# CONTEMPORANEITY AND ARCHITECTURE

> The contemporary is he who firmly holds his gaze on his own time so as to perceive not its light, but rather its darkness.
>
> Giorgio Agamben

> The trouble, however, is that we seem to be neither equipped nor prepared for this activity of thinking, of settling down in the gap between past and future. For very long times in our history, actually throughout the thousands of years that followed upon the foundation of Rome and were determined by Roman concepts, this gap was bridged over by what, since the Romans, we have called tradition. That this tradition has worn thinner and thinner as the modern age progressed is a secret to nobody. When the thread of tradition finally broke, the gap between past and future ceased to be a condition peculiar only to the activity of thought and restricted as an experience to those few who made thinking their primary business. It became a tangible reality and perplexity for all; that is, it became a fact of political relevance.
>
> Kafka mentions the experience, the fighting experience gained by "him" who stands his ground between the clashing waves of past and future. This experience is an experience in thinking [...] and it can be won, like all experience in doing something, only trough practice, through exercises. (In this, as in other respects, this kind of thinking is different from such mental processes as deducing, inducing, and drawing conclusions whose logical rules of non-contradiction and inner consistency can be learned once and for all and then need only to be applied.) The following six essays are such exercises, and their only aim is to gain experience in how to think; they do not contain prescriptions on what to think or which truths to hold.
>
> Hannah Arendt, *Between Past and Future*

## Course Description

The Italian philosopher Giorgio Agamben suggests that the true contemporaries are "those who do not allow themselves to be blinded by the lights of the century, and so manage to get a glimpse of the shadows in those lights, of their intimate obscurity. [...] It is as if this invisible light that is the darkness of the present casts its shadow on the past, so that the past, touched by this shadow, acquired the ability to respond to the darkness of the now." A more limiting definition of contemporaneity equates the term to what is Modern, characteristic of the present period, even "up-to-date, ultra-modern", or to designate art, furniture, decoration or buildings that have a "markedly avant-garde quality." Combined, these

definitions of contemporaneity point to both the century′s lights and their shadows. Playing between the narrow sense of contemporaneity and its deeper reaches, this Thesis Research and Design Studio will provide opportunities to investigate and reflect upon current approaches and discourses so as to foreground their bearing on the definition of the cultural role of architecture in the contemporary world. If, as Agamben suggests, ″the contemporary is the one whose eyes are struck by the beam of darkness that comes from his own time,″ we will work to identify the lights of our century and endeavor not to place ourselves in their beam but rather seek to engage the depth of their shadow. In short, we will engage theoretically, historically and practically in the humble pursuit of contemporaneity in architecture.

The studio will address the epistemological, the phenomenological and the socio-political grounds of architecture. By epistemological, we refer to the ambition to question the very foundations of contemporary architecture and to gain an awareness of the different forces that inflect contemporary practice. These include globalization, faith in technology, suspicion of criticality, and neo-liberalism insofar as they all bear both potential benefits as well as their share of shadow. This may mean considering architecture as it is epistemologically cast against a certain conception of time, whether global time, accelerated time, progressive time or the multiplicity of times. By phenomenological, we are referring to the very materiality of the projects we design, regardless of their scale, and the fact that these have a life that unfolds as we experience them and as they continue to be affected by time (for example bearing the traces of historical, natural and phenomenal weathering). By socio-political, we refer to the condition of our architectural projects as social artifacts, and the necessity to take into consideration how our designs and constructions are informed and transformed by their varying socio-political contexts.

The studio will privilege the creation of a forum within which you can each identify what you are personally interested in, even passionate about. The topics, means and realms of investigation are yours to identify. You may chose to investigate the cultural role of architecture through a design research thesis or in a predominantly written research thesis; you may choose to use pencil, hammer, computer, 3d printer or robot to work with; you may chose to focus on different scales and work on a joint, an interaction between material and user, a room, a home, a neighborhood, a city's network or a larger landscape; and your approach may be poetic, computational, historical, theoretical, iterative or a mix thereof. What is important is that you critically address the cultural role of architecture as it plays out in the shadow of progress, efficiency and productivity. I then assist you in searching for the resources that can both support and challenge you in your research.

**Objectives**

The main objective is to enable you to posit a clear thesis question that you can then continue to investigate in a self-directed manner during the following semesters. This objective represents the synthesis of three interrelated tasks: (1) research and documentation of precedents in the form of case study and literature review; (2) consideration of the means available to critically define your own approach to your architectural masters research; and (3) the delineation of the particular scope, program and site of your architectural research positioning your project within a larger cultural context.

As such, you will:
- Develop critical thinking;
- Improve research skills and graphic skills, as well as verbal and writing skills;
- Gain a greater awareness of the societal role of the architect in our culturally diverse world;
- Develop a better understanding of different trends and traditions through history and theory;
- Continue to refine your design skills, program preparation and site design approaches;
- Be able to define an approach to architectural practice in its social, political and cultural context.

**Structure**

The studio will be set up as a series of exercises and their synthesis, divided in two subsections: (S) setting and (T) thesis project.

In **SETTING**, you will be guided through (1) your literature review and intellectual context, (2) a selection of precedents and their critical study, (3) the consideration of means and approaches and (4) their impact on your project and its site. The work produced over these first eight weeks will be reviewed regularly, and continuously worked upon until its presentation at the mid-term review and beyond.

**S1**: will consider **Context** and **Intentions** to start to map out your intellectual and theoretical setting;
   (*see assignment description pages 4 to 7*)

**S2**: will focus on **Precedents** and **Process** to critically study precedents and draw from them;
   (*see assignment description pages 8 to 10*)

**S3**: will study **Practices** and **Program** to further define the scope and context of your intervention;
   (*see assignment description pages 11 to13*)

**S4**: will investigate **Site** and **Architecture** to position your project in relation to your specific intentions.
   (*see assignment description pages 14 and 15*)

In **THESIS PROJECT**, you will be guided through the first definition of your project. Over the last four weeks of the term, you will work towards the materialization of (1) your proposal in the form of a project, whether designed or written. You will also produce (2) an outline of your thesis that will encompass both the work produced over the term and the work projected for the completion of your Masters thesis over successive terms. (*see assignments description page 16*)

**T1**: will consist in a four-week **Research** and **Design** exercise

**T2**: will integrate the production of your thesis **Outline** and **Synthesis as prolegomenon**.

**Evaluation**

You will be evaluated on:

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Participation | 10% | - participation in the seminar, reviews, attendance and preparation; |
| mid review (Setting 1-4) | 40% | - quality of presentation: structure, synthesis, depth, content (A1-4); |
| final review (Thesis 1-2) | 20% | - quality of presentation: structure, synthesis, depth, content (A5-6); |
| Final thesis document | 30% | - 5% thesis statement and abstract; |

   10% depth of investigation (project and text);
   5% structure and clarity;
   5% references, bibliography, case study; timetable, milestones;
   and 5% ongoing development of the thesis throughout the semester;

## SCHEDULE

| SEPTEMBER | 0 | | 9/9 *This is a Wednesday*<br>**TRD1 PRESENTATION + INTRODUCTION 1:30 [ML]**<br>Lottery Umbrella Topics | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Orientation Week | | | | |
| Classes Begin | 1 | **15/9**<br>10am - 12:00 "What is a Thesis" [LOFT]<br>1pm: Studio Introduction and Abstracts Presentation<br>Introduction S1 / Assignment 1<br>**S1 CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK:**<br>**CONTEXT AND INTENTIONS** | **17/9**<br>**W1 LITERATURE SEARCH WORKSHOP [EC]**<br>10am - 12:00 **W1** Effie Patelos [UW Musagetes Library]<br>1pm – 2pm   All School Meeting [ML]<br>2pm – 4pm   Academic Integrity and Ethics [ML]<br>4pm:        DESK CRITS | |
| **DATAlab Drone Workshop**, 21/9, 5-8 [Frank Sedlar]<br>**InDesign Workshop,** 21/9, 8-9 [El Khafif, Van Leur] | 2 | **22/9**<br>10am PRESENTATIONS and RESPONSES | **24/9**<br>DESK CRITS | |
| | 3 | **29/9**<br>10am  **INTERNAL REVIEW A1** [LOFT]<br>5pm  Introduction S2 / Assignment 2<br>**S2 PRECEDENTS AND PROCESS** | **01/10**<br>DESK CRITS | |
| **OCTOBER**<br><br>Drop/no penalty period ends 02/10 | 4 | **06/10**<br>10am – 1pm  Group Review Part 1 (10 in 10 minutes)<br>2pm        DESK CRITS | **08/10**<br>DESK CRITS | |
| | 5 | **13/10**<br>10am  **INTERNAL REVIEW A2** [LOFT]<br>5pm  Introduction S3 / Assignment 3<br>**S3 LITERATURE REVIEW:**<br>**PRACTICES AND PROGRAM** | **15/10**<br>**W2 LITERATURE REVIEW WORKSHOP [EC]**<br>10am - 12:00 **W2** Effie Patelos [UW Musagetes Library]<br>DESK CRITS | |
| | 6 | **20/10**<br>DESK CRITS | **22/10**<br>**L2 GUEST LECTURE DESIGN RESEARCH [NN]**<br>10am  **INTERNAL REVIEW A3** [FL]<br>4pm  Introduction S4 / Assignment 4<br>**S4 SITE AND ARCHITECTURE**<br>**POSITIONING YOUR PROJECT** | |
| | 7 | **27/10**<br>6pm: **HAND IN digital version of BOOK** | **29/10**<br>DESK CRITS<br>**W3 WOKSHOP** (to be determined) | |
| **NOVEMBER** | 8 | **03/11**<br>DESK CRITS<br>**W3 WORKSHOP** (to be determined) | **05/11**<br>DESK CRITS | |
| | 9 | **10/11**<br>**MID REVIEW [LOFT]**<br>Presentation of A1-A4 | **12/11**<br>10am  **T1 THESIS PROJECT**<br>Introduction T1 / Assignment 5 | |
| | 10 | **17/11**<br>DESK CRITS | **19/11**<br>DESK CRITS | |
| | 11 | **24/11**<br>DESK CRITS | **26/11**<br>DESK CRITS | |
| **DECEMBER**<br><br>Lectures end 04/12 | 12 | **01/12**<br>DESK CRITS | **03/12**<br>DESK CRITS | |
| | 13 | **08/12**<br>10am **T2 THESIS OUTLINE**<br>**SYNTHESIS AS PROLEGOMENON**<br>Introduction T2 / Assignment 6 | **10/12**<br>DESK CRITS<br>*Exams Start* | **11/12**<br>**FINAL REVIEW [LOFT]** |
| | 14 | **15/12**<br>DESK CRITS (optional) | **17/12**<br>**THESIS OPEN STUDIO**<br>Digital and Poster Submission | |
| Grades due 08/12-03/01 | 15 | **22/12**<br>**DIGITAL SUBMISSION A1-A6**<br>*Exams End* | **24/12** | |

*The schedule is open for adjustments. Please see schedule announced in assignments. Changes will be discussed during class time. Further information:* http://gradcalendar.uwaterloo.ca/page/GSO-Academic-Deadlines-and-Events
**ML= Main Lecture Hall, EC= Eclass, FL= Founder's Lounge, L= Loft, WR= Ward Room, 226= Seminar Room 226**

**SETTING**

---

**S1. CONTEXT AND INTENTIONS**

*What is the cultural role of architecture?* As an introduction to the themes of the studio, we will survey current architecture debates on the use and abuse of theory, on the relevance or irrelevance of history, and on the notions of creativity and productivity. In relation to your individual thesis, this first stage involves the delineation of a theoretical framework within which your thesis will be given form. In this first exercise, you will be asked to present your abstract, to gather references and initiate your literature review. The objective is to gain awareness of the intellectual framework and your position within or against it. Most importantly, the intention is to enable you to identify and formulate a thesis question that is rooted in what you yourself value as being critically important. What have been the most challenging projects in your architectural education? What are the topics or issues that seem vital to you? What do you want to work on and how do you want to approach it?

You will be presenting your general field of inquiry and guided in the formulation of a thesis question as it is cast against – but also disturbs – this field of inquiry.

Your work will include:
1. Readings and presentations;
2. Initiation of literature review, bibliography and glossary;
3. Identification of precedents for S2.
4. Formulation of thesis question.

**SCHEDULE**

September 15:
   10am: "What is a thesis" discussion at BRIDGE
   1pm: Students' presentation of abstract; introduction context, and S1
September 17:
    10am: Literature search Workshop with Effie Patelos
   1pm: All School Meeting
   2pm: Academic integrity and Ethics workshop
   4pm: Individual meeting to discuss thesis context (field, relevant literature, key questions)
**September 21, 8pm: InDesign Workshop (this is a Monday)**
September 22:
   **Oral Presentations**
   Each student presents one reading and three authors (one presenter/one respondent);
   Each student will present one or two key readings in relation to the general contemporary field within which they are situating their thesis question. Prior to the presentation, you will have to select an article and circulate it to the class. We will continue to upload texts or build a reference library for the group. Half of the class will be presenting on Tuesday morning, the other half on Tuesday afternoon. Each student presenting in the morning will be coupled to a student presenting in the afternoon: they will act as the primary respondent to each other's presentations. As a respondent, you will carefully read the text circulated by your classmate, you will formulate one to three critical questions, and also suggest at least one additional reading which either undermines or reinforces the position defended in the text circulated by your classmate.

**Format:** This is strictly an oral presentation, with printed texts and images if necessary. Bring books, print outs, reproductions, photocopies. Whatever you need to refer to should ideally be on the table. Each student will have 10 minutes maximum to present; followed by 5 minutes questions and answers between respondent and presenter. We will allocate a maximum of 20 to 25 minutes pre group of presenters.

September 24:

Individual meetings

September 29:

Presentations (field of inquiry, commented bibliography, dominant questions & criticism)

\* \***You must submit your digital presentation by 10pm on September 28.**

\* \*You are required to **bring 2 letter size printouts at 10am on September 29.**

Your presentation should not exceed 15 minutes to allow for a group discussion. Bring any relevant material to the table, and prepare a presentation that includes graphic materials, text and important quotes. Your presentation will include between 10 to 15 slides in the following sequence:

**1**: working thesis title + working thesis question

**2**: updated thesis abstract;

**3**: a page identifying the context, or age, within which you position yourself and your thesis. Is it in the digital age, the age of the anthropocene, the global age, the late-modern world or the age of humanism?

**4-6**: zoom into key words of your abstract and point to some of the references uncovered and explored so far. These three slides should cover at least three key terms or concepts; Within this section, you must refer to at least **six** important sources that you have explored so far, and describe how you position yourself in relation to their writings or their works;

**7-9**: zoom in on at least three key works that you have come across. These may be actual projects, site studies, or approaches to practice that intersect with your specific research interests. Briefly describe how each one of these projects is relevant to your research.

**10**: The next slide will include a glossary of terms, cover at least 3 concepts and define them with acknowledged sources (historians, architects, dictionaries, etc.). You will continuously be updating your glossary over the course of the semester.

**11**. In the next section you will present your working annotated bibliography. Distinguish between the works you have consulted and those that you intend on consulting. For each work in each category, briefly describe the authors' position, the context in which they are writing, what the work is covering, and how it is relevant to your own research.

**12**: The last section is to project your work in the next assignment. List a minimum of 5 and up to 10 projects that you consider to be valuable precedents for your own research.

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Classes Begin | **1** | **15/9**<br>10am - 12:00 "What is a Thesis" [LOFT]<br>   1pm: Studio Introduction and Abstracts Presentation<br>      Introduction S1 / Assignment 1<br>      **S1 CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK:**<br>         **CONTEXT AND INTENTIONS** | **17/9**<br>**W1 LITERATURE SEARCH WORKSHOP [EC]**<br>10am - 12:00 **W1** Effie Patelos [UW Musagetes Library]<br>   1pm – 2pm   All School Meeting [ML]<br>   2pm – 4pm   Academic Integrity and Ethics [ML]<br>   4pm:          DESK CRITS |
| **21/8_ 8pm**<br>**In Design** | **2** | **22/9**<br>10am PRESENTATIONS and RESPONSES | **24/9**<br>DESK CRITS |
| | **3** | **29/9**<br>10am  **INTERNAL REVIEW A1** [LOFT]<br>   5pm  Introduction S2 / Assignment 2<br>      **S2 PRECEDENTS AND PROCESS** | **01/10**<br>DESK CRITS |

**Readings on Contemporaneity**

| Giorgio Agamben, "What is the Contemporary", in *What is an Apparatus and other essays*, trans David Kishik and Stefan Pedatella, Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2009, pp. 39-54.

__ Hartmut Rosa, "Social Acceleration: Ethical and Political Consequences of a Desynchronized High-Speed Society", *Constellations,* vol. 10, no. 1, 2003, pp. 3-33.

__ Friedrich Nietzsche, *On the Advantage and Disadvantage of History for Life,* trans. Peter Preuss, Cambridge: Hackett Publishing Company, 1980 .

__Theodor Adorno, *Prisms,* Cambridge, MA:MIT Press, 1997, pp. 17-35.

__Hannah Arendt, "The concept of history, ancient and modern", *Between Past and Future,* New York:Penguin Books, 1993, pp. 41-90.

__David Harvey, *The Condition of Postmodernity: An Enquiry into the Origins of Cultural Change,* London: Wiley Blackwell, 1992

__Paul Connerton, *How Modernity Forgets, C*ambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009

__Marshall Berman, *All that is Solid Melts into Air: The Experience of Modernity,* Penguin, 1988

__ Jurgen Habermas, "Modernity – An Incomplete Project", In the *Anti-Aesthetic*, ed. Hal Foster, New York: The New Press, 1998, pp. 1-15.

__Alan Colquhoun, "Three kinds of Historicism" in *Modernity and the Classical Tradition, Architectural Essays*, 1980-87, Cambridge: MIT Press, 1989, pp. 3-1


**Readings on Contemporary Discourse | Criticality and Post-Criticality, Marx and its Specters**

| K. Michael Hays, "Critical Architecture: Between culture and form," *Perspecta  23*, Vol. 21, 1984, pp.14-29.

| George Baird, "Criticality and Its Discontents," *Crossover. Architecture Urbanism Technology,* Rotterdam: 010 Publishers, 2006, pp.648-659.

| Reinhold Martin, "Critical of What? Toward a Utopian Realism, *Harvard Deisng Magazine 22,* Spring Summer 2005, pp. 104-109.

| Reinhold Martin, "Moment of Truth", *Log 7,* 2006, pp. 15-20.

--- Michael Speaks, "Theory was interesting…but now we have work," *Architecture Research Quarterly 6* (3), 2002, pp.  209-212.

--- Robert Somol and Sarah Whiting, "Notes around the Doppler Effect and other Moods of Modernism," *Perspecta 33,* 2002, pp. 72-77.

--- Bruno Latour, "Why Has Critique Run out of Steam? From Matters of Fact to Matters of Concern," *Critical Inquiry 30*m Winter 2004, pp.  225-248.

__Arie Graafland, "On Criticality", *in Crossover. Architecture Urbanism Technology,* Rotterdam: 010 Publishers, 2006, pp. 688-703.

__K. Michael Hays, "Architecture Theory, Media, and the Question of Audience", *Assemblage 27,* 1995, pp. 41-46.

__Reinhold Martin, "Critical of What?" *Harvard Design Magazine* 22, 2005, pp. 104-108.

__Georges Teyssot,"Heterotopias and the History of Spaces", in *Architecture Theory since 1968,* ed. K. Michael Hays, Cambridge (MA): MIT Press, 2000, pp. 296-305.

__Kenneth Frampton, "Towards a Critical Regionalism: Six Points for an Architecture of Resistance", in *The Anti-Aesthetics, Essays on Post-Modern Culture,* ed. Hal Foster, New Press, 2002, pp. 16-30.


**Readings on Contemporary Discourse: Globalization, Productivity and Architectural Reification**

| Rem Koolhaas, "Junkspace," in *October 100,* 2002, pp. 175-190.

| Fredric Jameson, "Future City", *New Left Review 21,* 2003, pp. 65-79

| Hans Ibelings, "Grade Zero", in *After Crisis, Contemporary Architecture Conditions,* Zurich: Lars Müller Publisher, 2011, pp. 28-33.

| Keller Easterling, "We will be Making Active Form", John Wiley & Son, 2012, pp. 58-63

--- Keller Easterling, "Zone: The Spatial Softwares of Extrastatecraft", *The Design Observer Group, http://places.designobserver.com/feature/zone-the-spatial-softwares-of-extrastatecraft/34528/*

---Ellen Dunham-Jones, "Rem Koolhaas and the 1990s", in *Architecture and Capitalism,* ed. Peggy Deamer, London: Routledge, 2014, pp. 150-69.

---Michael Sorkin, "Afterword: Architecture without Capitalism" in *Architecture and Capitalism,* ed. Peggy Deamer, London: Routledge, 2014, pp. 217-220.

__ Fredric Jameson, "Globalization and Architecture", in *The Domestic and the Foreign in Architecture,* Rotterdam: 010 Publishers, 2007, pp. 94-122.

---Michael Speaks, "Design Intelligence and the New Economy," *Architectural Record,* 2002, pp. 72-79.

__Marc Augé, "From Places to Non-Places," in *non-places: introduction to an anthropology of supermodernity,* New York and London: Verso, 1995, pp. 75-120.

__Guy Debord, *Society of the Spectacle,* London: Rebel Press.

__Dalibor Vesely, *Architecture in the Age of Divided Representation*, Cambridge (MA): The MIT Press, 2004.

__Jeremy Till, "Scarcity contra Austerity", *The Design Observer Group,* posted 10.08.12: http://places.designobserver.com/feature/scarcity-contra-austerity/35638/

__ Saskia Sassen, "Cities in Today's Global Age", *SAIS Review XXIX* (1), 2009, pp. 3-34.

--- Keller Easterling, "Enduring Innocence", *The Grey Room,* vol 7, 2002, pp. 106-113.

--- Saskia Sassen, "The Global Street, *Making* the Political", *Globalization 8* (5), pp. 573-79.

__Peter Sloterdijk, *In the World Interior of Capital: Towards a Philosophical Theory of Globalization,* Polity, 2013.

## S2. PRECEDENTS AND PROCESS

*What do we do when we do "architecture"? How do we define the means and sites of architecture? What are the implications of these different means on architectural practice?* Grounded in a larger discussion of the means and processes used to define the delineates the sites of architecture (data collection, geographical analysis, historical analysis, mappings), but also from a survey of the implications of the means employed on the development of the project (whether this traditional craft, parametric design, algorithms, diagrams, community involvement, etc), this second exercise is an opportunity to critically consider the process followed to define your approach to sites, projects and practice more generally. Do you draw, model, build or diagram? Do you conduct interviews or question materials? Think about the means you are privileging: Are you using those you know or are limited too? Are you *choosing* your means? Do the means employed inform the outcome? Do they inform the question? How do you define your *approach* to your setting? How to you gather, store, present, transform and work the information on your thesis and its potential site? Are you interested in pushing boundaries? Is the topic you are considering 'new' or is it 2000 years old? Is your approach disciplinary or is it in dialogue with other fields of inquiry? If so, how do you establish a relation across these disciplines?

In these two weeks, we will continue to work on your thesis questions and literature review as we critically consider precedents in relation to their intellectual and disciplinary contexts, their means, scopes and sites. This is an opportunity both to broaden your understanding of the different means you may chose to work with and to be critical of some of the opportunities and limits inherent to these processes.

Your work will include:
1. Identification of ten precedents of interest to you in relation to your proposed topic of research;
2. Presentation of two examples of collecting and using information in relation to three precedents;
3. Graphic and written analysis of three most significant precedents with attention to site, means, program and scope;
4. In preparation for S4, speculate on your own thesis site given the precedents and means you selected.

## SCHEDULE:

**September 29**:
        5pm: Hand out assignment S2; selection of texts to present
**October 1st**:
        Desk individual reviews for selection of means (min. 3 applications or projects to present).
        *Think about the precedents, means and process in relation to site, context and intentions.*
**October 6**:
        Through the presentation of 10 precedents, critically consider your own approach to analysis.
        Each student prepares a 10-minute presentation on approaches they are interested in.
        Format each precedent on one 11 x 17 sheet and bring 2 copies (one legal, and one 11x17).
        **\*\*You must submit your digital presentation by 10pm on October 5**
        **\*\*You must bring two printout of your presentation (one letter size, the other 11" x 17")**
        **Format:**
        Each precedent will be laid out on a two-page spread and will include the following information:
        1. At least one good image of the project

2. Author, location and date of design and/or completion
3. Context, program, intention and scope of the project
4. A paragraph explaining your own interest in this project in relation to your thesis
5. At least one drawing pulling out the information that is most critical to your own thesis interest.

**October 8**:
Desk review

**October 13**:
**\*\*You must submit your digital presentation by 10pm on October 12**
**\*\*You must bring two printout of your presentation (one letter size, the other 11" x 17").**
Your presentation will include your 10 commented case studies, critical analysis of selected examples, both based on your personal documentation (through textual or graphic means) of the projects studied.  Finally, you will also speculate on how your thesis project can materialize at the intersection of the theories, means and examples that you studied so far. This application should also speculate on the form of a built exploration, whether crafted, digitally fabricated or both. This will set the stage for S4.
Your presentation will consist of three parts.
**Part 1 | 10 case studies:**
Include 10 relevant case studies, with one key drawing for each, and one paragraph (as previous);
**Part 2 | Detailed analysis:**
Present your analysis of selected project(s) (minimum of 3 spreads, to include drawing, text and references). You must justify your selection in relation to your thesis interest. (i.e. is this about the site? the program? the process and means employed? the social-cultural context?)
**Part 3 | Speculative study**
Learning from the case study, speculate on your own site and means (minimum one study).

| | 3 | 29/9<br>10am  **INTERNAL REVIEW A1** [LOFT]<br>5pm  Introduction S2 / Assignment 2<br>        **S2 PRECEDENTS AND PROCESS** | 01/10<br>DESK CRITS |
|---|---|---|---|
| **OCTOBER**<br><br>Drop/no penalty<br>period ends 02/10 | 4 | 06/10<br>10am – 1pm  Group Review Part 1 (10 in 10 minutes)<br>2pm            DESK CRITS | 08/10<br>DESK CRITS |
| | 5 | 13/10<br>10am  **INTERNAL REVIEW A2** [LOFT]<br>5pm  Introduction S3 / Assignment 3<br>        **S3 LITERATURE REVIEW:**<br>        **PRACTICES AND PROGRAM** | 15/10<br>**W2 LITERATURE REVIEW WORKSHOP [EC]**<br>10am - 12:00 **W2** Effie Patelos [UW Musagetes Library]<br>DESK CRITS |

**Readings on Contemporary Processes: Gathering, Storing, Using and Transforming Information**
 | Alberto Pérez-Gomez, "Ethics and Poetics in Architectural Praxis", *Crossover. Architecture Urbanism Technology*, Rotterdam: 010 Publishers, 2006, pp. 676-87.
 | Robin Evans, "Translations from Drawing to Building", in *Translations from Drawing to Building and Other Essays,* Cambridge: MIT Press, 1997, pp. 153-193.
 | Mario Carpo, *Alphabet and the Algorithm,* "Preface", "The Fall" and "Epilogue",  MIT Press, 2011, pp. ix-xi and 81-128.
 | Anthony Vidler, "Diagram of Diagrams: Architectural Abstraction and Modern Representation," *Representations 72,* 2000, pp. 1-20.
 | James Corner, "The Agency of Mapping" in *Mappings,* ed. by Dennis Cosgrove, Critical Views, London: Reaktion, 1999.
 | Stan Allen, "Diagrams Matter," in *Diagram Work, ANY No. 23*, eds. Ben van Berkel and Caroline Bos,

1998, pp. 15-26.

| Eyal Weizman, "Forensic Architecture: Notes from Fields and Forum, *Documenta 13,* 2001, pp. 2-42.

---Eyal Weizman, "Lethal Theory", *Open 18,* 2009, pp. 80-99.

---Stan Allen, "Mapping the unmappable: on notation," in *Practice: Architecture, Technique and Representation,* New York: Routledge, 2000, pp. 31-45.

---Mark Wigley, "Network Fever," *Grey Room 4,* 2001, pp. 82-122.

--- Branko Kolarevik, *Architecture in the Digital Age: Design and Manufacturing,* "Digital Morphogenesis", "Digital Production", "Information Master Builders", London: Taylor & Francis, 2005, pp. 1-62.

--- Neri Oxman, "Digital Craft: Fabrication-Based Design in the Age of Digital Production", in Workshop Proceedings for Ubicomp 2007: International Conference on Ubiquitous Computing. September; Innsbruck, Austria; pp. 534-538.

---Michael Hansel, "Designing Morpho-Ecologies: Versatility and Vicissitude of Heterogeneous Space," Architectural Design 78 (2), 2008, pp. 102-11.

__Mark Burry, "Between Intuition and Process: Parametric Design and Rapid Prototyping", in *Architecture in the Digital Age: Design and Manufacturing,* London: Taylor & Francis, 2005 pp. 148-162.

__Michael Weinstock, "Metabolism and Morphology," *Architectural Design 78* (2), 2008, pp. 26-33.

__Thomas Mayne, *Combinatory Urbanism: The Complex Behaviour of Collective Form,* Stray Dog Cafe, 2011.

__Kostas Terzidis, "The Etymology of Design: Pre-Socratic Perspective," *Design Issues* 23, *(*4), 2007, pp. 69-78.

__Manuel de Landa, "Deleuze and the Use of the Genetic Algorithm in Architecture," in Neil Leach, *Designing for a Digital World,* London, 2002, pp. 117-120.

__Achim Menges, "Manufacturing Performance", *Architectural Design 78* (2), 2008, pp. 42-47.

__Achim Menges, "Manufacturing Diversity" *Architectural Design 76* (2), 2006, pp. 70-77.

__Lisa Iwamoto, *Digital Fabrications: Architectural and Material Techniques,* Princeton Architectural Press, 2009.

__Akos Moravanszky, "Power Lines", *Crossover. Architecture Urbanism Technology*, Rotterdam: 010 Publishers, 2006, pp. 660-75.

__Marshall McLuhan, "The Medium is the Message," and "Media Hot and Cold," in *Understanding Media: The Extensions of Man,* New York: McGraw Hill, 1964, pp. 7-32.

__ Robert Somol, " Diagrams of Matter," in *Diagram Work, ANY No. 23*, eds. Ben van Berkel and Caroline Bos, 1998, pp. 15-26.

## S3. PRACTICES AND PROGRAM / Literature Review

*How does architecture communicate?* Investigating different domains that have been staked for architecture - whether sculpture, landscape or infrastructure – this third exercise calls for the creation of an architectural lining to the theoretical cast. This probe will take the form of a material investigation of the selected theoretical field and the site drawn as they inform a certain manifestation of architecture. In which zone of the spectrum of architectural practices will you situate your project? What form - sculpture, infrastructure, landscape, criticism, joint, ornament or urbanism - will your project take? As we are moving back in the field, what are some of the established 'categories of practices', what are their processes and "programs"? How about yours?

Through this exercise you will *define the scope of your architectural intervention* with the awareness of the different domains that have been staked for architecture (from joint to landscape urbanism, from the home to the public space, from the facade to the larger territories). Think about the scope of your project and its program, both in relation to your intellectual setting, privileged means and potential site. As you refine your thesis topic, your work will include (1) the research and presentation of relevant case studies (projects, essays, articles, books, installations, etc.); (2) continuing the documentation of case study as well as your literature review; and also (3), a material investigation speculating on how your architectural project could be informed by your thesis question, the means your privilege, as well as the site and the approach you are considering.

For this assignment you will collect and update all the relevant work and material covered so far and present it in a book format. The speculation on your intervention, which can be undertaken in any way you choose, must also be represented in some way in your book draft. This assignment has two components:

**1**: Drawings/constructions/projective thinking

**In any format you wish**, you are ask to speculate on your site, the means you employ, the approach you privilege, the question you are interested in and the program that enables you to address it. The form of your exploration will depend on your specific interest. This could be a drawing (a mapping of the site, exploration of the program and scope of project, analytical diagrams), it could also be built (exploration of materiality, craft, fabrication method, etc), or it could be a critical text (pointed historical study, theoretical survey, building analysis, etc). You will be presenting this work on October 22.

**2**: Thesis Book draft

The second component will contain everything you have been working on in an updated form, and formatted in a book. It must include the following information:
      1. title;
      2. abstract;
      3. literature review that integrates references to context, means, approaches and precedents;
      4. precedent study within which you critically position your own approach and intention;
      5. critical presentation of your own site, scope of work, means and intention;
      6. reproduction of at least one key drawing, model, or essay from your ongoing investigation.

**October 13:**
        5pm: presentation of assignment S3
**October 15:**
        desk reviews
**October 20:**
        desk reviews
**October 22:**
        Group review: Present your updated abstract and explorative work (which projects into S4).
        Your presentation should not exceed 10 minutes to allow for discussion.
**October 27:**
        No Class.
        **\* \* \*Hand in digital version of book by 6 pm on October 27**

**SCHEDULE:**

| | 5 | 13/10<br>10am **INTERNAL REVIEW A2** [LOFT]<br> 5pm Introduction S3 / Assignment 3<br>    **S3 LITERATURE REVIEW:**<br>      **PRACTICES AND PROGRAM** | 15/10<br>**W2 LITERATURE REVIEW WORKSHOP [EC]**<br>10am - 12:00 **W2** Effie Patelos [UW Musagetes Library]<br>DESK CRITS |
|---|---|---|---|
| | 6 | 20/10<br>DESK CRITS | 22/10<br>**L2 GUEST LECTURE DESIGN RESEARCH [NN]**<br>10am **INTERNAL REVIEW A3** [FL]<br> 4pm Introduction S4 / Assignment 4<br>    **S4 SITE AND ARCHITECTURE**<br>      **POSITIONING YOUR PROJECT** |
| | 7 | 27/10<br>6pm: **HAND IN digital version of BOOK** | 29/10<br>DESK CRITS<br>**W3 WOKSHOP** (to be determined) |

**Readings on "Contemporary Forms": ecology, urbanism, landscape, and their combinations**
 | Roemer van Toorn, "After Criticality: The Passion for Extreme Reality in Recent Architecture ... and Its Limitations," in *Crossover. Architecture Urbanism Technology,* Rotterdam: 010 Publishers, 2006, pp. 170-83.
 | Kenneth Frampton, "Megaform as Urban Landscape", in *Landform Building: Architecture's New Terrain,* Schirmer/Mosel, 2011, pp. 238-249.
---Christophe Girot, "The elegance of topology", *in Topology,* eds. Christophe Girot, Anette Freytag, Albert Kirchengast, Dunja Richter, ETH Zurich, 2013, pp. 79-115.
---Charles Waldheim, "Landscape as Urbanism", in *The Landscape Urbanism Reader*, New York: Princeton Architectural Press, 2006, pp. 35-54.
---Chris Reed, "The Agency of Ecology" in *Ecological Urbanism,* ed. Mohsen Mostafavi and Gareth Doherty, Baden: Lars Muller Publishers, 2010, pp. 324-329.
__Sanford Kwinter, "Notes on the Third Ecology", in *Ecological Urbanism,* ed. Mohsen Mostafavi and Gareth Doherty, Baden: Lars Muller Publishers, 2010, pp. 94-105.
__Pierre Bélanger, "Landscape as Infrastructure", in *Landscape Journal 28,* 2009, pp. 79-95.
__Alan Berger and Charles Waldheim, "Logistics Landscape", in *Landscape Journal 27* (2), 2008, pp. 219-46.
__Rafi Segal and Els Verbakel (eds) "Architecture and Dispersal", with Stan Allen, Margaret Crawford, Marcel Smets and Sarah Whiting, *Architectural Design, 78* (01), pp. 102-07.
__ Stan Allen, "Infrastructural Urbanism," *Points+Lines: Diagrams and Projects for the City,* New York:

Princeton Architectural Pres, 1999, pp. 46-57.

__ Rem Koolhaas, "What Ever Happened to Urbanism?" in *Small, Medium, Large, Extra Large,* New York: Monacelli Press, 1995, pp. 958-971.

__ James Corner, "Terra Fluxus" in *Landscape Urbanism Reader*, ed. Charles Waldheim, New York: Princeton Architectural Press, 2006, pp. 22-33.

**Readings on "Contemporary Forms": from materiality to infrastructure, architecture as theory**

| Ignasi de Solà-Morales, "Weak Architecture", in *Architecture Theory sinc 1968,* ed. K. Michael Hays, Cambridge (MA): MIT Press, 2000, pp. 614-623.

| Pierre Bélanger, "Redefining Infrastructure", in *Ecological Urbanism,* ed. Mohsen Mostafavi and Gareth Doherty, Baden: Lars Muller Publishers, 2010, pp. 332- 349.

| Wang Shu, "Wang Shu" in *After Crisis, Contemporary Architecture Conditions,* Zurich: Lars Müller Publisher, 2011, pp 50-59.

--- Mary McLeod, "Herni Lefebvre"s Critique of Everyday Life: An Introduction", in *Architecture of the Everyday,* ed. Steven Harris and Deborah Berke, Yale: Princeton Architectural Press, 1997, pp. 9-29.

--- Georges Teyssot and Catherine Seavitt, "Boredom and Bedroom: The Suppression of the Habitual", *Assemblage 30,* 1996, pp. 44-61.

---Mark Burry, "Homo Faber," *Design Through Making, AD75* (4), 2005,  pp. 30-37.

---Stan Allen, "From the Biological to the Geological", "Geological From", "The Megaform Revisited", "Nature in the Plural" and "Matters of Surface", in *Landform Building: Architecture's New Terrain,* Schirmer/Mosel, 2011, pp. 20-41, 74-84, 192-200, 284-292 and 363-372.

---Mason White, Lola Sheppard, Neeraj Bhatia, Maya Przybylski, *Coupling, Strategies for Infrastructural Opportunism, "*Formatting Contingencies" and "Afterword: Figuring it out", Pamphlet Architecture 30, Infranet Lab/Lateral Office,  Princeton Architectural Press, 2011, pp. 6-9 and 76-78.

---Stan Allen, "Introduction: Practice vs. Project," in *Practice: Architecture, Technique and Representation*, New York: Routledge, 2000, pp.  xiii-xxv.

---Charles Waldheim, "Weak Work: Andrea Branzi's "Weak Metropolis" and the Projective Potential of an "Ecological Urbanism", in *Ecological Urbanism,* ed. Mohsen Mostafavi and Gareth Doherty, Baden: Lars Muller Publishers, 2010, pp. 114-121.

__Michael Hensel, "Extended Thresholds I: Nomadism, Settlements and the Defiance of Figure-Ground", "Extended Thresholds II: The Articulated Envelope" and "Extended Thresholds III: Auxiliary Architectures", *Architectural Design 80* (1), 2010, pp. 14-19, 20-25 and 76=83.

__Michael Hensel, "Type? What Type? Further Reflections on the Extended Thresholds", *Architectural Design* 81 (1), 2011, pp. 56-65.

__Moussavi Farshid, *The Function of Ornament,* Actar, 2008.

__Moussavi Farshid, *The Function of Form,* Actar, 2009.

## S4. SITE AND ARCHITECTURE | Positioning your project

*How do we define the site of architecture?* Building upon our previous discussions of context, processes, precedents, practices and program, this fourth exercise involves the drawing of a map or maps that position the project in a variety of dimensions (spatial, temporal, theoretical). The premise is that the means selected or investigated contribute to the definition of the site. To draw the site in its geographical, theoretical and historical dimensions, we will look at issues surrounding mapping, timing, and differences and similarities in analytical and conceptual approaches. You will be guided through the drawing of a map of your site that will foreground the information that is most important to your project. We will consider the relation between the act of *documenting* (and the means and position you assume in order to document), the resulting *documentation* (or what you gather and produce as you document), and the project emerging as a kind of *documentor* (a tracing of the project to come informed by the documentation conditions). More generally, we will discuss the ability to position architectural projects in relation to their representational means.

Your work will include:
1.  The mapping of a site and a critical reflection on the means used to map (i.e. locating the documentation approach in contemporary practice);
2. A critical "drawing" that can also acts as critical map of the thesis site (regardless of the scale that may vary from region and city to building, program or joint).
3. A material investigation (a design or written project), addressing the scope and ambition of the thesis through the means and site selected.

**Material to present for mid-term review:**
You will be presenting the work completed so far, clearly describing your interest, your site and your approach. Please also include studies of precedents, and integrate parts of your literature review as well as any pertinent term from your glossary in your presentation. Be sure to include also your updated abstract.

Presentation format:
       1. Bring a **print out of your book** that contains all your work so far;
       2. Your presentation panels (including layered precedents study) have to all fit on a 6' x 8' wall;
       3. Prepare at least a minimum of 4 presentation panels with the following content:

          **Panel 1**:
          1. Working thesis title;
          2. Updated abstract
          3. One paragraph describing the general field of inquiry with references to pertinent works.

          **Panel 2** and 3 if needed
          1. Presentation of important precedents that foreground your interest in these projects;
          2. Critical reflection on two particularly relevant projects with more detailed analysis;

          **Panel 4**, 5 and 6 if needed
          1. The mapping of your thesis site;
          2. A critical reflection on the means used to map (whether graphic or written);
          3. Representation of the potential program and scope of your thesis.

Your presentation should be between **5 to 7 minutes** to allow for a group discussion.

**October 27:**  6pm: hand in digital version of your book and have print out for October 29.
                    Continue work on speculative drawing
October 29: desk reviews
November 3: desk reviews: have tiled print out of your posters ready for discussion
November 5: desk reviews
November 10: **Mid Review**

**SCHEDULE**

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | 6 | **20/10**<br>DESK CRITS | **22/10**<br>**L2 GUEST LECTURE DESIGN RESEARCH [NN]**<br>10am  **INTERNAL REVIEW A3** [FL]<br> 4pm  Introduction S4 / Assignment 4<br>          **S4 SITE AND ARCHITECTURE**<br>          **POSITIONING YOUR PROJECT** |
| | 7 | **27/10**<br>6pm: **HAND IN digital version of BOOK** | **29/10**<br>DESK CRITS<br>**W3 WOKSHOP** (to be determined) |
| **NOVEMBER** | 8 | **03/11**<br>DESK CRITS<br>**W3 WORKSHOP** (to be determined) | **05/11**<br>DESK CRITS |
| | 9 | **10/11**<br>**MID REVIEW [LOFT]**<br>Presentation of A1-A4 | **12/11**<br>10am  **T1 THESIS PROJECT**<br>       Introduction Assignment 5 (T1) |

## THESIS PROJECT

T1. **Research and Design:**  Reflecting back on the process undertaken so far, you will propose an individual project that embodies the key elements of the self-directed thesis conducted in the deep sense of the contemporary.

T2. **Outline and Synthesis as Prolegomenon:**  As you complete the first iteration of your thesis project, you will prepare a complete outline of your project thesis, including both the work done during the term as well as the work you project to complete in your subsequent terms. Structure your book as you would approach the presentation of your final thesis project. Include an abstract, table of content, list of illustrations, an introduction, your literature review, case studies, site investigations and design speculations. Also include a schedule for completion, a bibliography, a glossary as well as proper footnotes and citations.

**FINAL REVIEW** will take place on December 11.

**FINAL SUBMSSION** will be a complete thesis document (including abstract, literature review, case study documentation and project, thesis site and scope of intervention, bibliography, schedule for completion).

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 9 | **10/11**<br>**MID REVIEW [LOFT]**<br>Presentation of A1-A4 | **12/11**<br>10am **T1 THESIS PROJECT**<br>        Introduction Assignment 5 (T1) | |
| | 10 | **17/11**<br>DESK CRITS | **19/11**<br>DESK CRITS | |
| | 11 | **24/11**<br>DESK CRITS | **26/11**<br>DESK CRITS | |
| **DECEMBER**<br>Lectures end 04/12 | 12 | **01/12**<br>DESK CRITS | **03/12**<br>DESK CRITS | |
| | 13 | **08/12**<br>10am **T2 THESIS OUTLINE**<br>        **SYNTHESIS AS PROLEGOMENON**<br>        Introduction Assignment 6 (T2) | **10/12**<br>DESK CRITS<br>*Exams Start* | **11/12**<br>**FINAL REVIEW [LOFT]** |
| | 14 | **15/12**<br>DESK CRITS (optional) | **17/12**<br>**THESIS OPEN STUDIO**<br>Digital and Poster Submission | |
| Grades due 08/12-03/01 | 15 | **22/12**<br>**DIGITAL SUBMISSION A1-A6**<br>*Exams End* | **24/12** | |

**The Writing Centre**

The Writing Centre works across all faculties to help students clarify their ideas, develop their voices, and write in the style appropriate to their disciplines. Writing Centre staff offer one-on-one support in planning assignments and presentations, using and documenting research, organizing and structuring papers, and revising for clarity and coherence.

You can make multiple appointments throughout the term, or drop in at the Library for quick questions or feedback. To book a 50-minute appointment and to see drop-in hours, visit www.uwaterloo.ca/writing-centre. Group appointments for team-based projects, presentations, and papers are also available.

**Please note** that writing specialists guide you to see your work as readers would. They can teach you revising skills and strategies, but will not proof-read or edit for you. Please bring hard copies of your assignment instructions and any notes or drafts to your appointment.

**For Distance Learners and Students at Satellite Campuses**

Online appointments (using video and audio) are available to students who are registered distance learners, students on co-op, and students who study at one of Waterloo's satellite campuses. Simply request an online appointment when you book an appointment. To see what in-person services are available at satellite campuses, please see the Writing Centre website.

**Academic Integrity:**

In order to maintain a culture of academic integrity, members of the University of Waterloo community are expected to promote honesty, trust, fairness, respect and responsibility. [Check www.uwaterloo.ca/academicintegrity/ for more information.]

**Grievance:**

A student who believes that a decision affecting some aspect of his/her university life has been unfair or unreasonable may have grounds for initiating a grievance. Read Policy 70 - Student Petitions and Grievances, Section 4, www.adm.uwaterloo.ca/infosec/Policies/policy70.htm. When in doubt please be certain to contact the department's administrative assistant who will provide further assistance.

**Discipline:**

A student is expected to know what constitutes academic integrity [check www.uwaterloo.ca/academicintegrity/ to avoid committing an academic offense, and to take responsibility for his/her actions. A student who is unsure whether an action constitutes an offense, or who needs help in learning how to avoid offenses (e.g., plagiarism, cheating) or about "rules" for group work/collaboration should seek guidance from the course instructor, academic advisor, or the undergraduate Associate Dean. For information on categories of offences and types of penalties, students should refer to Policy 71 - Student Discipline, www.adm.uwaterloo.ca/infosec/Policies/policy71.htm. For typical penalties check Guidelines for the Assessment of Penalties, www.adm.uwaterloo.ca/infosec/guidelines/penaltyguidelines.htm.

**Appeals:**

A decision made or penalty imposed under Policy 70 (Student Petitions and Grievances) (other than regarding a petition) or Policy 71 (Student Discipline) may be appealed if there is a ground. A student who believes he/she has a ground for or an appeal should refer to Policy 72 (Student Appeals) www.adm.uwaterloo.ca/infosec/Policies/policy72.htm

**Notes for Students with Disabilities:**
The Office of Person with Disabilities (OPD), located in Needles Hall, Room 1132, collaborates with all academic departments to arrange appropriate accommodations for students with disabilities without compromising the academic integrity of the curriculum. If you require accommodations to lessen the impact of your disability please register with the OPD at the beginning of each academic term.

**Penalty:**
No extensions will be given on presentations scheduled in class, and students who fail to present will be given a grade of 0%. Students who hand in their work late will be penalized. There will be a -5% penalty for documents handed in after the deadline. An additional 5% a day will be deducted for each calendar day after the deadline.