

11. Home Within Movement

The Japanese Concept of *Ma* (間): Sensing Space-time Intensity in Aesthetics of Movement

Renske Maria van Dam

Abstract

The ubiquity of immanent change and movement in contemporary urban landscape seems to exceed the present cognitive and sensitive abilities of our species and changes the relation between people and the environment. The emergence of the metropolis affects our sense of home. In Euro-centric architectural discourse, this is more often than not referred to as a general shunning of place that results in an experience of homelessness. In contradiction to the negative connotation of deterritorialization and displacement in Euro-centric discourse, in Asian discourse there are alternative sensibilities. In Beijing's tradition of community building, this fluid concept of home is visible in the courtyard typology (in historical order: *fang* (坊), *danwei* (单位), and superblock). Social interactions, based, respectively, on family relations, work, and lifestyles, are the key to the conceptualization and experience of feeling at home. In Japan, this is further conceptualized in the word *ma* (間). Normally translated as 'gap' or 'interval', *ma* describes the 'pregnant nothingness' with which the contemporary experience of home resonates. In this way, the concept of *ma* interferes with the Euro-centric philosophy of difference and inspires us to look at the modern urban environment from a different perspective, as a potential 'fifth dimension' in architecture.

Keywords: architecture, Japan, China, homelessness, *ma* (間), community building

Félix Guattari starts his essay ‘Ecosophical practices and the restoration of the “subjective city”’ with an accurate observation on the modern urban environment:

Contemporary human beings have been fundamentally deterritorialized. Their original existential territories—bodies, domestic spaces, clans and cults—are no longer secured by a fixed ground; but henceforth they are indexed to a world of precarious representations and in perpetual motion (Guattari 2015: 97).

Perpetual motion directly influences our experience and conceptualization of home. As Guattari continues, ‘Young people are walking around the streets with *Walkmans* glued to their ears, and are habituated by refrains produced far, very far, from their homelands. Their homelands—anyway, what could that mean to them? It is surely not the place where their ancestors have lived since time immemorial; neither is it the place where they were born, nor they will die’ (2015: 97). Euro-centric architectural discourse, as many other modern discourses, struggles with this sense of homelessness. In the words of the Dutch landscape designer Adriaan Geuze, ‘The contemporary city has been transformed into a modern cultural landscape in which all kinds of enclaves have settled like Mars landings. Contemporary programs contrast with archaeological fragments. In topography, the urban layout is one gigantic, suprematist painting’ (2000: 101).

However modern urban environment, characterised by continuous displacement, seems to exceed the present cognitive and sensitive abilities of our species. For this reason, it changes the relation between people and the environment: ‘Flexibility and mobility are the source of new tensions, as the multiplication of urban rhythms and space-time requires increased coordination, synchronization, exactness and punctuality’ (During 2010: 271). A new spatiotemporal sensitivity emerges in the modern urban environment, one in which the moment of movement is felt and experienced as a valuable interference—not as a liminal state finally settling for stability in new ideals or dreamed societies, but as a qualitative state in itself.

This sensitivity to the moment of movement is not yet common in Euro-centric architectural discourse—but, as a result of an appreciation and conceptualisation of change and movement in Asian philosophy, it is common in Asian architecture. This chapter introduces Chinese community building and Japanese spatiotemporal sensitivity, as expressed through the concept *ma*, as an alternative to the negative connotation of continuous displacement in Euro-centric architectural discourse. In doing so this chapter

discusses how contemporary displacement and homelessness can also be understood as radical displacement in a positive sense; as a possibility for the experience of home within movement.

Making sense of displacement

Continuous displacement—sensorial hyper-stimulation and the ensuing state of shock, as apparent in the modern urban environment—usually translates into a form of psychic depression combined with spatiotemporal disorientation (During 2010). In the traditional city ‘that strives for a condition of balance, harmony and a degree of homogeneity’ (Koolhaas et al. 2001: 29) this is an exceptional state. But in the modern urban environment ‘that is a climate of permanent strategic panic based on the greatest possible difference between its parts—complementary or competitive, where not the methodical creation of the ideal counts but the opportunistic exploitation of flukes, accidents and imperfections’ (Koolhaas et al. 2001: 29), hyper-stimulation and, with it, spatiotemporal disorientation is a permanent condition. The emergence of the metropolis replaces stability with fluidity and therefore affects our traditional sense of home: ‘Whoever lives in Berlin long enough ends up not knowing where he is truly from. His existence is no longer shaped like a line but like a juxtaposition of dots’ (During 2010: 271). In *The Fate of Place*, Edward S. Casey (1997) refers to this experience of homelessness as the general shunning of place. Referencing the cataclysmic events of world wars and the forced migration of entire peoples, he argues that the world is nothing but a scene of endless displacement, and the massive spread of electronic technology makes where you are irrelevant. ‘It is as if the acceleration discovered by Galileo to be inherent in falling bodies has come to pervade the earth, rendering the planet a “global village” not in a positive sense but as a placeless place indeed’ (Casey 1997: xii).

Growing awareness of living in a liquid society (Bauman 2004) has inspired Euro-centric architects to design with change and movement in mind. Early Modernism increased flexibility through creating modular designs, which provide a fixed set of combinations based on functional properties. Structuralism approached change and movement through the design of solid, functional structures that allowed for open-ended variation in modules. And Postmodernism approached design with change and movement in the form of representation: literally designing ‘smooth and liquid’ architecture, often made fancier with parametric-designed, binary-coded, interactive moving elements. Unfortunately, none of these examples appear

to provide fulfilling solutions for the feeling of homelessness that is still so apparent in the modern urban environment. Standardized structures where ‘anything—no matter what’ can happen are more often than not reduced to empty boxes that lack any sense of belonging. The Cartesian, dualistic tendency to define stability seems stronger than the faith in movement and instability—especially in architectural practice, with still-standing forms as its expertise. Therefore, both literally and figuratively, Euro-centric architectural discourse needs a critical reflection upon its own constructions.

Resonance

In ‘Sensing the Virtual, Building the Insensible’, Canadian philosopher Brian Massumi (1998) argues that alternative sensitivities and socio-environmental relations can be found within a completely different philosophical mind-set and approach to architecture and movement. Instead of focusing on properties like modules and structures, change and movement should be embodied within architecture by focusing on quality—the emergent relation between what previously was understood as module and structure. To overcome the impasse between change and still-standing form, architects should ‘re-entertain questions about perception, experience and even consciousness’ (Massumi 1998: 5).

If we conceptualize change and movement as immanent and permanent conditions of human life, rather than as temporary irritants upon our way to a rationally perfect world, ‘being modern’ need not be defined in terms of dualistic Enlightenment thinking based on a single Euro-centric society. ‘Being modern’ becomes immanently changeable, moveable, and open-ended. (Schinkel 2011) As ‘being modern’ was already associated with critical self-questioning, it now also provides the ability to deal with so-called loss of the self, through the awareness that every definition of a whole is a temporary construction, a singularity rather than a stable identity. If we rehabilitate ourselves towards letting go of wholes and focus on emergent relations instead, there arises the possibility of experiencing home, change, and movement simultaneously. This is where the paradox, as criticized in Enlightenment thinking, suddenly becomes a valuable interference. The moment of movement is felt and valued and therefore obtains an ontological status of its own—not as a temporary state on its way to stability, but as a qualitative state in itself.

This qualitative state can be experienced through ‘resonance’. ‘Beyond the automated response triggered in the hyper-stimulated urban subject,

“parrying the shocks” can also take a positive and potentially emancipating turn, provided that one can see in it a capacity to develop new perceptive skills’ (During 2010: 273). These skills, like increased coordination, synchronization, exactness and punctuality, allow the possibility of experiencing the moment of movement. The moment of movement is in a way insensible: there seems to be no direct sensory input corresponding to your experience, yet you still effectively perceive it. Our experience of movement can survive the removal of its object. Through non-local resonance, this experience is ‘tied to the senses but lacking sense content, nonetheless “directly perceivable” but only in feeling’ (Massumi 2003: 142). It is a perception of relations. Therefore, ‘it is thus reasonable to hope that the man of the metropolis, “spiritually homeless” as Siegfried Kracauer phrased it, can again be moved by things in a lateral and peripheral relationship with an enveloping environment’ (During 2010: 274).

What does this philosophical change mean for contemporary architectural *praxis* (πρᾶξις) and the possibility of experiencing home within movement? Because of the long tradition in Asian philosophy and architecture of the appreciation and conceptualisation of change and movement, Asian examples give an indication of possible directions.

Chinese community building: the social approach

A first example of alternative sensibilities and socio-environmental relations in Asia is community building in Beijing. Community building in China is now a political-environmental programme in which the community no longer stands in opposition to the state as a bottom-up development, as in the West, or in cooperation with it, as in earlier communist examples. Instead, the community is recast as a partner in the governing process itself. This is government through community (Bray 2006). This programme is based on a long tradition of living and working in enclosed compounds and shows an alternative understanding of the wall as enclosing of social exchange rather than the wall as eliminating the Other. Beijing’s community building is therefore an example of home within movement.

Beijing’s communities

When arriving in Beijing for the first time, the Western visitor is immediately impressed by the dozens of new apartment buildings, superblocs, rising along the airport highway. From the perspective of Western knowledge of

architecture and urban planning, one can only be surprised by how the Chinese build their cities. However, a better understanding of the Beijing way of city planning would be a valuable addition and alternative to the Euro-centric discourse. The Chinese tradition of living and working in enclosed compounds has resulted in a concept of community that is as much about constructing new forms of physical space as it is about building new kinds of social and political organizations. Thus, providing adequate numbers of dwellings for urban inhabitants is no longer simply a matter of housing but, rather, a complicated task of community building.

The long Chinese tradition of living and working in communities can be roughly divided in three main community typologies; the *fang* (坊, 'walled residential district'), the *danwei* (单位) and the contemporary superblocks. The imperial community type, *fang*,¹ together with the royal city prototype and *siheyuan* (四合院, 'courtyard houses'), formed the basis of Beijing's urban plan until 1949. The royal city prototype, an urban ordering based on a square with nine longitudinal and nine latitudinal streets and three gates on each side, gave rise to a clear and coherent system out of the city and its communities. The *fang* was a long rectangular enclosed residential site within the royal city prototype providing housing for roughly 1000 households. The streets running east-west connect the courtyard houses. This streets became a linear public space with a strong sense of community for local inhabitants. The highly modularized courtyard houses most typically consist of a front yard, inner yard and a back yard. The inner yard is a square surround by a main house in the north, a southern house opposite to the main house and two side houses in the east and west (Knapp 1999).

The imperial community was based on the Confucian hierarchical understanding of society and family relations (see Bracken, this volume; Li, this volume). The spatial hierarchy of the buildings was used to give each family (member) a proper place in a city, *fang*, and courtyard. The plan of a fully developed imperial city clearly expressed hierarchal relationships in terms of the sequencing of and circulation through walls, gates, and steps. The social organization was thus based on the image of human, especially family, relationships. Since family members during imperial times mostly had the same occupation, families with the same occupation grouped together in the *fang*. People living in the same or nearby *fang* often

1 During the Sui and Tang Dynasties the term *fang* (坊, 'walled residential district'), replaced the term *li* (里, the unit of distance that a walled neighborhood was supposed to be (i.e., one *li* square)). *Fang* (坊) was apparently adopted because it was a homophone for *fang* (防), which means 'to guard against' (Bray 2005: 207).

had similar occupations, forming enclosed neighborhoods with occupational homogeneity but personal wealth heterogeneity. Since both family and work cause strong social ties and roots for identification the community cohesion in the *fang* was tremendous. This was further supported by the local services provided like elementary schools, basic food and health services, and organized security.

The Maoist community type called *danwei* formed the basis of Beijing's urban plan between 1949-1987. Influenced by a new market-oriented economy, based on socialist ideology of the Soviet Union, it was presumed that industrial production was the major function of cities. Community cohesion during the Maoist period was based on work relations. A *danwei* is both a physical work and living unit as well as the common social and political organization system shared by all urban Chinese workplaces during in the Maoist period. Where social, political and spatial organization was already integrated in the *fang*, in the *danwei* there was no difference anymore between these disciplines. Everyone calls the social/political organization in which they are employed whether it be a factory, shop, school, hospital, research institute, cultural troupe, or party organ by the generic term *danwei*. *Danwei* differ in size and ownership. There are big units, up to 800 households, and small units, enterprises and businesses, publicly owned units as well as collectively owned utilities and even government and military units. Usually the living units are close to or combined with the workplace and provide public housing, all necessary services (health care, kindergartens, libraries, sports fields, guest houses, shops) and security for employees and their families. In contrary to the *fang* system *danwei* have their own complete identity within the structure of the city. Rather than following the regular grid system of the imperial city the streets are laid out in a flexible pattern to fit the particular needs of the unit to produce efficiently. *Danwei* are organized by a monumental centre where all services and public life is located (Bray 2005). In contrast to the monumental main buildings dwelling in the work unit is modest. The manufacturing flow determines the floor plan and the floor plan defines the form of the building. In order to solve the problem of housing shortages the government constructed many dormitory-like apartments in the newly built industrial areas with a standardized building system. These dormitory buildings had rooms on both north and south sides of the building with an inner corridor. These buildings are only used for sleeping, in the most basic *danwei* all other activities such as cooking, bathing, and socializing were done collectively in the main buildings of the compound which immediately activated a sense of community based on productive work relations.

Since the 1978 opening up of China, Beijing transformed into a global city with superblock apartments as the basic community typology. Spatial organization is based on a combination of qualities drawn from *fang* and *danwei* within standardized high-rise apartment buildings. Community cohesion is based on consumption (Fleischer 2007) and supported by the newly developed political-environmental programme called community building (Bray 2006). A super block is a city block that is much larger than a traditional city block occupied and enclosed by modernistic standardized high-rise apartment buildings. The spatial definition of a super block can be based on a single residential compound or on an urban block defined by major urban roads. Super blocks vary in size from 8 hectares in existing urban areas to 40 hectares in newly built area (Bray 2006). A super block community in China contains apartments and services for 100 to 1500 households. Every super block contains basic services like primary school, supermarket, security and government facilities. Depending on the size and quality of the super block, other social (sports, cultural) and commercial (shops) programme is included. Just like the *fang* and the *danwei* the super block is a walled community within the city. Different from the *fang* and the *danwei* the super block is, regularly, open during the day so all services within the super block are freely accessible also for outsiders. The apartments are standardized and based on one-, two-, or three-person families. Strict climate regulations make little variation possible in the design of the apartment blocks. Because of the size of the flats (regularly 25m by 25m) this often results in irregular floor plans with whimsical outlines to give kitchens ventilation and rooms on the north direct sunlight for one hour a day.

Under the influence of modernization and the 'one child policy' Chinese family structures started to diversify. Social ties based on family or work vanished, but the strong sense of community survived. The residential compound itself have become the basis for identification and lifestyle formation. A newly formed political program 'community building' supports this development. Where the *danwei* system was literally used to educate Mao's ideology, the current government seeks to develop more localized and sustainable forms of governance where citizens are mobilized and trained to govern themselves within the community. Urban residents have developed specific ideas about their living environment and lifestyle within the super block: to choose a house means to choose a lifestyle (Fleischer 2007). Although not based on family or work relations a strong sense of community remains based on contemporary 'community building'. Living in Beijing means being part of a community.

Enclosing social relations

While these three basic organizational units present different types of social structure, the enclosed compound continues in an unbroken historical line. Throughout history, the wall has been a central symbol for China (see Li, this volume). Apart from their defensive functions, walls in China are assumed to show social spaces. In the Western perspective, the wall presents closure, limitation, and social control; since the wall is a central symbol in Chinese society, China has been characterized as a ‘closed-off, earth-bound, backward-looking, and conservative peasant culture’ (Bray 2005: 18). However, all generalizations that associate Chinese walls with limitation and enclosure are too reductionist (Bray 2005: 16-37). In China, the most important thing about the wall is what lies within it. The wall is not seen as an act of enclosure or exclusion, but as embracement of a space that shows social relationships. This is something that Li Shiqiao further explores in *Understanding the Chinese City* (2014).

In line with Massumi, Bray suggests that it is possible to change the perspective, mind-set, and approach to architecture by providing an alternative, more fluid and relational concept of the wall. One of the most helpful Chinese symbols to understand this quality is the *bagua* (八卦). The written form of *bagua* consists of eight ‘trigrams’ (symbols comprising three parallel lines, either broken or unbroken, that represent *yin* (陰) or *yang* (陽) respectively—signifying the relationships between the five elements: wood, fire, earth, metal, and water), which are often portrayed around a centrally placed *yin-yang* (陰陽) symbol, which in turn is believed to have a void in the middle. This void is not empty, but rather filled with energy of relational movement between the elements (Yeo, Li 2007: 35, see Lacertosa, this volume for a further discussion of *dao* (道)). The traditional Chinese courtyard is the exemplary manifestation of this philosophy, as are the *fang*, *danwei*, and superblock on the urban scale. The most significant thing about the community or home experience is not the building, but the energized void and social relations marked by it. It is exactly this relational movement, the social exchange, that makes one feel at home.

The Japanese concept of *ma* (間): a conceptual approach

A more elaborate example of alternative sensibilities and socio-environmental relations can be found in the Japanese architectural context. The ancient Chinese understanding of home as an energized void in the historic and

symbolic representation of *bagua* has also influenced Japanese discourse. This section examines our understanding of home within movement with a more contemporary anthropology of the Japanese concept *ma* (間).

Commonly, *ma* is translated as the interval between two or more spatial or temporal things or events. It is not only used to suggest measurement, but also carries meanings like ‘gap’, ‘opening’, ‘space between’, and ‘time between’. However, this translation lacks a full understanding of the difference in approach to spatiality represented in *ma*. Based on the work of Japanese architect Arata Isozaki, the Dutch philosopher Henk Oosterling and Japan-based American architect Gunter Nitschke think it reasonable to argue that *ma*, in an architectural context, is not to be understood as just an interval or gap between two things or events. Like the Chinese notion *bagua*, *ma* is the understanding of an energized middle that makes a difference. ‘The original character of *Ma* consisted of the pictorial sign for “moon” (月), not the present day “sun” (日), under the sign for “gate” (門). For a Chinese or Japanese individual using language consciously this ideogram is depicting a delicate moment of the moonlight streaming through a gap in the entrance ways’ (Nitschke 1988: 48). *Ma* is not just a gap between two doors; it is the change and movement, the energization happening within this gap. *Ma* is a charged field and should be understood as a dynamic spatiotemporal interval. The conceptualization of *ma* provides a sensitivity to this alternative space-time experience within Japanese architectural discourse.

Sensing the moment of movement

Arata Isozaki acknowledges that *ma* is the primary medium of architecture: ‘Architects work with *Ma*’ (Oosterling 2005: 3). In his book *Japan-ness in Architecture* (2006), Isozaki explains *ma* through discussing various traditional Japanese architectural projects, of which the Ise shrine is most important in the context of this argument.

Ise Jingū is a complex composed of a large number of Shinto shrines. The complex is rebuilt every 20 years as a part of the Shinto belief in impermanence. The continuous activity of preparing the building process is part of the shrine complex’s atmosphere. This shows how home can be experienced within movement:

Etymologically *Ma* is rooted in Shinto religion. It has a ritual background [...] Of course these ritual spatiotemporal sites are not solely confined to Japanese religious culture. But the specific Japanese character is found in how the ‘descent’ of gods is enacting in order to install a relationship

between nature, men and gods. *Ma* is a practice, a performance. It is the formless within the informatization (Oosterling et al. 2000: 37).

Ma was introduced to Western discourse in an Isozaki-designed exhibition in Paris in 1978. The exhibition consisted of nine spatial, visual, and sculptural installations in which different dimension of *ma* were made experiential. Isozaki elaborates on *ma* in several ways, such as these following definitions:

Ma is a place in which a life is lived. *Ma* organizes the process of movement from one place to another. *Ma* is the structural unit of living space. *Ma* is maintained by absolute darkness. *Ma* is a system for indicating the place upon which the gods descend. *Ma* divides the world. *Ma* is a signal of the ephemeral. *Ma* is an empty place where all kinds of phenomena appear, pass by and disappear, it is an alignment of signs (Isozaki 1978).

And, of great significance for this argument, '*Ma* is a way to sense the moment of movement' (Isozaki 1978: 24). This indicates that the moment of movement is a singular event with an ontological status of its own and becomes a moment of home within movement.

Oosterling (2000) elaborates on this conceptualization of space-time by reminding us that when Westerners think and talk about space they mean the distance between objects, but in Japan the focus is instead on relation and performance. In the West, architects are taught to perceive and react to the arrangements of objects and to think of space as empty, but 'In *Ma* space and time are both involved: *Ma* is a dynamic space-time interval wherein activity and passivity, agents and patients are one and the same, yet different' (Oosterling 2005: 5). *Ma* is not empty space; it is a charged interval, immaterial but active and real. With *ma* the Japanese foster a sensitivity, literally a sense organ for movement, that is not yet apparent in the Euro-centric architectural discourse. *Ma* as a spatio-temporal interval makes it possible to experience and value paradox: activity and passivity can happen at the same time; home and movement can resonate simultaneously.

The fifth dimension

Sensitivity to *ma* is, thus, an alternative to Euro-centric space-time interpretation. It gives another dimension to the daily architecture practice. Inspired by Nitschke's work on *ma*, it is reasonable to argue that a 'fifth dimension' of architecture can be introduced. In his essay '*Ma*, the Japanese sense of place in old and new architecture and planning', Nitschke (1966) elaborates on the

five dimensions in which *ma* is used in the Japanese language. In the first dimension, *ma* indicates 'span' and relates to the Western first dimension of distance in a single line. This is followed by the second dimension of a plane, in Japanese measurements more commonly known as the *tatami* (畳, 'room'). The third dimension is understood as empty space or a cube. In the Euro-centric interpretation of spatial measurements these three dimensions are enough to discuss architecture, but *ma* is also used in the fourth dimension, time, to indicate the duration between two moments. Furthermore, *ma* is used in what Nitschke calls the 'fifth dimension and subjective realm' to indicate quality. According to Nitschke's (1966) examples: in the sentence 'the *Ma* of his speech is excellent', *ma* is used to qualify the excellent manner in which the length, character, and pauses of someone's speech are used. In relation to space: 'the *Ma* is bad' can be used when someone feels that they can no longer remain in a certain place because either their own *ma* and/or the *ma* of the place is negative. *Ma* thus indicates the quality of an event, be it speech, dance, music, or environment. This quality is not defined by its properties, but felt by its intensity. *Ma* indicates the architectural quality of the energized, charged field experienced directly through (non-local) resonance.

The fifth dimension creates an awareness and sensitivity to quality in the moment of movement and with that a more fluid sense of home. In my opinion, alternative sensibilities and social-environmental relations to Euro-centric architectural discourse are to be found in the potential of the fifth dimension, which can be understood as 'energy' or 'intensity'.

Potential aesthetics of movement

In the fifth dimension, architecture is about 'making sense of intensities' (Hendrickx 2014). In Chinese community building this is visible in the integration of social relations and participation during the building process. In Japan this is visible in the conceptualisation of dynamic space-time in *ma*. The potential of the fifth dimension lies not only in the literal flow of energy, as studied in contemporary sustainable architecture, or in flow of information in the Internet-society, but in a social and aesthetic realm that can provide new sensibilities and social-environmental relations. The fifth dimension therefore trains one's sensitivity to energy and intensity through an aesthetics of movement.

A traditional Japanese example of this aesthetic awareness is explained by David A. Slawson in his book on *The Secret Teachings of Japanese Gardens*

(2013). Spatial experience in these gardens is not based on functions or properties, but on the ‘moments of movement’ created by the juxtaposition of rocks, trees, and bushes in a very specific way. During the design process, vectors indicate the intended moments of movement in the sketches. Sensitivity to intensity is trained and experienced through the creation of language. A diversity of aesthetic concepts is developed to increase sensitivity. One of the examples from the vocabulary of scenic and sensory effects is *fuzei* (風情, ‘local conditions’—not unlike the French concept of *terroir*). *Fuzei* implies a poetic, quality-oriented approach to design, resulting in spatial compositions that awaken a sense of movement within still-standing objects through the use of framing and perspective. Some of these traditional concepts are still used in present-day Japanese architectural discourse, helping architects foster sensitivity to movement and change.

More contemporary manifestations of a similar approach to the design process are visible in, for example, the experimental work of the architect Shusaku Arakawa and the philosopher Madeleine Gins. Installations such as ‘Nagi’s Ryoanji’ or ‘The Site of Reversible Destiny’ in Yoro park, Gifu explore alternative body movement in space. Architect Hiroshi Sambuichi is currently focusing on ‘moving materials’, in which an aesthetics of movement is explored:

The materials of the twentieth century are glass, concrete and steel, the materials of the twenty-first century are air, water and, sun; the moving materials. The scenes of the earth that we find beautiful are scenes of instant circulations produced by energy. One role of architecture is to beautifully manifest the characteristic regional phenomena of these transformation, of change and movement (Sambuichi 2016).

Junya Ishigami’s study for the KAIT workshop in Kanakawa Prefecture also focuses on flow and opens a different approach to architecture. By not focusing on individual spaces, but on movement, he was able to design a flow free of geometry or rules. Place emerges as a temporary moment within movement.

My intention was not to plan individual spaces in different locations of the building one by one. I wanted to create a space in which the whole and the parts are infinitely close to having equal value. I do recognize that it is possible for a flexibility to emerge, out of plans or factors, that become so homogenous the particular properties of the spaces all but disappear. But here I was beginning to think that there could be a flexibility that results

when the plans or other different factors remain in effect, from simply softening and blurring their boundaries [...] As we deform the spaces step by step we gradually discover the relation between part and whole. During the course of this work the spaces meandering and filling out between the columns began to feel like transparent clay (Ishigami 2008: 4).

In Euro-centric discourse it is also possible to indicate micro-revolutions that show a growing awareness of an alternative spatio-temporal sensitivity in the fifth dimension. Processes indicated in Euro-centric discourse where potential aesthetics of movement are emerging include the renewed focus on craftsmanship, participation in urban design, and revitalization by renovation. An elaborate study of both contemporary Japanese examples and the potential to change Euro-centric discourse is needed to further develop both this argument and training in this alternative spatiotemporal sensitivity to intensity.

Radical displacement

The fifth dimension is a dynamic spatiotemporal interval and therefore defies the provision of a defined architectural or pedagogical methodology. The experience of homelessness is also a challenge for designers in the Asian urban environment, as indicated by this chapter's opening quote by Félix Guattari. But the Asian examples discussed can inspire alternative sensitive abilities and socio-environmental relations in Euro-centric architectural discourse.

Training for an alternative spatio-temporal sensitivity to intensity through the development of an aesthetics of movement will, in my opinion, open Euro-centric architectural discourse to a potential morphogenesis of resonance. When this happens, a positive experience of home within movement is possible. Displacement causes shock and spatio-temporal disorientation, but within traditional Japanese examples such as Ise Jingu the appreciation of change and movement results in a very minor form of displacement, in which the shock and disorientation are solely focused on the detachment from material values. This value is not created by the specific wooden beams and columns that the shrine was built from in its 'original state', but by the performance of construction and with that the charged field of intensity created on the site. In the modern urban environment, shock and disorientation are more intense, and therefore an increased sense of detachment might change the mind-set and trigger a sensitivity that opens up to felt intensity of home within movement.

To experience this, the last suggestion of this chapter is to visit the Go'o shrine by Hiroshi Sugimoto in the Art House Project on Naoshima in the Kagawa Prefecture, Japan. What can be experienced there is an ultimate manifestation of home within movement. The glass stair indicates direction, a movement towards the platform, but just before the stair reaches its goal there is a gap between the last step and the final destination. This gap is not empty but filled with energy: the intensity to go up. Within the gap a valuable and paradoxical interference resonates. Flow and pause are simultaneous. The Go'o Shrine shows a dynamic space-time interval filled with an intense moment of home within movement. There is nothing philosophical going on here, it is all comprehended immediately.

Bibliography

- Bauman, Zygmunt. 2004. 'Liquid Society'. Lecture on the ANSE-conference 2004 *Value dilemmas as a challenge in the practice and concepts of supervision and coaching* on May 7th 2004 in Leiden/The Netherlands.
- Bray, David. 2006. 'Building "community": new strategies of governance in urban China'. *Economy and Society* 34(4): 530-549.
- Bray, David. 2005. *Social Space and Governance in Urban China: The Danwei System From Origins to Reform*. Stanford: Stanford university Press.
- Casey, Edward S. 1997. *The Fate of Place: A Philosophical History*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- During, Elie. 2010. 'Loose Coexistence: Technologies of Attention in the Age of the Post-Metropolis', in *Cognitive Architecture: From Biopolitics to Noopolitics. Architecture & Mind in the Age of Communication & Information*, edited by Deborah Hauptman et al.: 267-283. Rotterdam: 010 Publishers.
- Fleischer, Friederike. 2007. 'To choose a house means to choose a lifestyle. The consumption of housing and class structuration in urban China'. *City & Society* 19(2): 287-311.
- Guatari, Félix. 2015. 'Ecosophical practices and the restoration of the "subjective city"', in *Machinic Eros: Writings on Japan*, edited by Gary Genosko, Jay Hetrick: 97-115 Minneapolis: Univocal Publishing.
- Geuze, Adriaan. 2002. 'Accelerating Darwin', in *Architectural Positions: On Architecture, Modernity and the Public Sphere*, edited by Tom Avermaete, Klaske Havik, Hans Teerds. Amsterdam: 101-111 Sun Publishers.
- Hendrickx, Arnaud. 2014. 'Making Sense of Intensities', in *Perception in Architecture: Here and Now*, edited by Claudia Perren et al.: 22-28 Cambridge: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.

- Hetrick, Jay. 2015. 'Towards a Critical Nomadism? Félix Guattari in Japan', in *Machinic Eros: Writings on Japan*, edited by Gary Genosko, Jay Hetrick: 137-154 Minneapolis: Univocal Publishing.
- Sambuichi, Hiroshi. 2016. 'Moving Materials'. Exhibition in Tokyo: TOTO art gallery. Visited in May.
- Ishigami, Junya. 2008. *Small Images*. Tokyo: LIXIL Publishing.
- Isozaki, Arata. 2006. *Japan-ness in Architecture*, translated by S. Kohso. Cambridge: The MIT Press.
- Isozaki, Arata. 1978. 'Ma espace – temps du japon'. Exhibition in Musée des Arts Decoratifs, Paris.
- Koolhaas, Rem, Chuihua Judy Chung, Jeffrey Inaba, and Sze Tsung Leong, eds. 2001. *Great Leap Forward*. Cologne: Taschen.
- Knapp, Ronald. 1999. *Living Houses: Symbols and Household Ornamentation*. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press.
- Li Shiqiao. 2014. *Understanding the Chinese City*. London: Sage.
- Massumi, Brian. 2003. 'The Archive of Experience', in *Information is Alive: Art and Theory on Archiving and Retrieving Data*, edited by Winy Maas, Arjun Appadurai, Joke Brouwer, Simon Conway Morris: 142-15. NAI Publishers.
- Massumi, Brian. 1998. 'Sensing the Virtual, Building the Insensible: From Hypersurface Architecture'. *Architectural Design* 68(5/6): 16-24.
- Nitschke, Günter. 1988. 'Ma – Place, Space, Void', in *From Shinto to Ando: Studies in Architectural Anthropology in Japan*: 48-61. London: Academy Editions.
- Nitschke, Günter. 1966. 'Ma: The Japanese sense of place in old and new architecture and planning'. *Architectural Design*: 113-156.
- Oosterling, Henk. 2005. 'Japanese Inter-esse: "Ma" as In-Between'. Lecture at Transmediale.05 BASICS Berlin, 5 February.
- Oosterling, Henk, Heinz Kimmerle, and Gerrit Steunebrink, eds. 2000. 'Sensus Communis' in *Multi- and Intercultural Perspective: On the Possibility of Common Judgments in Arts and Politics*. Würzburg: Koningshausen & Neumann.
- Schinkel, Willem. 2011. *De gedroomde samenleving*. Zoetermeer: Klement.
- Slawson, David A. 2013. *Secret Teachings in the Art of Japanese Gardens: Design Principles, Aesthetic Value*. New York: Kodansha.
- Yeo Kuang Shua and Li Xiaodong. 2007. *The Chinese Conception of Space*. Beijing: Tsinghua University Press: 35.

About the author

Renske Maria van Dam is an architect and researcher with a great interest in Japanese spatiality. Initially, she started her studies in fine art and philosophy but then graduated as an architect from the Technical University of Delft with a minor in urban anthropology from the honours programme in Chinese urbanity. She worked for *architectuurstudio* Herman Hertzberger in Amsterdam and Li Xiaodong Atelier in Beijing. From 2009 to 2011, she worked for Vision included: a self-initiated, pro-active design practice and discussion platform. Since 2013 she is lecturer in ArtScience and spatial design at the Royal Academy of arts, the Hague. In 2017 she started a design-driven PhD research at the KU Leuven architecture department Campus Brussel/Ghent. Email: info@renskemaria.com / <http://www.renskemaria.com>

