Simmel, G. (1909, 1971) 'Bridge and Door', in Levine, D.N. (ed.) Simmel: On Individuality and Social Forms. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

At the beginning, I became interested in boundaries and divisions, pondering how to define things that are "visible but inaccessible." Simmel argues that a door is a movable boundary—it can open, close, or be crossed—allowing individuals to separate from or reconnect with society. Although a door symbolizes "limitation," it also offers "the possibility of perpetual exchange" (a boundary "with freedom"). This inspired me to observe the doors around Stratford and explore the question: how do we define a "door"? I found those "incomplete" doors particularly intriguing. Increased transparency enhances visibility, yet simultaneously enforces restrictions. "You can see but cannot enter," or "You are welcome to enter, but only under certain conditions." How does transparency both attract and repel?

Colomina, B. (2019) X-Ray Architecture. Zurich: Lars Müller Publishers.

Beatriz Colomina argues that modernist architecture reflects the X-ray's ability to expose internal structures (a concept tied to the spread of tuberculosis in the early 20th century), emphasizing purity, clarity, and the prevention of contamination. This association between transparency and hygiene has prompted me to reconsider the spatial attributes of Stratford. Stratford employs more transparent (glass) materials than other areas of London, carefully crafting an image of being "clean, safe, and renewed." My focus has shifted to glass doors. The glass entrances and buildings in Stratford—shopping malls, modern apartments, and office spaces—physically and symbolically embody transparency. How do glass entrances convey cleanliness, control, and order? Is the transparency of Stratford's glass architecture connected to the city's image or its history? Could the reconstruction associated with large-scale events still play a role here? As a controlled, carefully curated facade, does it align with the desire to attract investment and tourism?

Rowe, C. & Slutzky, R. (1963) 'Transparency: Literal and Phenomenal', Perspecta, 8, pp. 45–54.

Rowe and Slutzky distinguish between literal transparency and phenomenal transparency. According to them, literal transparency refers to the direct physical property of materials (such as glass) that allows light to pass through. In contrast, phenomenal transparency involves the simultaneous perception of different spatial positions, requiring the viewer to actively switch or adjust their visual and cognitive engagement to resolve the seemingly contradictory spatial relationships within an image. This led me to think about how spaces and environments allow for "multiple interpretations." They proposed two approaches: one fixes the viewer's perspective, effectively compressing space into overlapping planes (as commonly seen in Cubist paintings); the other emphasizes overall layout and multiple viewpoints, enabling the viewer to experience spatial layering as they move through or observe it. I began reflecting on whether 3D scanning could provide insights through its medium-specific properties.

In Stratford, the primary locations where glass doors are used include:

1.Stratford Station and train stations.

2.Shopping malls and stores (Westfield and surrounding areas).

3.Modern apartments (e.g., East Village/Coppermaker).

4.Office buildings (universities/government offices, etc.).

Which of these glass doors exhibit literal transparency? And which demonstrate phenomenal transparency? How do these levels of visibility relate to the nature of the spaces they inhabit?

Pallasmaa, J. (2005) The Eyes of the Skin: Architecture and the Senses. 2nd edn. Chichester: Wiley.

Pallasmaa criticizes modern architecture's obsession with "visual hegemony," arguing that "absolute transparency" or "reflective transparency" often renders buildings "opaque," symbolizing a form of "surveillance" or "exposure" where private spaces are opened to public scrutiny, turning them into vehicles for "scrutiny" and "control." I do not fully agree with Pallasmaa's critique of modern architecture. My focus is not on the architecture itself but on the influence of space on other spaces, people, or behaviors. The glass doors in Stratford are not entirely based on a "right" to observe the observed but instead take a more "reverse" approach: they use a choice of rights to allow the observed to see themselves. Notably, this delegation does not imply that rights are transferred to others but that I (as the designer of the glass door/transparent entrance) choose to present certain content to you. Therefore, compared to the "domination" mentioned in the text, I find this relationship more complex. It could be said that I have pre-placed certain information here, but whether or not it constitutes "domination," the key is that it reinforces a highly physical form of visibility, allowing such information to be perceived more intuitively. I have realized that transparency can also foster a form of mutual observation. I no longer merely capture transparent surfaces but seek to understand what is selectively revealed or hidden and how this mode of display influences the audience's interpretation.

Cullen, G. (1961) The Concise Townscape. London: Architectural Press.

Serial Vision describes the constantly shifting perspectives and sequential views we encounter as we move through a space. When navigating urban environments, new geometries, vistas, and focal points continuously emerge, appearing and disappearing dynamically—this is what is referred to as sequential vision. Cullen emphasizes how enclosure and exposure shape this unfolding visual experience. Walls, porches, and other structural elements define or divide spaces, creating "visually comprehensible and coherent parts" that guide our journey. Without these frameworks, views are neither hidden nor revealed, diminishing the sense of drama and forward momentum. He achieves a sense of wandering and interprets space through a series of photographs of landscapes. Is social media a form of sequential vision? How should I define making? Is the process of observation through media itself a form of "making"?