The Origin of Postmodern Architecture: Eurocentric Pragmatism or Asian Symbolism

Eka Swadiansa, Realrich Sjarief, Andy Rahman

'Modern Movements in Architecture' (1973), 'The Language of Postmodern Architecture' (1977), and 'Modern Architecture: a Critical History' (1980), were the three critical foundations written by –perhaps the two most influential and productive architecture writers of our time- Charles Jencks and Kenneth Frampton on the subject of postmodern architecture. Then there was long pause before recently the two published 'The Iconic Building (2005), 'The Story of Post-modernism' (2011), and 'Genealogy of Modern Architecture' (2014). In economic perspective, what laid in between the two time frames were the success of Guggenheim Bilbao (1997), and the failure of Athens post-Games (2005). In politic, it was all about the positive response on Riechstag (1999) against the fierce critics on Musee du Louvre (1989).

When architecture entered modernism, it was clear how to get it started: make everything simple, remove all ornaments; vice versa how to kill it: make everything complex, reintroduce culture. However when technological advancement had allowed design and construction operations to be so complex –as architecture grew farther from cultural roots- no one really sure anymore as how to escape postmodernism. In time when Ieoh Ming Pei constructed Egyptian glass pyramid in the center of Paris medieval/Renaissance fabrics, Jencks and Frampton returned to re-contextualized critical discourses forwarded few decades earlier.

So what is postmodern architecture? What logic does it exactly serves? Does it doomed in equally confusing Gordian-knot like its philosophical twin? How does it behaves in the different regional contexts? In the world of rapidly rising Asia, acting as –Darwin's primordial- through multiple layers of historical dialectics, this paper aims to provide alternative re-readings on the history of architecture in order to formulate the 'Asian point of view' of postmodernism.

KEYWORDS: *postmodern architecture, postmodern philosophy, Ieoh Ming Pei, Asian postmodernism.*

Introduction

On 2012 in the race to win Tokyo's 2020 Olympic bid, Japan Sport Council (JSC) launched stadium design competition chaired by Tadao Ando (1995 Pritzker Laurette[1]) whom then crowned Zaha Hadid (2004 Pritzker Laurette) in favor to other ten shortlisted internationally renowned teams which includes SANAA and Toyo Ito (2010 and 2013 Pritzker Laurates)[2]. After winning hosting bid on early September 2013, mid October of the same year Fumihiko Maki (1993 Pritzker Laurette) organized Tokyo Olympic Design Symposium and led the protest against Hadid's context-less stadium[3]. Early 2014 JSC forwarded possible over budget estimation to Hadid's design, mid 2014 the firm launched scaled-down proposal to cut construction cost from USD 2.95 billion to 1.66 billion[4]. Disregarding the refined proposal, July 2015 Prime Minister Shinzo Abe officially scrapped out Hadid's proposal[5]. August 2015 Richard Rogers (2007 Pritzker Laurette) stepped out to defend Hadid and 'Japan's professional credibility' followed by international campaign to reinstate Hadid's status[6]. December 2015, in the heat of opinion wars among elite architects, JSC ran an enclosed competition in between Toyo Ito and

---

[1] Recepient of Pritzker Price, the prize commonly associated as Architecture Noble Prize.

[2] Frearson, A. *Zaha Hadid to design Japan National Stadium*, Dezeen, 15 November 2012. https://www.dezeen.com/2012/11/15/zaha-hadid-to-design-japan-national-stadium/

[3] ——. *Japanese architects rally against Zaha Hadid's 2020 Olympic,* Dezeen, 10 October 2013. https://www.dezeen.com/2013/10/10/japanese-architects-rally-against-zaha-hadids-2020-olympic-stadium/

[4] ——. *Zaha Hadid modifies controversial Tokyo Olympic stadium design,* Dezeen, 8 July 2014. https://www.dezeen.com/2014/07/08/zaha-hadid-responds-to-protests-with-modified-tokyo-olympic-stadium/

[5] Howarth, D. *Japan scraps Zaha Hadid's Tokyo 2020 Olympic Stadium*, Dezeen, 17 July 2015. https://www.dezeen.com/2015/07/17/japan-scraps-zaha-hadid-tokyo-2020-olympic-stadium/

[6] ——. *Richard Rogers steps in to defend Zaha Hadid's scrapped Tokyo 2020 Olympic stadium,* Dezeen, 13 August 2015. https://www.dezeen.com/2015/08/13/richard-rogers-defends-zaha-hadid-scrapped-tokyo-2020-olympic-japan-national-stadium/

Kengo Kuma to find replacement design[7]. The later architect won the bid with a 'highly-Japanese' wooden-clad stadium design[8].

Despite of the ethical misconduct on scrapping Hadid's winning design –possibly in scale comparable only to Corbusier's proposal rejection in the 1932 competition for Palace of the Soviets- the Tokyo 2020 crisis suggests how the Japanese authorities backed up by large portion of their general masses; the people of Japan, are willing to take any account in defending their cultural roots. Moreover trending or otherwise, this debate also proved how to some extent, recent Asian architecture is already practicing a different kind of postmodernism – a peripheral contemporariness which, visible or otherwise, embodies portions of collective archetypes within. The research question that follows is trying to understand how different this Asian Postmodernism is to its western's older cousin.

The Popular Definition of Postmodern Architecture

To understand postmodernism in the perspective of the masses is to investigate under popular ground. On 2017 *Netflix* released *Abstract*; 8-episode series of TV documentary on contemporary art/design profession in the eye of today's foremost avant-gardes young illustration, footwear, stage, architecture, automotive, graphic, photography, and interior artists/designers. Episode four was discussing the topic of architecture through the life and works of Bjarke Ingels, principal architect of Bjarke Ingels Group (BIG). In the opening statement the architect explained:

---

[7] Mairs, J. *Kengo Kuma and Toyo Ito unveil competing bids for Tokyo Olympic Stadium,* Dezeen, 15 December 2015. https://www.dezeen.com/2015/12/15/kengo-kuma-toyo-ito-bids-for-tokyo-olympic-stadium-2020-games-replacing-zaha-hadid/

[8] Winston, A. *Kengo Kuma beats Toyo Ito to win Japan National Stadium competition,* Dezeen, 22 December 2015. https://www.dezeen.com/2015/12/22/kengo-kuma-beats-toyo-ito-to-win-japan-national-stadium-competition-tokyo-2020-olympics/

It should be like documentary version of 'Inception' ... [where] in the dream world, they could do all these kind of things. And when architecture is at its best, that's exactly what you're doing. You're coming up with something that is pure fiction, and then after all the hard work, all the permits, all the budgeting, and all the construction; it now becomes concrete reality[9].

An editorial excerpt then follows:

When Bjarke came along, [every]*thing in architecture* [is] *somehow sleeping. We* [architect] *had our hail-days back in the fifties, sixties, seventies. We became world famous compare to how small we are actually.* [But] *at the time Bjarke came around, people didn't really expect anything to happen. And I think you could argue that he really make everybody wake up[10].*

Indeed, Ingels/BIG's works are both fiction-like and wake up-calling. On 2015, at the age of 41 (which in the architect circle is relatively young) he published *Hot to Cold* –a half-monograph-half-manifesto in comic-like format- exhibiting 252 projects located in all continents, mostly of large scale and either built or were/are under constructed/ion[11]. However Ingels/BIG was already becoming worldwide *starchitect*[12] even few years earlier. That's when at 35 he published *Yes is More,* his first half-manifesto-half-monograph of 185 mostly conceptual designs[13] with key-projects eventually re-published in *Hot to Cold* as built projects.

---

[9] *See* Abstract: the Art of Design, Season 1 Episode 4, Netflix, 2017.
   https://www.netflix.com/id/title/80057883
[10] Ibid.
[11] Bjarke Ingels Group. *Hot to Cold: an Odyssey of Architectural Adaptation,* Cologne: Taschen, 2015.
[12] Abbreviated from *Star Architect* commonly uses to describe highly recognized international architects.
[13] Bjarke Ingels Group. *Yes is More: an Archicomic on Architectural Evolution,* Koln: Evergreen, 2009.

In the introduction section of *Yes is More*, Bjarke explained his architecture by briefly defining the architectural style of his predecessors. Starting from Mies van der Rohe's 1950s –*less is more*- modernism/minimalism:

> *One of the founding fathers of Modern Architecture (along with Le Corbusier), Mies Van Der Rohe's architecture was like an architectural revolution. Liberating the architectural vocabulary from stylistic exercises through the consistent elimination of excess ornament and redundant form, he created a tabula rasa from which pure concepts and spaces could emerge[14].*

Followed by Robert Venturi (and Denise Scott Brown)'s 1970s –*less is a bore*- postmodernism:

> *As a counterrevolution against the limited choice of vocabulary for the orthodox modern architect ... they reintroduced symbolism and signs in the architectural palette, offering "complexity and contradiction" in place of simplicity and consistency[15].*

And Phillip Johnson's (1979 Pritzker Laurette) 1982's –*I am a whore*- opportunism and eclecticism (2nd wave postmodernism?):

> *Like a curator rather than a creator, Philip Johnson has been capable of identifying and assimilating a broad history of styles and architectures ... And subsequently incorporate the latest forms, materials, vocabularies into his own work ... like a collection of exotic species of various 'isms and epochs, they are all* [becoming] *his own original designs[16].*

---

[14] Ibid., Pp. 2.
[15] Ibid., Pp. 4.
[16] Ibid., Pp. 6.

The introduction then followed by pages on Rem Koolhaas' (2000 Pritzker Laurette) essays and Barack Obama's speech (of which to pay more architectural focus will not be included in this style-discussions) to be concluded on the explanation of his own 2009's –*yes is more*- pragmatic utopian (3ʳᵈ wave postmodernism?):

> *Historically the field of architecture has been dominated by two opposing extremes. On one side an avant-garde of wild ideas, often so detached from reality that they fail to become something other than eccentric curiosities. On the other side there are well-organized corporate consultants that build predictable and boring boxes of high standard. Architecture seems entrenched between two equally unfertile forms: either naively utopians or petrifyingly pragmatic. Rather than choosing one over the other, BIG operates in the fertile overlap between the two opposites…[17].*

In regards to the –complexity dichotomy- the works of both Rohe and Venturi had generated clear bi-values differentiation of either 'less' in one end or 'more' on the other. To provide even clearer understanding, the phrase 'ornamental/details' can be added after the values; hermeneutically resulting to the formation of 'less ornamental/details' for modern-minimalism or 'more ornamental/details' for postmodernism. The relation between the works of Johnson and Ingels however, is more complicated than mere ornamental opposition. As explained by the author's previous publication:

> *Phillip Johnson's architecture can be assume as the non-aligned architecture* [in jargon referencing to the non-aligned movement], *where he chose not to advocate either the simplicity bloc (less) nor the complexity bloc (more), but instead utilize both fronts as of how Ingels then associated him* [his no-preferential design] *as*

---

[17] Ibid., Pp. 12.

'whore'. This is differs to Bjarke Ingels' concepts which tend to choose to collide the two extreme points to form a new entity. Linguistically the relation-pattern of Phillip Johnson's designs can be explained as 'or' to form 'less or more' pattern, while Bjarke Ingels as 'and' to form 'less and more'[18].

Yes is More however, never explained about what happened before modernism.

From Late (Neo) Classicism to Early Modernism

The era when neo classicism met modernism was the golden period of Frank Lloyd Wright in The States and Le Corbusier in Europe. Wright's Nathan Moore House (1895) portrayed strong American vernacular vocabularies, which then refined in Imperial Hotel Tokyo (1923), and culminated in the Falling Water (1935). By the time Wright's doing Johnson Wax Headquarter (1936) and Guggenheim New York (1959), his vocabularies were already becoming more and more simplified. Corbusier's works on the other hand, were already simplistic from the start; best exemplified by both Villa la Roche (1923) and Villa Savoye (1929-31) but with later works becoming even more formalist than the earlier. However evidently since Unite d'Habitation (1946-52), Corbusier is slowly shifting towards brutalism, making quantum leap through Chapelle Notre Dame du Haut (1950-54), and in larger scale/programs, perfected in Sainte Marie de la Tourette (1956-60).

In the perspective of the previously discussed binary system, Wright's works were evolving 'more to less', while Corbusier's went 'less to more'; even when both value(s) of 'more' were not exactly of the same definition with the earlier being vernacularism

[18] Swadiansa, E. "Trias Arsitektura: Mempersepsi-ulangkan Pareseden Arsitektur Oldefo Era Modern dan Posmodern (Architecture Triad: Rereading Oldefo's Architecture Precedents of the Modern and Postmodern Era)", in Pratikno, P., (ed.), *Arsitektur Untuk Indonesia* (*Architecture for Indonesia*), Yogyakarta: Deepublish, 2014. Pp. 75.

and the latter being brutalism. Nevertheless vernacularism or brutalism, both are exhibiting certain value of ornamental/details complexity. Two lessons can be learned from this case. First, many great architects tend to make one sharp turn in some point of his/her career. A turn that is so sharp it often resulting in the opposite direction to his/her career's starting point. A more recent example would be of Zaha Hadid whom started her career with complex deconstructivism and ended with smooth futurism. Second, divided by ocean-wide space and half-a-generation time, Wright and Corbusier had somehow made smooth transition to what seems to be continuous 'style-leap' of 'more to less to more' or in short 'more to more'. In the –neo classic to modern transition period- this style-leap had created violent collision in the wider transatlantic scale, best exemplified by the oxymoron exhibition on built projects of the last romanticist (i.e. Antoni Gaudi of Art Nouveau/William van Allen of Art Deco), contra early modernist (i.e. Jacobus Oud of De Stijl/Walter Gropius of Bauhauss).

From Late Modernism to Early Postmodernism

1930 young Phillip Johnson joined Museum of Modern Art (MoMA) New York –one of the most influential art museum in the world- serving as full time architectural curator. 1931 he organized Corbusier and Gropius's lectures in The States. 1932 with Henry-Russel Hitchcock he co-curated the *International Style* exhibition, exhibiting the works of (the already discussed) Rohe/Corbusier/Oud/Gropius, along with Alvar Aalto, Erich Mendelsohn, Frederick Keisler, Karl Schneider, Otto Eisler, and Richard Neutra[19]; followed by the publication of *Modern Architecture Since 1922*[20]. 56 years later,

---

[19] Tournikiotis, P. *The Historiography of Modern Architecture*, Cambridge (MA): MIT Press, 1999.
[20] Hitchcock, H. R., and Johnson, P. *International Style: Modern Architecture Since 1922*, New York: W. W. Norton & Co., 1932.

referencing to the 1982 Parc de la Villette design competition[21], in 1988 Johnson whom then had already became well known architect returned to MoMA, and with Mark Wigley co-curated the *Deconstructivist Architecture* exhibition, exhibiting the works of then younger rising stars: Benard Tschumi, Coop Himmelb(l)au, Daniel Libeskind, Frank Gehry (1989 Pritzker Laurette), Rem Koolhaas, and Zaha Hadid[22].

Although exhibiting equal oxymoronic values of opposition; the tension that happened in between the two, worked at much lower level than the preceding last romanticism-early modernism frictions. Because first, the two groups were of different generation/time frames; and second while the earlier exhibition only exhibited built projects of strictly-defined collective characteristics, half of the later were even loosely curated from conceptual unbuilt projects. However the concepts displayed, were in completely different complexity level to Venturi's version of postmodernism. The kind of 'more of more' level. Nevertheless, however avant-gardes a style was in the beginning, in time it always turned into yet another populous over-exploited repetitions, as explained in *Yes is More*:

> *For his* [Mies] *followers (and to some degree for himself) the revolutionary movement gradually degenerated as the liberating mantra became a starvation of the imagination, turning the freedom from style into a stylistic straightjacket itself. The result is the relentless repetition of identical anonymous boxes that dominate vast areas of the contemporary city[23].*
>
> Or:

---

[21] Derrida, J., and Eisenman, P. *Chora L Works: Jacques Derrida and Peter Eisenman*, New York: The Monacelli Press, 1997.

[22] Johnson, P., and Wigley, M. *Deconstructivist Architecture*, Boston: Little Brown and Company, 1988.

[23] *See Yes is More.*, Pp. 2.

Robert Venturi and Denise Scott Brown started looking at the contemporary city outside the realm of modern architecture. By "Learning from Las Vegas" ... the counterrevolution against the monotony of strictly functional modern architecture [however]*, in turn led to its own epidemic of indistinguishable Postmodern towers no more varied nor interesting than their Modern siblings*[24].

Post Postmodernism: Sub-genres and their Evolution Characteristics

Chronologically, the binary value-based findings so far can be exhibit as: 'more to less', 'less to more', 'less is more', 'less is a bore', 'less or more', 'more of more', and 'less and more'; respectively referencing the works of Wright-Corbusier-Rohe (et. al)-Venturi-Johnson-Eisenman (et. al)-Ingels/BIG. This findings suggests that the style evolution is actually happened in continuous thesis/antithesis or action/reaction string with newer style being the antithesis/reaction to the older ones. Once again however, when 'less' had always been consistently defined to have less ornamental details, 'more' embodied various different measures of more-ness. Thus when Rohe-Oud-Gropius's 'less' consistently referred to minimalism, Corbusier-Venturi-Eisenman's 'more' can be variously associated to brutalism/postmodernism/deconstructivism; in cases best exemplified by the discourses generated in the *Oppositions*[25]

Perhaps this is why –'postmodernism' as a jargon is not articulated as 'post modernism' (with space in between)- because unlike 'neo classicism' (instead of 'neoclassicism') whom refined classicism; postmodernism is not a refinement of modernism. On the contrary, it is the antithesis of modernism, in itself a completely new breed, advanced out of modernism and not continuing from it. However with the aid of

---

[24] Ibid., Pp. 4.
[25] Influential architectural journal published by the Institute for Architecture and Urban Studies in 1973-84.

new design-and-build technologies, postmodern architecture had been developed so fast that within itself, sub-genres flourished. Then as history entered the internet age, these sub-genres became widely publicized, if not over-publicized, each becoming as influential even as their preceding core-genres. As vast postmodern buildings flooding the globe, architecture became lost in the masses. As suggested by Charles Jencks:

> *For more than fifty years, the complaint has been that society has lost its orientation. But the trouble started earlier; ever since Copernicus displaced man from the center of things, Darwin gave him a family tree of apes from which to swing, and Freud turned his loving soul into an impulse-driven psyche, many have assumed this disorientation to be permanent. Nietzsche, of course, celebrated the death of God because it promoted the freedom and power of future man, superman, and recently Deconstructionists and the Archbishop of Canterbury - to name opposites - have drawn different conclusions from this secular shift. They do, however, agree on one thing: society lacks direction, it is disintegrating into angry fragments. Many post-modernists claim that it is confused because there is no shared philosophy, no 'metanarrative'[26].*

As forwarded by Jencks –one of the most important architectural criticist of our time- the problem with postmodernism is not necessarily coming from the field of architecture itself. As product of culture; architecture only 'flow' with the downstream current where most likely a 'river-disorder' happened on the upstream – in its very 'thinking-spring'. Not of architectural thinking, but of pure philosophical ones. Not of established classics, but of contemporary curation curating established readers. Advancing to more recent thus more contextual deep reading, the investigation rest on the works of Walter Truett Anderson.

---

[26] Jencks, C. *The Architecture of the Jumping Universe,* London: Academy, 1995., Pp. 7.

Through his editorial works *The Truth about the Truth*, Anderson convinced that there is a need to re-read the whole history of postmodernism[27]. After succeeding in inventorying some key points, he then continued his 'postmodern(ism) re-construction attempts' through *The Fontana Postmodernism Reader*; by identifying four distinguish presence of -Ironist/Scientific-rational/Social-traditional/Neo-romantic- postmodernism typologies. Respectively the four seek truth by means of social construction/methodical inquiries/Eurocentric heritage/nature and spiritualism[28]. Returning to the architectural discourses, similar re-reading method can be applied through the following steps:

1) Regarding to the thesis/antithesis or action/reaction nature on the development of architectural styles, the 4 typologies will need to be expanded twice to give room for both 'less' and 'more' values; which then can be respectively simplified as 'order or chaos' in reference to their physical appearances.

2) Arrangement on time-prefix will need to be made to acknowledge development progress of specific style. The chronological term proposed is 'meta' to come after 'neo'. For example: 'Classicism' evolved to 'Neo Classicism', and later to 'Meta Classicism'.

3) References to established postmodern philosophy will also need to be inserted to provide deeper meanings towards the understanding of each proposed typology.

The proposed –eight postmodern architecture's typological identification- are as follows:

---

[27] Anderson, W. (eds). *The Truth about the Truth: De-confusing and Re-constructing the Postmodern World*, New York: TarcherPerigee, 1995.
[28] Anderson, W. (eds). *The Fontana Postmodernism Reader,* Fontana Press, 1996.

I. *Of Ironist Postmodernism:*

1) Explicit Meta Classicism. Identified through Richard Rorty's Anti-Foundationalism and Anti-Essentialism; arguing about the problem of scientific imitation observed within contemporary analytic philosophy, while advocating pragmatic conventionalism/relativism. Characterized by Michael Graves' buildings –e.g. Portland Building, and Team Disney- which tend to discard previous classical Foundationalism/Essentialism through the introduction of simple geometrical patterns/'seven-dwarf columns' in blatant classical arrangements.

2) Implicit Meta Classicism. Identified through Martin Heidegger's Hermeneutic Circle; rejecting the subjectivity/objectivity paradox to advocate elucidation of *Dasein* (being/being-there). Characterized by Phillip Johnson's buildings –e.g. 400 West Market, and PPG Place- which elucidate modernist/postmodernist 'borders' by either simplifying classical forms or detailing modern material-arrangements.

II. *Of Scientific-rational Postmodernism:*

3) Explicit Postmodernism (Traditional Deconstructivism). Identified through Jacques Derrida's Deconstruction; which departed from Heidegger's *Destruktion,* to re-examined linguistic structure, and articulated circulation of meanings between two-ends. Characterized by Coop Himmelb(l)au's buildings –e.g. Vienna Gasometer, and BMW World- which neither modernist nor (early) postmodernist, destabilized from its very structural (linguistic) core.

4) <u>Implicit Postmodernism (Neo Constructivism).</u> Identified through Michel Foucault's Discursive Regime; which rejected the established epistemology and suggested the use of genealogical *biopower* to complete/balance rational judgement and social construct. Characterized by Rem Koolhaas/OMA's buildings –e.g. Seattle Public Library, and Taipei Performing Art Center- which appeared as highly deconstructivist piece, but like *biopower*, they are actually very much functionally/programmatically-oriented.

III. *Of Social-traditional Postmodernism:*

5) <u>Neo Postmodernism.</u> Identified through Frederic Jameson's Postmodern Capitalism; which introduced the existence of new cultural logic of the late capitalism age. Characterized by Frank Gehry's buildings –e.g. Prague Dancing House, and Guggenheim Museum Bilbao- which especially the later, through *Bilbao Effect* phenomenon had proven the capital power of the super expensive enigmatic signifier.

6) <u>Neo Modernism.</u> Identified through Jean Braudrillard's Simulacra and Simulation; which introduced the concept of short-circuited reality, the hyperreal, interchangeable communicatively and semantically throughout the new information age. Characterized by Zaha Hadid's buildings –e.g. Galaxy SOHO, and Heydar Aliyev Center- which built completely out of contexts, referencing only to the architect's previously designed/constructed precedents, yet well-received in many territorial origins.

IV. *Of Neo-romantic Postmodernism:*

7) <u>Meta Postmodernism (Post-capital Symbolism).</u> Identified through Douglas Kellner's Semiotic System; which insisted on disbanding modernist formal assumptions and procedures, and make ways for the advancement, innovation, and adaptation of meaningful semiotic. Characterized by Norman Foster/IM Pei's –Reichstag (succeeded), and Musee du Louvre (failed) Renovations- exhibiting both meaningful semiotic and misplaced symbolism.

8) <u>Meta Modernism (Post-capital Gaia).</u> Identified through Jean-Francois Lyotard's Exteriorized Metanarratives; which pointed out the increasingly exteriorized knowledge, through information revolution, to be understood as mere data. Characterized by HOK/Ma Yansong-MAD's –Mercedez-benz Atlanta Stadium (succeeded), and Chaoyang Park Plaza (failed)- exhibiting sustainability measures as real-technical calculations (LEED Platinum) and mere visual gimmick.

Conclusion

The above 8-points evolution suggested that in architecture, early postmodernism works (Graves and Johnson) are actually not philosophically postmodern yet (proto postmodernism?). Because under strict classic/modern/postmodern characteristic differentiation, it was deconstructivism that first distinctively emerged as new architecture neither classic nor modern. Interestingly; passing the Scientific-rational stage, it was the chaotic/'more'/postmodernist evolutions that got to be developed before it's ordered/'less'/modernist counterparts. As the whole development reached Neo-romantic stage however, failed samples were starting to appear.

Meta Modernism failure was in one hand, of clear case over different sustainability's depth of understanding; that is to say, of energy (HOK) or visual (MAD) performances. Meta Postmodernism's case on the other hand, was of much more complicated matters. As Jencks forwarded:

I.M. Pei's three pyramids, placed in front of the Louvre in Paris, were built with Eqyptian proportions and literally recalled those of Cheops, Chephren, and Mycerinus. The conceit was so stunningly banal and obvious that critics tended to overlook it. They concentrated on the way the building blocked all axial views of Lefuel's 19th-century façades. Modernists defended this 'grand project' as another High-Tech insertion (after the Pompidou Center) in the city's historic core. I criticized the scheme as a typical example of 'blasphemesis', an architectural disease that spreads quickly when a lot of pomp and money are involved ... A Parisian newspaper lampooned the presidential pretension of Mitterameses I, and depicted him as a sphinx in the bloodline of Rameses II ... But the public accepted it, came in droves, and didn't bother with niceties of meaning, historical theft or architectural inflation. The Egyptians joked they would reply with a glass version of the Louvre to surround their sacred forms[29].

From (ordered) classicism to (chaotic) neo classicism to (ordered) modernism, the architectural evolution had always happened in the typical thesis/antithesis adaptation game. Same story goes on as postmodernism entered this survival-of-the-fittest niche; from Explicit Meta Classicism all the way to Neo Modernism, developed through repetitive chaos-and-order pragmatic impulses. But then, there was (the revisiting of) symbolism. Much more complex than Gehry's economic generator or Ingel/BIG's

---

[29] Jencks, C. *Iconic Building: The Power of Enigma,* London: Frances Lincoln, 2005., Pp. 36-37

science fiction – deep within, symbolism embodied certain values of collective consciousness. A culmination of shared archetype, which despite to what happened in the Louvre, the Tokyo 2020 crisis had exemplified it as the game of the east. A taste of Asian postmodernism.