

Global sense is agree-able seen as the scenario of 'time space compression'. As globalization is happening all around the world, trend and technologies has opened various portals for people to be present everywhere in a sense. These portals enable different attitudes to be created within society, such as learning, philosophical, competitive, etc. Whether this has been a good thing that happened in our realm, it is subjective to how individuals see it.

Time-space compression has created this vortex or knowledge that you can see specific identity to appear not only at their homeland, but somewhere else you never expect. In architecture realm, this has brought the vision of designers to a larger scale of vision where we understand how design responds to different climate and context. It is this attitude of sharing that force the evolution of architecture to be questioned through the timeline. Designs has no longer be constrain based on their places. For example, you can see how the trend of skyscrapers evolved from tall blocks, to parametric architectures that you can see in different countries by MAD Architects, Frank Gehry, or late Zaha Hadid. This architecture style has no specific context to be in existence.

However, there is an issue that we have been facing especially through this era. What is the definition and value behind that architecture that we are able to work with our context? How do we make both these knowledge and context coherent into one design? It is mainstream that now people would appreciate this 'time-space compression' as a means to 'copy-paste' ideas, but not understanding the process behind it. We, not always but however replicate things we see nice, we do things that seems workable to others, but we never question the sense of local and suitability. Designers nowadays should make use of this 'time-space compression' as a medium of advantage to understand the attitude and strategies behind them, not by the literal aesthetic visual of them.

Sadly, this is what happening in most of our precedent studies. We often question how ideas work in their context and if it is workable, we just replicate them. But we seldom insert the locality of method into this design. And as a means to end this synopsis, this article sums up 2 simple questions that we could all always keep in mind;

How is this relating to the local value? How do we envision that particular place to be in 10years time?

There is always a question that struck my mind; deep down in the field of architecture, what else is there that defined the term 'architecture' other than blocks of buildings? In fact as a normal person, that is what we perceive directly as an environment of living. This article opens up another perspective of looking architecture as an environment living.

It is true that architecture is a man-made realm, an extension of the living planes, and an enhancement of sensory through different strategies. It is common to say what is nice to build and what is not, but the real question stated is: how does this design potentially be a transaction between the body, imagination and environment? How can we find a coherent existence of 3 realms into one?

Thus we can now see architecture not just as urban blocks, but a medium for us to realize our sensory, explore possible realms that sparks between the marriages of different senses; it is almost infinite!

To answer the question of the role played by architecture in changing humanity, this medium indirectly, unconsciously shape human into different behavior and energy. We can see how various strategies potentially use senses to blend different community together into one scenography. As we know a scenography consist of settings, sound, visual, characters, motion, etc. to form a scene, this same goes to architecture. And when different scene flows from one to another, it creates multiple dramas that bring different messages to the society that reflect what humanity should be. It is easy to blend senses within a block, but can senses blend between blocks and context? If it is made possible, it would be a healing city where different dramas are seen happening interactively.

In the urbanized city formed with numerous blocks of different functions, it is undeniable that an identity must be addressed to each building to be recognized by the public. This identity can be seen as a form of symbol, but defined and interpreted in different manner.

As we look through the timeline we can see how signboards are translated literally from fonts and words, to shapes and form of the identity, also known as logo. For example, we can see how Pizza Hut uses a hut in their logo as to recognizable by that icon. KFC uses an icon of its founder, Kentucky as a logo of their own, where as Randy's Donuts uses a literal donut as their signboard. These characteristics make people easy recognizable by their translation of signboards, colors, and logo.

In nowadays era, identity of buildings are slowly moving towards the interpretation of the form of building itself. Some design it in a literal manner, for example the Medium Market Basket Company made their building into a literal basket form. Whereas another way of translating identity into their design is Harbin Opera House, where they formulated the energy going around site and also through music, and interpreted that fluidity into their building design. Thus people wont directly see it as an opera house, but rather recognize it from the fluidity of form and spaces. Not only these identity is translated on the exterior, but also within interior spaces as to circulate movement as the translation of music motions.

To bring this topic further to question the role of symbol in future architecture, should they be a literal symbol from the exterior, or also a translation integrated to form, spaces organizations and also circulations? There are no definite answers but a discourse worth to start up.