III. Architecture of Resistance (Architecture as Architecture + Critical Position)

The third position understands architecture as a relatively autonomous field of action. "Autonomous" in the sense that it considers architecture as a specific discipline which has its own knowledge, tradition, approach and a task of its own. And "relatively" in the sense that it understands architecture as part of the social totality, and its task as inseparably connected with a critical approach to this totality. More precisely, for the advocates of this position engagement in a changing of social reality is that which also justifies the existence of architecture. In this way this position actually preserves the modernist ideal, according to which architecture is understood as one of those practices which are supposed to change society for the better. One (significant) difference in relation to the modernist position being, however, that the architecture of resistance doesn't understand change as a radical transformation – such as the building of a more socially just world – but as a social improvement.

However, this position must continually confront the fact that in the time of global capitalism there is less and less possibility for such a practice. The very possibility of practicing architecture as architecture is put into question. The main concern of investors and others involved in building activity is the production of financial profit, which means that instead of dwellings, "real-estate disguised as architecture" is being built, and that architecture in general is being reduced to glittering facades and fleeting images, "pressed into the service of spectacle". And the ability of architecture to critically intervene in its social reality too is put in question. Globalised capitalism is a precarious system in the