









We cannot state it more succinctly. This is the sequence that generally determines the cultural agenda. It starts with the assessment that the end of growth is in sight, that there are signs of recession or retrogression; then, peoples' minds start filling with fear as the rhetoric of doom spreads, until, finally, sweeping measures are enacted everywhere — restructurings, evasions, budgetary cutbacks and cancellations. Above all, a mentality develops in which the new, the strange, the different, in short the surprising, is no longer held in esteem, but rather is perceived as a threat. Protectionism, xenophobia, conservatism and frugality become the primary forces. What started out as a narrow-minded aberration, ascribed to extremism, suddenly becomes bon ton.

People cannot accept shrinkage. Since the beginning of human history, all our thoughts, every cell in our bodies, have been focused on growth, expansion, renewal, innovation. Living standards, labour productivity, consumer spending, investments, cultural agendas, assortments, scientific knowledge... where would they be without the dynamics of growth? This goes beyond the capitalistic structure as the chosen model for society. This has to do with the human condition, with wanting to live and not to die, with progressing and not degenerating. Growth is a sign of youth.

The facts of today are different, however. Despite all the banging of drums, universal shrinkage is noticeable. Human populations age, and thus energy levels decrease. Money devaluates. Natural resources are drained. Economies stagnate. Rainforests and polar icecaps are getting smaller. Budgets get tighter, the workforce shrinks. Farmland is abandoned. Architecture itself becomes more modest. And all this is starting to attract quite some attention. Shrinkage is no longer a deniable side-effect of growth but instead is seen by many people to be an overpowering reality. Shrinkage becomes a cramp. Now, all we can do is wait for the narrow-mindedness that is usually the answer to this.

Or not? Can an answer to shrinkage be found that is not inspired by conservatism, fear or short-sightedness, but rather sees the greatest of challenges in shrinkage? This is the question being asked in this issue of Archis. Or, more precisely, is it possible to design for shrinkage rather than for growth?

Maybe it is necessary to perform a mental pirouette. Because, in fact, no human activity is more estranged from shrinkage than design. In particular, architecture has so identified itself with growth-scenarios in the past hundred years that the idea that

In particular, architecture has so identified itself with growth-scenarios in the past hundred years that the idea that the opposite process can also use design is regarded as blackberry Consider population growth the growth of prosperity, hygient thing had to the past hundred years that the idea that the opposite process can also use design

In particular, architecture has so identified itself with growth-scenarios in the past hundred years that the idea that the opposite process can also use design is regarded as blasphemy. Consider: population growth, the growth of prosperity, hygiene and production, the growth of velocity and experience, everything had to be accommodated for and stimulated by architecture

In particular, architecture has so identified itself with growth-scenarios in the past hundred years that the idea hat the opposite process can also use design is regarded as blasphemy. Consider: population growth, the growth of prosperity, hygiene and production, the growth of velocity and experience, everything had to be accommodated for and stimulated by architecture.

In particular, architecture has so identified i self with growth-scenarios in the past hundred years that the idea that the opposite process can also use design is regarded as blasphemy. Consider: population growth, the growth of prosperity, hygiene and production, the growth of velocity and experience, everything had to be accommodated for and stimulated by architecture.

In particular, architecture has so identified itself with growth-scenarios in the past hundred years that the idea that the opposite process can also use design is regarded as blasshemy. Consider, population growth, the growth of properity, hygiene and production, the growth of velocity and experience, every thing had to be accommodated for and stimulated by architecture.

he just humber was that the idea that the opposite process can also us issign is segarded as bloophern. Consider population growth, the ground of prospective, beginn and production, the growth of velocity and experience scripting had to be accommendated for and stimulated by architecture.

the opposite process can also use design is regarded as blasphemy. Consider: population growth, the growth of prosperity, hygiene and production, the growth of velocity and experience, everything had to be accommodated for and stimulated by architecture. Nothing other than this could satisfy any artistic and intellectual ambition. Above all: there is money in growth, but not in shrinkage; therefore, growth is much more attractive.

A change, then, begins to become apparent in this simple opposition. The small, the miniaturised, the refined, the modest, the slow, they all come to be viewed in a different light. More than that, they begin to acquire something exclusive, a privilege, a quality. The small nestles itself in the aesthetic of things. It returns as a 'clever solution'. It is itself seen as a new scientific paradigm (nanotechnology). In addition, more recently, there is a growing realisation that more study must be done of the shrinkage process as perhaps not being by definition opposed to growth, but rather, shrinkage being an aspect of the same growth. In a network society, growth has the tendency to concentrate at junctions, in areas with a high density of people and capital.

This means that density is also reduced. Sometimes this is nothing more than a classic case of degeneration. But also, especially with a good design, the interaction can be a knife that cuts both ways, delivering a double blow in quality. The relevant question here is: Is this an insight into shrinkage as something other than the harbinger of cramp and narrow-mindedness, which is converted into action: into policy, into vision and above all into design. Is shrinkage a domain where there is not only something to be lost, but also precisely something to be gained? Is it a subject in which talent can be better utilised than in the worn-out cliché of growth, the extrapolations and *big is beautiful*?

*Crystals* Jeroen de Rîjke / Willem de Rooîj

The images on the following pages were made in reference to the films *Crystals I-IX* (2003, 15 min, 16mm colour film, mute) and *Crystals X-XII* (2003, 4 min, 16mm colour film, mute).

'Crystals' îs a series of 12 short films. They show crystallîsatîon processes: the moment when liquid becomes solîd. A drop of fluid îs put on a mîcroscopîc slîde. The glass has been pre-heated and after some tîme the preparation starts to dry. Slowly the water retreats, leaving a white residue on the glass: Crystals. Like minuscule rocks or mountain ridges, each set of crystals has a unique shape. Light reflects through a polarisation-filter that is situated under the slide, revealing relief's and filling them with colour. Black areas în the îmage are still fluîd, the coloured areas grow solid, meeting each other, searching for space.

Courtesy Galerie Daniel Buchholz, Cologne

2





