# THE OTHER 20\% JACoues herzog AND REM KOOLHAAS 

in conversation with Sabine von Fischer

## Both Jacques Herzog and Rem

 Koolhaas are famous for their buildings and received Pritzker Prizes in subsequent years. Then, again in parallel, both architects have initiated major research initiatives in a different field, the countryside to be exact: Jacques Herzog and ETH Studio Basel have published a book called Achtung: die Landschaft in 2015, while Rem Koolhaas and AMO presented their report on Countryside, the Future alongside the 2020 Guggenheim exhibition.Sabine von Fischer: You both claim that the countryside is a blind spot. But is it a blind spot for architects, or for society at large?

Rem Koolhaas: I would not say that this is a blind spot. I would also not say it's a blind spot of architects. Basically, my interest is more political. I'm simply saying that since 2007, when the UN warned everybody that already in the early 2000s $50 \%$ of mankind is living in cities, and that in 2030, or 2050, that might be $80 \%$. This would create a situation that is completely insane - that the vast majority of mankind would be situated on very small areas while a very small percentage of mankind would be left to manage the enormous majority of the territory. That is the incentive of the entire effort. And it's nothing to do with claiming anything or with correcting blind spots. It's simply this observation that became alarming to me. And that was for me an important reason to try, almost on a political level, to create a kind of corrective.

Jacques Herzog: Back in 2000, we started a research project at the ETH Studio Basel on the urban topography of Switzerland with special attention given to the landscape. After six years of research the result was a publication in several


Pixel plot agriculture. Pages from Countryside, A Report.
volumes called Switzerland: An Urban Portrait. Cities and landscapes were analyzed and described not as opponents like in previous studies but as equally matched territorial and political agents. Switzerland is one of the most radical examples of totally urbanized landscapes in Europe.

On a global scale only $3 \%$ of our planet's territory is occupied by cities, but in fact almost everything and increasingly more is controlled and organized by humans. This is actually much more alarming than
anything else we may say about landscape or countryside, or any other term we may use, especially when looking into the future. It's not advisable to extend cities into the landscape, but vice versa: We must bring more landscape into the cities.

The 'city' is omnipresent, also in Switzerland, not just in the conventional understanding of urbanization, but with train lines, electrical plants, energy production, even with agriculture. The whole picturesque appearance that
had been previously overlooked or whose potential was somehow hidden. We tried, however, not to impose those identities. While travelling and exploring we 'discovered' them through a very intense, emotional and sometimes painful process of perception and discussion among ourselves. These discussions were often about 'borders' which run invisibly through cities and lands. Such borders can be of a social, political, or geographic nature, or even along botanical lines marking the edges of vegetation. Borders have a strong psychological side when two seemingly different entities are touching each other.

SvF: In your book Achtung: die Landschaft you call for the border as the place of intervention, that is where architects actually can act. How do you describe these borders? Are they clear? Are they getting blurred?

JH: Borders can be many things: physical walls or terrain, vague, visible or invisible. We have observed border areas between countries where both sides had amassed mountains of rubbish, built sewage plants, cemeteries and other unwelcome and undesirable installations. All things that create a distance between two opposite sides - a kind of noli me tangere. We find this in the Middle East between countries which have been in conflict against each other for a long time, but also between countries within Europe. Even in the trinational area around Basel where tram and train lines cross borders and commuters move back and forth between their homes and workplaces in France, Switzerland, and Germany, the border areas are a neglected subject. That is why we started to develop ideas for how to change that. Not necessarily as an architectural project, but rather with soft interventions like bus stops, vegetation, new paths, etc. These interventions would be given names, so the border gets a more tangible and accessible identity for both sides.

Borders are a fact. They separate two sides. That is an archaic pattern of human settlement. Borders are also why things evolve differently in different places. They are linked with what we call 'specificity' as an inevitable and ongoing process in the history and development of cities. We cannot change that, but we can transform borders, so people have a different and more conscious awareness of them. Borders can be crossed only when you are aware of their existence.

SvF: Can we still apply the term border when we talk about the duality of city and countryside?

RK: I would like to really resist acting like an architect. For me the issue is absolutely not how architects can reclaim anything or reposition themselves or any term that is strictly architectural. If the situation is right, we can do significant things. But I think currently the context is completely alien or completely hostile to the idea of any of these considerations. Let's take Holland. When I was young, in Holland there was a Ministry that had as its only function to order the country spatially; that has been abandoned. There was a Ministry for housing; that has been abandoned. So simply, every political ordering system has been abandoned.


And that is the chaotic situation in which we are now, and we all have to operate. Of course, we can operate with more or less intelligence and more or less sophistication, but I think that the crucial thing is to try to work on a more political framework. That is also an implication of the countryside. It's not only a statement about the world in its current form and what architects could contribute to it, it's also the situation that the world is facing a kind of hairraising dilemma. We know, essentially what needs to be done in order to address the dilemma, but we have abandoned the institutions or the entities that can help us to deal with this dilemma. So again, I would emphasize that the political dimension of the countryside show is much stronger than the architectural element of it.

## THE POLITICAL DIMENSION OF THE COUNTRYSIDE SHOW IS MUCH STRONGER THAN THE ARCHITECTURAL ELEMENT OF IT

Ingemar Vollenweider: As one of the organizers of this symposium, I would like to clarify the role of the architect. Do we have to build the countryside to save it? Construction is under way in many remote places, as you have shown, Rem. And you also, Jacques. The strategy of Jacques is to build the landscape first, as Central Park was first - coming back to Delirious New York - and then there were the building lots. It's a very conservative strategy, but it's about borders and it's about conserving and building very dynamically. So, don't you have to build to save?


Achtung: die Landschaft.
RK: I don't think so. For me, the irony is that we are discussing building more in the countryside.

But as I said, there is a process currently going on, where a world, a territory that is inhabited right now by half of mankind, in 30 years will be halved - in terms of human beings. That in itself already shows it's not an issue of building. It is an issue of conceptualizing what the role of that kind of residue (as Jacques called it) represents and what we can do with it. Clearly, that question is also a question that is crucial in terms of dealing with global warming. How can we make sure that we abandon certain parts in a creative way so that they can become nature and that they can help to overcome global warming? I don't think it's remotely an issue of building; it's purely an issue of conceptualizing. And it is interesting to look to Africa or China, where almost any urban citizen has a foot in both camps you can live in the city but also have a background in the countryside. I think one thing, which might be much more productive, is if we can develop a situation where any kind of citizen has in some way an engagement with the two conditions: with the countryside and with the city. For me, the issue is really: how can this vast majority of the world's surface be inhabited in a different way? SvF: Do we need new definitions? Do we need new terms for city and countryside with all this focus on construction outside the city limits?

JH: My concern is less about how this vast territory outside the cities will be built, but rather that it is increasingly being occupied by huge plants and other installations which seem to be put into operation without defined control mechanisms. Maybe we share this concern? I wonder if you, Rem, have a kind of sad or joyful pessimism...

RK: What l've been trying to do in this current exhibition is to show a couple of episodes that are actually a basis for optimism and others that could be a basis for pessimism. For instance, we looked very carefully at new forms of agriculture and discovered that there is a massive movement to use digitalization for a more refined and ecological agriculture. So that the digital is being used in two radically opposite ways: one, an abusive way, to extract from the earth the absolute maximum at the expense of the Earth. And the other way to be careful, subtle and to see how a much richer way of agriculture can both maintain the ground and can maintain ecology. So, again, it's not all pessimistic or all optimistic, there is evidence of the two. We're simply trying to show the kind of richness and perplexity of the current situation.

JH: Agriculture and food production have very interesting potential when rethinking our cities and surrounding landscapes. At the ETH Studio Basel, we spent a few semesters around this topic, mapping existing landscapes around cities to better understand how much and what type of agriculture (livestock, grains, fruits and vegetables) is currently being produced within a certain radius. How much is missing to be self-sufficient and how much needs to be imported. Nutritional habits such as meat consumption have a huge impact on such a radius and on the type of landscape that surrounds us. New methods to produce food in laboratories and indoor plants are developing rapidly. These will have an impact on the image of the landscape but also on the shape of our cities. This is another reason why we should not extend cities more into the landscape but rather bring the landscape into our cities.

SvF: So, at the end it is about saving the world in a certain way, is that what both of you are aiming at? If you have to create a formula, is it the understanding of technology that can save us? Or is it a higher sense of beauty that can save us?

RK: I think all of the above. I think, politics, technology, sensibility, artistic drives, agriculture, farming... it's really not a single entity, it's the combination of all of it.


JH: Yes, I agree. I would especially highlight science - without science, we would not survive. Despite the progress in digital and biological technology, there is, paradoxically, a growing mistrust in developed countries against science. However, I think we need to attribute an even bigger role to science and technology in order to preserve and also to transform landscapes.

RK: Yes, I agree there. Because it's not the artificiality which is the thing to emphasize in Holland or in Switzerland, it's also the contribution of science. And actually, the exhibition ends on a laboratory in Germany where they are getting closer and closer to realizing fusion, as an alternative form of nuclear energy. So we really stuck our neck out in making the claim; also, for the importance of science and how it will be crucial in the next 30 years.

SvF: City, countryside, and nature - do you see them as dialectical opposites? Or are they symbiotic systems?

RK: I think that right now, it would be very productive to consider them in a single framework, and not as opposites. There may be a time that this might be useful again but I think that today it's really crucial to look at the overall picture rather than build on an opposition.

# WE CAN ONLY IMPROVE OUR HUMAN CONDITION AND OUR LIFE IN CITIES IF WE BETTER ABSORB THE 'COUNTRYSIDE', PROTECT IT MORE AND ABUSE IT LESS 

JH: There I agree, we certainly share that concept. If we don't see City and Landscape - or rather the built and the not-built territory - in opposition but within one framework, we should grant both these territories equal attention and importance for our survival on this planet. We can only improve our human condition and our life in cities if we better absorb the 'countryside', protect it more and abuse it less.

This conversation took place in June 2020 as part of the Dortmund Architecture Days, an event created in 1975 by Josef Paul Kleihues and, since 2020, continued by his successors to the Chair of Urban Planning at the TU Dortmund, Anna Jessen and Ingemar Vollenweider. This year's discussion was the first one held electronically via Zoom, with all discussion partners in remote locations. It gathered a wide range of positions with the intent to map the current state of architecture in society at large: www.bauwesen.tu-dortmund.de/sb/de/Aktuell/
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 to your brain.

The debate continues online. Stay tuned at volumeproject.org

