

I have read the critical essay. It is clever, but from an a-priori distant view that essentially states that there are better things to consider and talk about than the things at the focus of our pavilion. In my opinion, criticizing someone for dealing with what they deal with instead of dealing with other things of even greater interest according to the opinion of the author, is the cheapest and laziest form of criticism.

The question we need to ask is whether we clarify that maximizing square meters is NOT the only aim discussed in the exhibition. I am happy that in many essays – ignored so far by all critics for the good reason that readings takes time and effort - it is clear that what is exciting are larger cultural values that are at stake. Perhaps we could have done more to promote these larger values in the main narrative on the boards of the pavilion. But the problem was time. As we move forward we (whoever is the team) must bring the larger values to the fore. Essentially the slogan is: Architecture with vision embraces and diverts even the seemingly most basic challenges towards higher aims. Not doing so, marginalizes architecture and limits it to the few clients and places that can afford 'star architects' type stuff.