

ARCHITECTURE OF THE FUTURE, NOW IN THE USSR

Mobile-missile complex, near Yur'ya, USSR. Designed by Soviet military architects who probably have secret fantasies about Malevich, Archipenko and Leonidov.

With a satellite, roving the world, one can discover the state of the art in architecture. Here, at the crest of the world urban-renewal ('arms') race, the Soviets practice the art of targeting other cities or bases without themselves becoming a vulnerable target. A mirroring proceeds. According to the arms negotiators from both sides, it would seem that this complex—a third the size of Greater London—will soon be emptied of missiles and become suited to more civil ends. Like Constructivist living. In the wilderness.

More sober, we confine ourselves to taking lessons from the military designers. Elsewhere in the wild, far away from cities or even those patchwork farmfields, a few railroad spurs could be linked to remote roadways connecting the very concentrated, integrated settlements advocated by the Megastructuralists in the 60s, or the Constructivists 50 years before. The entire complex connects with the outside world at the telecommunications and information-processing center (in military jargon, C³), at center top. Each surrounding base, accomodating, say, 10,000 inhabitants, functions as a unique combination of standard elements, added or removed on demand. A plug-in architecture, intermodal for integration with rail and road transport, ensues. The wilderness retains its vitality. Each settlement, though of uniform components, gains a unique and changing configuration, and all settlements in any complex connect with the world with the same instant technology enjoyed by the military. The plan is Archipenko; the on-site community-generated possibilities, Leonidov; the view from above, Malevich.

New towns need not be mini-cities, like Reston, or garden cities, like Tapiola or Benghazi. They can be inserts of industrial structure into wild terrain, ready to receive or discard components according to each localized demand—all connected with the world by the latest in transportation and communications technology.

As we observe with Benghazi's lagoon, the scale of habitat should not be human. The jungle or forest are not 'human.' Rather, the scale should be of wild and given terrain, intensifying the experience of that terrain.

Peter Fend