

## From Central Planning to a New Sensibility

---

The second part of this book ended with a call to develop a new sense of sensibility for the material-human network. This part is concerned with its implementation in our day-to-day lives. It also marks a shift away from laboratory architecture towards inclusive and open forms of architecture. This in turn demands a new role for those engaged in the public building process, the architect, but also the designer and the community organiser. The redefinition of their roles also redefines the role of church and theology in a public process which could best be described as a social laboratory.

In this first chapter I want to focus on the consequences a heightened sensibility for the subtleties of the material world has for planning processes. As an example I want to show how the planning of public space and public buildings has changed.

### Addressing the Needs of a City: An Artistic Primer

Planning a whole city can be seen as a rare instance where the architect's and the city planner's world view manifests on a grand scale. I have chosen two cities as examples of entirely planned spaces here to show to what extent design philosophies can be realised in that way. The focus, however, is not on the design of the city itself, but on the way these cities work for their citizens today.

Brasilia and Chandigarh are places where a renowned architect was given a *carte blanche*. Work on Brasilia started in 1957 when the Brazil's president Juscelino Kubitschek began his campaign to develop the interior of the country and relocated its capital. Together with the city planner Lucio Costa, the Brazilian architect Oscar Niemeyer oversaw the construction. The plans for Chandigarh are also rooted in a project of national reassurance, starting as a dream of

India's first prime minister Jawaharlal Nehru in 1949: "Chandigarh was meant [...] to produce a powerful symbol of a new and progressive India" (Stierli 2010). In contrast to Brasilia, Chandigarh's architects were foreign to the country. First the American Albert Meyer and after his resignation the British couple Jane Drew and Maxwell Fry, who partnered with the French Le Corbusier.

The photographer Iwan Baan photographed these cities in 2010 to document how the inhabitants are *Living With Modernity* and make the planned spaces their own. The pictures in the book are accompanied by two essays. One is by the Dutch novelist and journalist Cees Nooteboom, who reflects on what it means that these cities were created "ex nihilo", the other is on the political circumstances of the cities' planning processes by the Swiss architectural and art historian Martino Stierli.<sup>1</sup> Before turning our attention to the photographs themselves, we should therefore note a particular line of thought in these essays that integrates with the theme of this book. It is the difference between planned possibility, or *potentiality*, and realised *actuality*.

Cees Nooteboom compares the task of the city planner who starts from scratch with the experience in the Netherlands where land was created in the middle of the sea. Before the first building is erected, the planner pictures a future state: "The buildings he sees are still virtual, a possibility. [...] Suddenly everything is possible. Possible feet that will walk down possible streets [...] The possible church, the possible school" (Nooteboom 2010). But the city on paper is different from the one in the real world. There is a difference between an architect's vision and the real world realisation of that vision.

In architectural blueprints, no grass grows between the stones. The concrete shows no sign of efflorescence and rust is not part of the design. People in architectural sketches are faceless outlines, predictable shadows [...] architectural sketches are always silent, whereas cities never are (ibid.).

What is important from my perspective is that both the materials and the people have not realised their potentiality yet, nor have they interacted. Their interaction turns the city into something radically different from what the architect

---

1 Stierli has also published on Robert Venturi's seminal book *Learning from Las Vegas* (1972) on the planned – and car friendly – city of Las Vegas and its richness in architectural signs and symbols.

imagined. This is where Baan's photographs become important as he demonstrates "the interplay between what is designed and what is experienced, between the Platonic idea and the current reality of a practice that has taken possession of that idea" (ibid.).

What we can take from Nooteboom's and Stierli's essays is a tension between planning and living, between the potentiality of the material and its actuality. Baan's photos strikingly show that difference.

*Figure 19: Jeff Wall Morning Cleaning, Mies van der Rohe Foundation, Barcelona, transparency on light-box (1999)*

Jeff Wall's photo is part of the collection of the *Kunstsammlung Nordrhein-Westfalen* and can be found under the title: "Morning Cleaning, Mies van der Rohe Foundation, Barcelona/ Morgendliche Reinigung". It is the second of two prints made in 1999. The photo was taken when the *Fundació Mies van der Rohe* in Barcelona invited the photographer in the same year.

One photograph pictures the water basin in front of the *Palácio da Alvorada*, the seat of the Brazilian government built by Niemeyer in 1958. A cleaning worker fishes for leaves and other debris with a long pole. We see not only the pool and the palace behind it but also the large bronze statue *As Banhistas*, two bathing women, by the Brazilian sculptor Alfredo Ceschiatti, who collaborated with Niemeyer. The photo exhibits strong references to Jeff Wall's *Morning Cleaning*, which shows a window cleaner in Mies van der Rohe's *Barcelona Pavilion*. We immediately understand that these architectural icons require a lot of labour and care to preserve their spotless looks. But we also understand that architecture does not function without human beings.

*Figure 20: Palácio da Alvorada, Oscar Niemeyer (1958)*

Iwan Baan photographed the Palácio for his book "Brasilia - Chandigarh. Living with Modernity". Some of the pictures from the book can be seen on the website of *Lars Müller Publishers*. However, the picture of the Palácio with a worker cleaning the pool in front of it can only be found in the book on pages 66-67.

The other image shows the inside of one of Le Corbusier's governmental buildings in Chandigarh. The room is cluttered with old desks and paper files piled as high as the ceiling. Cees Nooteboom mentions this picture in his essay.

When I look at Iwan Baan's photographs, I wonder how Le Corbusier, who once said that a house should be a "machine for living," would have related, for example, to the sight of the incredible chaos in the office [...] When Le Corbusier was growing up in the early years of the last century, which is already so distant, futuristic circles shared a veneration of machines, but the photograph of this room blatantly disregards the originally futuristic element of the city (Nooteboom 2010).

The machine-like architecture and the ideal of making the humans that inhabit them function like machines is disrupted here. It shows that architecture can both work with and against its users.

*Figure 21: Government office, Le Corbusier (n.d.)*

A picture of an overstuffed office building in Chandigarh can be found in Iwan Baan's book "Brasilia - Chandigarh: living with modernity" on pages 156-157.

Baan's photography raises the question of the scale of architectural planning, that is, whether these plans are made by decree and architectural blueprints – seemingly from above – or if they have the building's and the city's users in mind and start from below. Both Brasilia and Chandigarh, despite them being a symbol for national pride and a spirit of optimism, had to be appropriated by the people before they could work for them. While the architects' disregard for the small details of daily lives did not stop people making these cities more liveable, there are better ways to make people and buildings work together. A vital idea is that of an open architecture that changes with its users.

## Addressing the Needs of a City: A Planner's Perspective

In his book *Person-Centred Planning*, the architect and Pritzker Prize laureate RICHARD ROGERS addresses the problem of social cohesion in planned spaces. He sharply criticises the compartmentalised and neatly ordered city as envisioned by Le Corbusier: “Some planners still long to create ghettos in the shape of commercial districts, industrial districts, dormitory districts, shopping districts and the rest without realizing the social cost for the individual” (Tickell 1995, p. x). Against these versions of the city Rogers develops a different, “pluralist and integrated, diverse and coherent” (ibid., p. x) form.

As in the discussion of Brasilia and Chandigarh, I want to focus on specific aspects in Rogers' book which relate to my topic of material-human networks.

Rogers mentions the deep impact of advanced communication technology both on the city and its citizens. Yet at the same time as people are growing together, Rogers sees social separation on the rise. “We have never before been linked more closely electronically and physically, yet never before have we been more socially separated” (Rogers 1995, p. 150). Against these tendencies he proposes a new form of urban culture which is participatory in essence. A key concept therein is that of “creative citizenship” which,

is participation in essentially creative communal activities. It could animate communities; it could fill a vacuum in many lives now empty of purpose; it could provide status, satisfaction and identity, and begin to tackle the cause of much of society's disharmony and alienation (ibid., p. 150).

For Rogers this cultural shift towards participation, inclusion, and creativity manifests in the built environment. He thinks that we can build democracy, a thought which I want to come back to at the end of this chapter. “Safe and inclusive public space [...] is critical for social integration and cohesion. Democracy finds its physical expression in the open-minded spaces of the public realm, in the quality of its street life” (ibid., p. 152). The backside of this is that we can also build fascism, or, in its milder form, systems that “de-empower”<sup>2</sup> us: “It is no accident that under Fascist or similarly repressive regimes the city is segregated and specifically designed to overwhelm the

---

2 A term by the designer Friedrich von Borries, whom I will come back to in the next chapter.

individual. [...] At present we are building cities that segregate and brutalise rather than emancipate and civilise” (Rogers 1995, pp. 152–153).

As a remedy, Rogers does not present the reader with a blueprint for a built environment that empowers citizens and fosters cohesion and creativity. But he hints at a key concept in the design of public buildings and public spaces, namely flexibility and openness to change. Rogers observes that the pace with which cities are changing accelerates as the institutions that place their iconic buildings in the city have ever shorter lifespans. “[R]ailway stations are converted into museums, power plants into art galleries, churches into night-clubs” (ibid., pp. 163–164). As a consequence, architecture must embrace rather than resist social change.

What particularly stands out from the perspective of this enquiry into the materiality of architecture is Rogers’ observation that a new flexibility will manifest materially. For Rogers both buildings and public space are becoming more open and permeable, which in turn fosters openness and engagement of citizens.

Architecture is changing in response to environmental demands and the development of new high-performance and bio-responsive materials. Le Corbusier described architecture as the “masterly correct and magnificent play of masses brought together in light”. In the future, however, buildings will tend to dematerialize. It will be an age not of mass but of transparency and veils: of indeterminate, adaptable and floating structures that respond to daily changes in the environment and patterns of use. The buildings of the future [...] will be less like the immutable classical temples of the past and more like moving, thinking, organic robots.

This new architecture will change the character of the public domain. As structures become lighter, buildings will become more permeable and pedestrians will move through them rather than around them (ibid., p. 165).

Rogers’ position is especially important for public architecture, e.g. by a city or state government. The urban planner points towards public buildings in France in the late 1990s and the way they seek to foster “community, pride, and cultural achievement” (ibid., p. 160). While we must be aware of the fact that there is no direct link, or correlation, between building with flexible and light materials and an increase in social cohesion and democratic participation, we can argue that architecture at least needs to aim to reflect these social values.

## Addressing Spiritual Needs: An Architect's Perspective

We can go beyond Rogers' perspective and more into the actual material detail of buildings to get a more complete perspective of the way in which a building can serve the people. I want to bring in the perspective of the architect PETER ZUMTHOR on the spiritual qualities of buildings. Before going into detail, however, this warrants a primer on what I mean by "spiritual".

In his essay *Placing the Sacred*, the theologian Philip Sheldrake argues that public spaces must not only include civic values but also religious ones, they must tell "narratives of redemption" (Sheldrake 2007, p. 254). From an architectural perspective Robert Birch and Brian Sinclair argue that architecture does not just address the physical and intellectual needs of its users but also their spiritual needs (Birch and Brian 2013). They refer to the psychologist Abraham Maslow and his article on *Peak Experiences as Acute Identity Experiences* in which Maslow defines the term *peak experience* as "a name, a word, a concept that expresses the amount of sameness that exists among the experiences of life, insight, creativeness, orgasm, parturition, mystic (oceanic, cosmic) experience, certain athletic experiences, aesthetic experience, and some others as well." (Maslow 1961, p. 254) The psychologist discusses examples from his therapeutic practice to identify 15 aspects which more clearly define how these peak experiences are experienced by his clients. Some of these aspects are helpful to recapitulate here to get a better idea of what Birch and Sinclair try to convey when they talk about buildings addressing a wide range of spiritual needs of their users. For Maslow's clients a peak experience can mean:

1. The person [...] feels more integrated (unified, whole, all-of-a-piece) than at other times. [...] less split between an experiencing-self and an observing-self, more one-pointed, more harmoniously organized
2. As he gets to be more purely and singly himself, he is more able to fuse with the world, with what was formerly not-self [...], the creator becomes one with his work being created
3. The person in the peak experience usually feels himself to be at the peak of his powers, using all his capacities their best and fullest (ibid., p. 255).

Two aspects are striking here. The first is feeling integrated with the world, which goes as far as the creator becoming one with his or her creation. This

reminds us of Bloch's concept that the person becomes so absorbed in his doing in the world, that the world carries more of the identity of a person than the person themselves – in Levinas' terminology of the "tua res agitur". The second aspect is that a peak experience also fosters the person in all their capacities. This reminds us of Richard Rogers' "creative citizenship," where individuals realise their full potential. We must, however, note that this realisation goes beyond the logic of the (labour) market, where human beings are seen as nothing more than a commodity with a clearly defined set of potentials to be realised.

One way in which Birch and Sinclair see architects trying to evoke peak experiences is by allowing for a "full sensual engagement" which in turn "encourages a focus on the present, a 'here-now' mindset, 'free of past and future'" (Birch and Brian 2013, p. 86). That *sensual quality* of architecture has been explored in great detail by Peter Zumthor in his book *Architektur denken*, thinking architecture.

What makes Zumthor's book different from other architectural publications is that he starts not with design but with the idea that architecture evokes memories. These are the "foundation of architectural moods and images which I try to fathom in my work as an architect"\* (Zumthor 2017, p. 8). Zumthor's way to engage with these deep experiences is to pay close attention to the materials with which he builds. I want to focus my attention here on the way the architect talks about materiality, the self-will of the things, and the attention it demands from the architect.

The first aspect I want to mention is that Zumthor encourages architects to think more deeply about the materials they use, not just with regards to their static and artistic characteristics, but rather in terms of their "poetic qualities"\* (ibid., p. 10). While Zumthor does not regard the material itself as poetic, he argues that architects can place materials in different contexts to bring out "not only the way in which the specific material is commonly used, but also its own sensual and purpose-giving properties"\* (ibid., p. 10).

This demands attention to the material itself and its properties. Zumthor recalls a conversation that clarified this aspect for him:

"In my mother tongue, in Spanish," my young colleague answers, "there is this nearness of the words wood, mother, and material: madera, madre, materia." We start a conversation about the sensual properties and the cultural meaning

of the primary raw materials wood and stone and how we can bring them out in our buildings\* (ibid., p. 56).

Throughout his book Zumthor shows a great concern for the materials themselves. He talks about “their dignity, their memory”\* (ibid., p. 53)<sup>3</sup> which architects must respect. We can also see his vocational training as a cabinetmaker shining through (cf. ibid., p. 47).

Zumthor is aware that this aspect connects him to the work of Martin Heidegger. What he takes from Heidegger’s dictum of “residence with the things as a fundamental trait of being human”\* is “that we are never just in the abstract but always in a world of things, within which we think”\* (ibid., p. 36).

But Zumthor does not see the material in isolation of the human experience. On the contrary, he asks us to be attentive of our reactions to houses and cities: “which smell was in the air, how did my footsteps sound, how did my voice sound, how did the floor underneath my feet, the door handle feel in my hand”\* (ibid., pp. 65–66)? He wants us to detect “the magic of the real, the material, [...] the things that surround me, that I see and touch, that I smell and hear”\* (ibid., p. 83) when we describe architecture. Even the landscape that surrounds the building must be “felt”\* (ibid., p. 99) by the architect.

But the result is not just an attention for the materiality, it is a liveable environment, a building that *houses* its inhabitants. Throughout his book, Zumthor refers to different buildings and his sensual reaction to them. One is a small mountain hut which he sees as a prototype for

[buildings] that offer me, in an informal and natural way, situations, that fit to the place, to the daily routine, to my occupation, and to my [mental and health; C.P.] condition [...] without making much fuss about it\* (ibid., p. 44).

Zumthor is interested in an architecture that allows for emotions but does not provoke them forcefully (cf. ibid., p. 29) and that is able to take on and absorb in itself the traces of human life (cf. ibid., p. 24).

This in turn means that inhabitants are part of the developmental process of a building. Zumthor refers to John Cage and his music<sup>4</sup> to argue that only

3 Zumthor names the Finnish filmmaker Aki Olavi Kaurismäki as one of his role models for a respectful treatment of the material.

4 We could link that to Umberto Eco’s *open artwork*, cf. page 17.

through performance – which I understand as both building and living in a building, with its materiality and sometimes the materials stubbornness as well (cf. Zumthor 2017, p. 62) – a building comes to life. According to Zumthor,

[Cage] was not a composer that heard music in his mind and then tried to write that down [...] He worked out concepts and structures and had them performed to only then find out how they sounded.\* (ibid., p. 31)

Thus, the way out of the crisis of corporate campus architecture and planning is on the one hand cooperative communal planning and on the other hand an openness for the spiritual needs of humans and the transcendental potential of the material.

### **A Sense for the Greater Good through Building: An Architectural Perspective**

How are the demands of Richard Rogers and Peter Zumthor realised in architectural practice? While both are quoting examples from architectural praxis, I want to look at a particular style of building that matches the corporate laboratory we looked at in the second part of this book. It is the public architecture of democracies, which finds its most visible expression in parliamentary buildings, where the civic virtues – and spiritual needs – of people are addressed. These buildings speak for the ideals of a society, even if its citizens cannot afford a house built by Zumthor or are not as fortunate as to live in a city quarter planned by Rogers.

We must be aware that the link we are making between civic virtues and architectural forms is a contested one. In his book *Beautiful Democracy* Russ Castronovo critically deconstructs the ideals of American city planners at the turn of the century who sought to better the lot of the country's poor through beautiful buildings and city parks but were also displaying their cultural (and white) supremacy (Castronovo 2007). Heike Delitz goes even deeper in her analysis of the "Built Society"\* where she develops an architectural sociology that neither reduces buildings to mere expressions of a society's values nor chimes in with

the architects who think that they can change society through architecture.<sup>5</sup> Rather, Delitz argues that there is a symbiotic co-existence between buildings and the ideals of the society. For parliamentary architecture, she argues that the modern open glass parliaments

are generating a new form of the political system, [...] which its representatives might not have been able to understand themselves\* (Delitz 2010, p. 16).

To sum up the caveats mentioned in this paragraph: while parliamentarians might commission buildings that represent the ideals of a liberal democracy, they themselves might fully realise them only when they enter the finished building.

A group of public buildings that stands out in this regard are the buildings of the Federal Republic of West Germany after the Second World War in the new capital of Bonn and in other West-German cities. I want to single out one particular building, namely the Bundestag building by GÜNTER BEHNISCH, as displaying a spirit of openness and modesty through its design and materiality and thus giving visible expression to the values of the young German republic after the war. I will preface this by a short introduction to democratic building.

In his sociology of architecture, Bernd Schäfers devotes a chapter to *building for democracy*. In it he begins with revolutionary architecture that wanted to turn the ideals of the French Revolution into monumental architecture. Science played an important part in the revolutionary world view – alongside liberty, equality, and fraternity – and therefore large structures like the Newton Monument by the classicist architect Étienne-Louis Buellée were devoted to the idea of a society led by scientific reason. Architects like Buellée wanted to turn the ideals of the revolution into brick and mortar in order to make a lasting impact in the fluidity of history.

---

5 The author does, however, take the claims of such architects seriously, especially when she applies her theory to examples from the building practice of the 1920s (“Life Reform”), the 1930s (“Neues Bauen”), or the socialist megablock architects of the 1960s. In these examples Delitz draws heavily but critically on the self-descriptions of the architects involved.

*Figure 22: Haus des Landtags, Horst Linde (1961)*

Photographer *Marcus Ebner* has documented Horst Linde's building. Especially interesting is the night shot of the illuminated cube.

But democracy does not only rest on values, such as liberty and equality, it is also indebted to a specific type of political process that is in essence a public one. Thus, democratic architecture also encompasses public space. The state parliament of Baden-Württemberg, for instance, features an open, glazed ground floor above which the parliament's assembly room sits. Horst Linde created a low and open structure where the glass around the ground level makes the upper plenary room almost levitate. The Federal Constitutional Court of Germany in Karlsruhe also employs glass to give the impression that the decision-making process of the court is open and transparent to all citizens. Both the original building by the Berlin architect Paul Baumgarten from 1969 and the 2007 extension by the Berlin architect Michael Schrölkamp rely heavily on that material. Finally, the dome of the Reichstag in Berlin, built by Norman Foster, which allows visitors to see the parliamentarians at work, is also a highly transparent structure.

*Figure 23: Baumgarten-Bau, Paul Baumgarten (1969)*

A documentation of the Baugarten-Bau can be found on the website of *Bundesbau Baden-Württemberg* under the title "Bundesverfassungsgericht, Karlsruhe".

It seems then, that democratic architects have taken a leaf out of Adolf Arndt's famous speech *Demokratie als Bauherr*, democracy as a builder, and created transparent and accessible spaces that embody the ideals – as well as the humbleness – of German democracy after 1945 (Arndt 1961). But glass architecture has also been criticised for that it merely gives the illusion of openness. As we have seen with Holmdel, glass is not just transparent, it can also act as a powerful barrier.

Thus democratic architecture hinges not on the material per se but a different approach to building. Günter Behnisch and Partner stood for this.<sup>6</sup> Their design of the new parliamentary building in Bonn spoke of an open and humane architecture: a humane scale, a non-monumental type of architecture that does not want to overwhelm the visitor, the openness of space, keeping a low profile and thus showing respect towards the other buildings that surround it – and the process character and unfinished nature of the building itself. One architectural critic summed up the ideas behind Behnisch's architecture:

This building is a platonic ideal image of what we have come to as a community, as a state, after the years of the NS dictatorship: openness, justice, liberty [...] the message is: freedom, relaxedness, unpretentious self-assurance and generosity. There might be more dignified parliamentary buildings, but a more liberal, a more democratic one can hardly be found\* (Battis 1994, p. 4).

Figure 24: Plenary Building Bundestag Bonn, Günter Behnisch (1992)

The German *Bundestag* has documented the “Behnisch-Bau” in the section “Parlamentarische Schauplätze in Bonn” under the title “Behnisch- und Schürmann-Bau”.

For some critics, however, the building lacked the monumental power and might that a strong and well-fortified democracy needed. Johannes Groß remarked:

In its relaxed airiness, the openness to all sides [the parliamentary building is] a monument to the ideals of the 60s and 70s, the old Federal Republic of [West; C.P.] Germany. It is a beautiful annex to the national gardening show next door. It is the refusal of the state of emergency turned into architecture\* (ibid., p. 4).

6 This is probably also due to the biography of the architect. As a young officer on a submarine in the Second World War, Behnisch must have experienced claustrophobic spaces coupled with authoritarian power structures. Both are absent in his buildings.

## A Sense for the Greater Good through Building: A Parliamentary Perspective

The ability of the building to have an impact on its users, making them slow down and reflect, is hard to support empirically if we do not want to enter the realm of the psychological experiment. But there is at least an interrelation between reflexive architecture and reflected users. There are few places where this is more apparent than in the parliament, especially when parliamentarians reflect on the mission of *the house*. I am referring here mainly to the analysis of the opening speeches of the German parliament at the beginning of each legislative period during its residency in Bonn. Werner Patzelt has undertaken an analysis of these speeches and focused on “discourses of transcendence” within the opening addresses of the Bundestag’s presidents by seniority, such as Paul Löbe, Konrad Adenauer, Ludwig Erhard, Willy Brandt, Herbert Wehner, or Marie-Elisabeth Lüders.

Patzelt argues that by looking at transcendental discourses, it becomes possible to understand “how the new beginning in 1949 turned into a particular [...] political order, which over the years [...] has turned into an order we take for granted [...] and which today even more than before is being defended with a civic religious zeal against extremists”\* (Patzelt 2013, p. 158). Patzelt then goes on to distinguish between different types of (transcendental) discourses (cf. *ibid.* 162). My question here, however, is how transcendental discourses refer to the space and the materiality of the parliament and thus hint at the interdependence between space/material and democratic values.

*Figure 25: Interior of the Bundestag Bonn, Günter Behnisch (1992)*

An article with pictures of the interior of the “Behnisch-Bau” was printed in the magazine *Bauwelt* 83.41 (1992) on page 2351.

The first discourse I want to look at is the “through the night to the light” discourse (cf. *ibid.*, p. 167). As the parliament begins its work in 1949 – and years before it moved into the Behnisch building –, its first president by seniority, Paul Löbe, reminds the parliamentarians of the physical destruction of the war which corresponds to a moral destruction:

[Who had travelled to Bonn on his way to the opening of parliament has seen] the shocking witnesses to the destruction which was brought about by the [Nazi; C.P.] seizure of power. These are just the visible witnesses, but every one of us knows that with the outer destruction there had also been a destruction of mind and soul in our peoples. [...] [What is needed then is] to replace the ruins with a cosy house and inspire courage in the discouraged\* (Löbe 1949 in *ibid.*, p. 168).

Only eight years later, Marie-Elisabeth Lüders can rejoice in the fact that such a homely place has indeed been built: “The resurrection and the expansion of our country and our relations to the world”\* (Lüders 1957 in *ibid.*, p. 170) have been successful. It is important to notice how the presidents connected the path to democracy with the rebuilding of the country. Both Paul Löbe and Marie-Elisabeth Lüders see the development of democratic ideals through the metaphor of rebuilding. That rebuilding is not done by a single architect, but by *us*, the democratic citizens of the Federal Republic of West Germany.

The second discourse I am interested in is called by Patzelt the “plus ultra” discourse, which aims at a transcendence of the status quo. In the 1970s Willy Brandt argued for a renewal of the political order in Germany:

In the 70s we will have only as much order in this country as we encourage a shared responsibility. Such a democratic order needs an extraordinary amount of patience for listening and trying to understand one another. We want to dare more democracy. We will open our procedures and will satisfy the critical need for information\* (Brandt 1969 in *ibid.*, p. 183).

It is noteworthy that Brandt speaks about the need for transparency and for listening, which later Behnisch and Partners tried to realise in the open plenary building in Bonn. What Brandt did not see, however, was that while the architecture of parliaments employed glass and open spaces, it was still the architecture of star architects and prominent planning commissions. The problem, as Adolf Arndt has emphasised – but answered only with a call for more star architecture – is that it is hard to instil a sense of *we* into citizens looking at the plenary building when they are not part of the planning process.

