, Paola Antonelli asks, in fact, how design can respond to the question of climate change in the world, attempting to put threads already broken back together, that connect human beings and natural environments (Antonelli and Tannir 2019). In this way infinitely large and infinitely small values are put on the same scale

and by means of the action of man, the relationship between the scale of the object accessed directly and the scale of the territory or even of the cosmos to which the infinite actions of man are added, is put together again.

And so, “doing, recounting, and taking part”, are the new actions that are now part of the professional baggage of the designer (Arena and Iaione 2017). Actions that are adjacent to one another, but all very capable of tackling the complex systems of our current societies, giving rise to new paths to creation and implementation. Almost unexpectedly, and certainly, the design discipline appears once again, but not as the only one invited to the decision-making table, because the determining event for creating the space now seems to have become the “action of man”. An action that puts man center stage, no longer in an abstract manner, but authentically and measurably. As in a circular process, the acting of man in the space has its tool in the object, whereas the object is rendered legitimate in the requirements formulated by the action itself.

References

- Antonelli, Paola and Ala Tannir. 2019. *Broken Nature*. Exhibition catalogue. 22th Triennale di Milano. Milan: Electa.
- Arena, Gregorio and Christian Iaione. 2017. *L'età della condivisione*. Rome: Carocci.
- Argan, Giulio Carlo. 1951. *Walter Gropius e la Bauhaus*. Turin: Einaudi.
- Bussagli, Marco. 1999. “A misura d'uomo: Leonardo e l'Uomo vitruviano (Dentro il quadro).” *Art e Dossier* (146): 17-20.
- Crutzen, Paul. 2005. *Benvenuti nell'Antropocene. L'uomo ha cambiato il clima, la Terra entra in una nuova era*. Milan: Mondadori.
- De Certeau, Michel. 2012. *L'invenzione del quotidiano* (1990). Rome: Edizioni Lavoro.
- Dujarier, Marie Anne. 2009. *Il lavoro del consumatore* (2008). Milan: Egea.
- Kaufmann, Emil. 1973. *Da Ledoux a Le Corbusier* (1933). Milan: Mazzotta.
- . 1982. *Tre architetti rivoluzionari, Boullée Ledoux Lequeu* (1952). Milan: FrancoAngeli.
- Koolhaas, Rem. 2014. *Fundamentals*. Exhibition catalogue. 14th Venice Biennale. Venice: Marsilio.

Magnano, Milena. 2007. *Leonardo*. Milan: Mondadori Arte.

Manzini, Ezio. 2018. *Politiche del quotidiano*. Città di Castello: Edizioni di Comunità.

Mirti, Stefano. 2018. *999: Una collezione di domande sull'abitare contemporaneo*. Milan: Triennale di Milano.

Rifkin, Jeremy. 2001. *L'era dell'accesso* (2000). Milan: Mondadori.

Risselada, Max. 1991. *Raumplan versus Plan Libre*. Delft: Delft University Press.

Sejima, Kazuyo. 2010. *People meet in Architecture*. 10th Venice Biennale. Exhibition catalogue. Venice: Marsilio.

Profiles of the authors

Luca Basso Peressut

Architect, PhD in Architectural Composition (IUAV, Venezia), he is Full Professor of Interior Architecture, Exhibition Design and Museography at Politecnico di Milano, and Director of the International Workshop of Museography and Archaeology Villa Adriana-Premio Piranesi held in Tivoli and Rome since 2003.

On the theory and practice of museography and design for cultural heritage he has organized national and international symposia, conferences, workshops and seminars. On the same subjects he participated in design competitions, developed and realized projects. He is member of the Scientific Committee for the National Conference of Interiors 2005, 2007 and 2010, and member of Scientific Board and co-organizer of the international conferences *IFW-Interiors Forum World*. He is member of the Scientific Board of Museography of Edifir Publisher and consultant for the architectural magazine *Area* since 1997. He is also member of the Research Unit *Museums Interiors and Built Environment*. He was, from 1993 to 1998, local coordinator of three national researches, funded by MURST, about “The Museum of Work.” From 1998 to 2000 he was national coordinator of the Research “Architecture and Material Culture in Museums of Science.” In 2001-03 he was coordinator of a national research co-financed by MURST, about “The New Museum: Architecture, Territory and Landscape.” He was Project Coordinator of the Research Project *MeLa - European Museums in an Age of Migrations*, funded by the European Commission within the Seventh Framework Programme under Socio-economic Sciences & Humanities. Among his recent publications: *Museums in an Age of Migrations: Questions, Challenges, Perspectives* (L. Basso Peressut and C. Pozzi eds., EU-Polimi 2012); *European Museums in the 21st Century: Vol. 1; 2; 3* (L. Basso Peressut, F. Lanz and G. Postiglione, eds., EU-Polimi 2013); *Wandering in Knowledge: Inclusive Spaces for*

Culture in an Age of Global Nomadism (L. Basso Peressut, I. Forino and J. Leveratto, eds., Santarcangelo di Romagna: Maggioli 2016).

Alessandra Como

Associate Professor in Architectural and Urban Composition at the University of Salerno (Italy), she studied in Naples, where she also delivered her doctorate dissertation on fragmentation and the process of design in the work of Sir John Soane. She worked for several years at Francesco Venezia Architect and later started her practice. She began her university career abroad working between the UK and the USA, where she taught at several universities – Washington State University (USA), Architectural Association, Manchester School of Architecture (UK), before returning to Italy.

Imma Forino

Arch, PhD, she is Full Professor of Interior Architecture and Exhibition Design and member of PhD Program in Architecture, Urban and Interior Design at Politecnico di Milano. She is editor of *Op. cit.* journal and of “ii inclusive interiors” book series (Maggioli), and member of the Scientific Committee of *ARK* and *Res Mobilis* journals and of “DiAP Print” book series (Quodlibet). Among her publications the books: *L'interno nell'interno: Una fenomenologia dell'arredamento* (Florence: Alinea 2001), *Eames, design totale* (Turin: Testo&Immagine 2002), *George Nelson, thinking* (Turin: Testo&Immagine 2004), *Uffici: Interni arredi oggetti* (Turin: Einaudi 2011, 1st Award Biella Letteratura e Industria 2012 for essays). Her last book is *La cucina: Storia culturale di un luogo domestico* (Turin: Einaudi 2019).

Madalina Ghibusi

Architect and PhD candidate in the Architectural, Urban and Interior Design Programme at Politecnico di Milano, she collaborates in various research projects with the Department of Architecture and Urban Studies of the same University. Her research focus is on the evolution of the human implications of contemporary phenomena in the urban environments. Among her publications the book: *Urban Design Ecologies: Projects for City Environments* (co-edited with F. Marchetti, Santarcangelo di Romagna: Maggioli 2018).

Maryam Khatibi

Architect and PhD student at Politecnico di Milano, she has conducted undergraduate and graduate studies in architecture and sustainable

development. In 2017, she graduated from ETH Zürich in MSc of advanced studies in housing and architecture. Her research focuses on contemporary sustainable housing in Europe, where sustainable and environmental design challenges and strategies are addressed and investigated.

Orietta Lanzarini

Associate Professor in History of Architecture at the University of Udine, her studies focus in particular on museography and architectural drawing. Her published work includes *Carlo Scarpa. L'architetto e le arti: Gli anni della Biennale di Venezia 1948-1972* (Venice: Marsilio 2003), *Teatri e luoghi per lo spettacolo* (Milan: Electa 2008, with A. Muffato) and «Questo libro fu d'Andrea Palladio»: *Il codice Destailleur B dell'Ermitage* (Rome: L'Erma di Bretschneider 2015, with R. Martinis).

Francesca La Rocca

Arch, she is Associate Professor at the University of Campania “Luigi Vanvitelli”, where she is teaching Methods and critique of contemporary design. Her main research interests concern the design culture, in its relations with science, technological innovation and aesthetics; the perspectives of the eco-oriented project applied to architecture and industrial design. Her work includes *Il tempo opaco degli oggetti: Forme evolutive del design contemporaneo* (selection ADI Index 2007 for 22th Compasso d'Oro Award) and the recent *Design on Trial: Critique and Metamorphosis of Contemporary Design* (Milan: FrancoAngeli 2017).

Federica Marchetti

Architect and PhD Candidate at Politecnico di Milano, she studied at the University of Roma Tre and at the Eindhoven University of Technology. She is also Teaching Assistant in Architectural Design Studios courses (University of Roma Tre and University of Southern California) and in 2016 she co-founded the creative office *Superficial Studio*. Among her publications the book: *Urban Design Ecologies: Projects for City Environments* (co-edited with M. Ghibusi, Santarcangelo di Romagna: Maggioli 2018).

Annalisa Metta

Architect, PhD in Landscape and Garden Design, she is Associate Professor of Landscape Architecture at Roma Tre University. In 2016 she was the Italian Fellow in Architecture/Landscape Architecture at the American Academy in Rome, where she currently serves as advisor. She has

lectured in many universities and cultural institutions, among which the School of Design at the Penn University in Philadelphia; the University of Southern California, in Los Angeles, the École Nationale Supérieure de Paysage de Versailles /Marseilles, the Accademia Nazionale di San Luca in Rome, the Parson School of Design in New York. Among her books: *Wild and the City: Landscape Architecture for Lush Urbanism* (with M. L. Olivelli, Melfi: Libria 2019); *Southward: When Rome will have gone to Tunis* (Melfi: Libria 2018); *Anna e Lawrence Halprin: Paesaggi e coreografie del quotidiano* (Melfi: Libria 2014); *Paesaggi d'autore: Il Novecento in 120 progetti* (Florence: Alinea 2008). In 2007 she founded the Rome based design office *Osa architettura e paesaggio*. Among its works, Bosco Italia at the 13th Venice Biennale di Architettura, Italian Pavillon.

Silvia Maria Mundula

PhD student at Politecnico di Milano. After graduating in Architecture in Milan, she attended a Master in History and Critical Thinking at the Architectural Association in London. She explores the ways in which various constructs of the past and of the contemporaneity relate to architectural and visual practices. She is currently investigating the contemporary obsession for wilderness and the role of wild spaces in western countries.

Matteo Umberto Poli

He is an architect, working as a full-time researcher and landscape design Professor at the Politecnico di Milano. He has an extensive and international experience as a design consultant in architecture, urban and landscape projects. From 2004 to 2007 he has been editor for *Domus* journal and until 2014 special correspondent for *Abitare* journal. He is co-chair the MSc in Landscape Architecture - Landscape Heritage and the MSc in Sustainable Architecture and Landscape Design.

Chiara Pradel

Architect and PhD student in Architectural, Urban and Interior Design at Politecnico di Milano, she graduated at IUAV di Venezia and received a postgraduate research Master of Advanced Studies in Architecture of the Territory at Accademia di Architettura di Mendrisio. Her professional experience revolves around Landscape Design. Her current research investigates ground movements in Landscape Architecture, in particular focusing on big infrastructures and complex construction sites.

Francesco Repishti

Full Professor of History of Architecture at DASTU Department, Politecnico di Milano. From 1998 to 2015 he was editor of the journals *Lotus International* and *Navigator*. His researches on contemporary landscape has led to exhibitions, essays and the book *Dizionario dei nuovi paesaggisti* (with P. Nicolin, Milan: Skira 2003).

Pierluigi Salvadeo

PhD, Associate Professor in the School of Architecture Urban Planning Construction Engineering of the Politecnico di Milano, where he teaches Architectural Design and Set Design and Spaces of Performance. Author of several publications and scientific curator of various international workshops of design and national and international conferences/congresses. Winner of many national and international architecture awards and winner of the Compasso d'Oro Award for the Research "CampUs" of the Politecnico di Milano.

Maurizio Vitta

Philosopher, he is author of numerous articles, essays and books on Art, Literature, Architecture, Visual Communication and Industrial Design. He has devoted many years to teaching these matters at Politecnico di Milano, at Accademia di Brera, at Naba in Milan and at ISIA of Urbino. Among his publications on contemporary literature and art, on architecture and design, we recall *Il disegno delle cose* (Naples: Liguori 1996), *Il sistema delle immagini* (Naples: Liguori 1999), *Il progetto della bellezza* (Turin: Einaudi 2001 and 2011, in an expanded edition), *Storia del design grafico* (co-edited with D. Baroni, Milan: Longanesi 2003), *Il paesaggio* (Turin: Einaudi 2005), *Dell'abitare: Corpi spazi oggetti immagini* (Turin: Einaudi 2008), *Il rifiuto degli dèi* (Turin: Einaudi 2012) and *Le voci delle cose* (Turin: Einaudi 2016).

Xin Xu

Xin Xu is a PhD student at Politecnico di Milano, in Architectural Urban Interior Design program. Her research is about typology study of exhibition spaces, concerning the spaces that exhibitions build in a broad and expansive context. She is also a co-founder of *TAOZI STUDIO*, where she writes reviews and critiques of exhibitions both in Italy and China.