Without care, human beings would not have survived for so long on this planet. Yet, despite its relevance, these tasks have been made invisible and minimized. Perhaps the fact that they had been done mainly by women can explain this disdain. As Nancy Fraser (2016) indicates, the defense of male domination was the way in which, historically, the social relevance of caregiving tasks has been underestimated. That would reveal why housework has not been considered a formal ‘work’ and that the difference between oikos and polis has ended up becoming a characterization of genders: politics as a masculine sphere and care as a feminine one.

Today, these distinctions have lost ground. However, they persist as cultural heritages or political inertias. It is worth remembering that, as care is directed mainly towards those who cannot support themselves, the pandemic put these practices in the foreground and made the unequal distribution of these responsibilities visible. Hence, it is necessary to highlight them and raise them as a topic of discussion in the current context.

Among its many facets, architecture is one of the technologies of care. Constructions not only allow people and things to be cared for indoors, but they are also a first defense tool against the environment. They also offer places to carry our care, transfer cultural capital, or enable intergenerational contact. Not by chance, the most socially demanded architectural programs – such as houses, hospitals, or schools – are spaces for care. But architecture also allows other forms of care: not only of human beings or more-than-humans but also of the intangible institutions that humanize us, such as history, heritage, or culture.

This issue offers multiple aspects of the relationship between architecture and care. In the portfolio, we present the exhibition Meli Newen – Four Forces, in which cooperatives of Mapuche weavers made, during the pandemic, a large-scale weaving based on the sum of individual contributions. Jochamowitz and Rivera analyze the autobiography of the Peruvian neighborhood leader María Elena Moyano, discovering the relationships between architecture and care. Peliowski, León, and Saavedra state that the work of the first female architects in Chile was focused on administrative tasks and not on design. Luneke, Rasse, and Ugalde observe how the confinement during the pandemic affected the movement possibilities of those who engaged in domestic care tasks – mainly women. Puga, Moletto, and Velasco share the remarkable heritage recovery they designed and built for the Pereira Palace in Santiago. Herrmann, Parra, Figueroa, and Mora study the care of the elderly in the pandemic. Scott Rasmusson designs a circular plan house for the elderly, where all its inhabitants
have the same possibilities to enjoy the interior and the surroundings. Link, Ibarra, Matus, Méndez, and Ruiz-Tagle analyze neighborhood and domestic care relationships in the pandemic. The remarkable case of the Maestranza neighborhood, pushed for by Ukamau and designed by the FCV Office, shows how neighborhood-scale associations can manage to get state support to build homes of a standard better than usual. Mondragón and Marini present the case of the open-air schools, which raised the problem of care, isolation, and ventilation more than a hundred years ago. The Patio Vivo foundation proposes that learning and care are complementary and that architecture can be a tool that maximizes both. Manuel Herz, finally, intervenes in a memorial site in Ukraine with a synagogue that, like a book, opens for reading and closes to take care of its content.

This last example makes the architectural dynamics of care evident: a space that closes to protect itself and opens to create a common space. Just like a book, this magazine is also a space for care, not only of knowledge but also of academic debate, of difference, and, of course, the new discourses and recent productions of contemporary architecture. It is a space where these different manifestations can appear with freedom precisely because they will be treated with openness and respect. After all, the invisible work of editing and producing a magazine is a form of care: a practice that gives space for other voices to appear in the public sphere. It is a team task that, with successes and errors, but also with energy and enthusiasm, we have developed in the last twenty-one issues of ARQ. Our publishing house has an incredible group of people who silently allow this magazine and all our publications to reach you. Hopefully, we will be able to take care of this wonderful team. I owe them infinite gratitude, and, as editor-in-chief, I cannot say goodbye without thanking them publicly.

At the end of 2021, the challenges are different from those of a few decades ago. This fact may lead us to re-evaluate all of our practices. Such change in the forms, emphasis and the very sense of architecture has had space in this magazine in recent years because it seems to us that it is the biggest challenge our generation will face. History, in the end, will judge us by how we act in this moment of crisis when the most critical mission is caring for our planet since our survival depends on that. ARQ
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