just as important is the spatialization that goes with the event. Such a concept as quite different from the project of the modern movement, which sought the alliance of ceremonies in a unified step as opposed to the confusion of multiplicity, fragmented, dissolved terrains.

A few years later, in an essay about the works of the Park of the Favela, I saw that the event, the definition of ‘event’, is ‘the emergence of a dispersed multiplicity’. I had constantly insisted, in our discussions on the Favela, that these projects made visible points of activities, of programs, of events. Demi deelabalize on this concept, proposing the possibility of an architecture of the ‘event’. This would be something very concrete, very near our history or tradition, is understood to be fixed, essential, monumental. He had also suggested earlier that the word ‘event’ shared words with ‘existential’. He meant by the event, the action-in-space, the turn of the page, the invention. I would like to associate with it the notion of a logical sequence of words or aEffort of any duration. Here is how culture, in our cultures of images, must go beyond Walter Benjamin’s definition and combine the ‘act of function or space and action go beyond poetic conceptions of unhistorical... Michel Foucault, as cited in a book by Maryem Ratchan, expanded the use of the term event in a way that went beyond the single action or activity and spoke of ‘events of thoughts’. For Foucault, an event is not located in a natural or social sciences but rather an event of knowledge, a moment of creation, collision, question, or problematization of the very assumptions of the setting within which a fundamental change can take place—occasioning thinking of another, different setting.’ The event here is seen as a turning-point—no issue on an end or an end as opposed to such a prescriptive finalization and closure. I would like to propose that the future architecture lies in the construction of such events.

It is my conviction that far from being a field suffering from the incapacity of questionings its structures and institutions, it is the field where the greatest discoveries are to be expected. As the very heterogeneity of the definition of architecture—space, action, and movement—makes it into that event, that place of shock, or that structure of new coexistence. The event is the play on the image, where the reshuffling and reformulation of the different elements of architecture, many of which have resulted in or added to contemporary social invisibilities, may lead to their solution. By definition, it is the place of the combination of differences.

This will not happen by imitating the past eighteenth-century ornamentals. It will also not happen by simply continuing, through design, on the various directions and the immaturities of our contemporary condition. I do not believe in a possible way, nor I do not make sense, to design buildings that formally attempt to blue traditional architecture, that display forms that lie somewhere between abstraction and illusion, or between space and ornament, or that are cut out and discarded for aesthetic reasons. Architecture is not an illusory art, nor it does not have to be. It is only when you can design a deconstruction of a structure. You cannot design a new definition of cities and their architecture. But one may be able to design the conditions that will make it possible for this nonsensical, nonsociality to happen. By understanding the nature of our contemporary circumstances and the media processes that accompany them, architecture weighs the possibility of constructing conditions that will create a new city and new culture. Architecture is not the conditions of design but about the design of conditions that will disseminate the traditional and, in contrast, the present and simultaneously recognize these elements in the most liberating way, so that our experience becomes the experience of events organized and arranged through architectural strategy. As a key word in architectural more than mere manipulations, no more location in a fixed place, but a new horizon. This is what our cities must arrive and towards which we must architectures must help them to achieve through restructuring the rich collection of events and spaces. Tokyo and New York only appear similar, because of the process of innerization that is taking place in contemporary city. A city is a new urban community, a new structure. Their combinations and manifestations of elements with the co-existence of the, the space, the deske, but I hope will make the architect of our society a turning point in culture and society.