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INTRODUCTION

THAT'S SO 20 MINUTES AGO

“...and in his dream, Coyotitio was reading from a book as large as a house, with letters as big as dogs, and the words galloped and played on the book...” — Steinbeck

Do you recognize the book with the galloping dog-words?


But wait a minute:
Is the new catalogue instantly out-of-date?

There are some who argue that the act of imagining new architecture, student by student, is an antique conception.
They insist that the aspiration to a personalized architecture, one architect at a time, is old news.

Perhaps a depersonalized new is in prospect.
What's depersonalized architecture?
Bubble gum and razor scooters a must in the building photo?

Paradoxically, those who insist that a history of perpetual invention in architecture is no longer perpetual, are themselves inventors/propagators of a new notion.
They claim an alternative paradigm.
A new paradigm as surrogate for the paradigm of the new.
And the intellectual future of the “it's too late for new architecture” advocates is contingent on the efficacy of their new argument.
Followed by their unsurprising admonition: If you're not with us, you're out of date.

Those who reject the individuated new are themselves advocates of their own rendition of what's new.
Is their case empirically demonstrable?

The anti-news rely on the same originality premise that the pro-news rely on.

In the end there's tacit agreement on the durability of the new, but disagreement on the new's constituent parts.

What's genuinely new, we're told, is the architect as the entrepreneur of savvy: chase what the world chases; don't indulge the architect's solitary pursuits.
The accommodation with “how the world sees it” switches the architect as introvert to the architect as extrovert.
Resistance as passé.

The new architect is to be formed by the collateralization of various external constituencies.

Of course, those external obligations are nothing new to architecture.
It's the notion of the value engineering of those external pressures that's at stake.

A collective maturing of the profession, we're told.
Time for implementation, we're told, not speculation.
A new institutional allegiance, [and an old one]:
Behave yourself.

Let's not generalize SCI-Arc.
The SCI-Arc institutional model is only the aggregate of productive private models.
SCI-Arc is not an institution with a rigid perimeter arrayed against other institutions with their perimeters.
If SCI-Arc has a perimeter, it's perforated.

To make it new is an ideal with no guarantee the ideal will be realized.
As long as architecture could be other than it is, the ideal is alive.
What we do is to articulate the ideal, and engender a context where fruition has an opportunity.
And opportunity is all architecture requires.

Eric Owen Moss
SCI-Arc Director
THESIS. (period)

In the last couple of years, maybe even a decade or so, many schools have gone through the process of either keeping or abolishing thesis. This issue was not even debated at SCI-Arc—we simply just have THESIS. At SCI-Arc, we believe that thesis is about an architect at a time, and the collection of many individuals is what defines the discourse.

Investigation, Teaching, Practice, they are all interwoven with thesis’ logic. What invents what? This is in the notion of thesis as the main vehicle for the production of discourse. Design always concerns a translation between forms and formats of image. Perhaps some might see this as a triumph of superficiality over depth, but it’s also an intensification of the conjectural and fictive logics of design, of its ability to mobilize a social imagination, and with it a series of potential futures. We see this as a real and complex demand that mutating culture makes on producers of architectural content.

A thesis is an individual’s input into a collective conversation called architecture. As peculiar as it may sound, the sooner we realize that the sooner we, the discipline, can do what we really want to. We architects think that architecture is always at an inflection point and we are here to solve its conflicts. SPOILER ALERT: there are no such conflicts, and we are not here to solve anything. I think it is about always looking for an ingenious way to push the conversation in a new direction. If a thesis were to be successful, then everybody who is already part of the conversation will stop and change what he or she is saying, based on what that particular thesis contributed.

We need to understand, right now, that whatever amazing thing we think we might know or whatever tricks we can do; none of it is nearly as original as we might think it is. But that is OK. Thesis, believe it or not, shouldn’t be about inventing something completely from scratch that nobody has seen before. Thesis gives our students the chance to come up with a project that can deliberately go beyond what is possible or even what makes sense. This is part of what the architectural conversation needs from us.

That means that a thesis can shift, in its own small way, where we are going as a discipline, because we are arguing that this is the direction where things are heading. Conversations are inherently collective even if sometimes in architecture one or two people dominate them for a little while (or think that they do when actually most everybody ends up ignoring them). We need to understand where our part of the conversation came from, where it is now, where other people think it’s going, and then figure out how, in our own unique way, to move the line of what is possible and what is impossible.

Graduate Thesis students come from two programs—M.Arch 1 and M.Arch 2. Both have very unique pedagogical inflections, the first being geared towards an advancement of the principles of architecture, and the second challenging the boundaries of the principles of architecture. Two other postgraduate programs also share this weekend: Emerging Systems, Technology | Media (ESTm), with a focus on new technologies and highly specialized design tools, and SCI-Arc Future Initiatives (SCIFI), which deploys its expertise in the city and urban design thinking.

Here at SCI-Arc we don’t really see architecture as part of the world, as much as we see the world as (1) parts that are architecture in which we are interested, and (2) parts that aren’t architecture, which we are happy to steal ideas from, and hope that they will take care of themselves. It is assumed that architects can and will borrow inspiration from the strangest places and mix them together into something new, hopefully not horrible. It should go without saying that our job is to bring all of this stuff into architecture and figure out what it can do for the architectural conversation. It’s somebody else’s problem to worry about the other way around.

Hernan Diaz Alonso
Graduate Programs Chair
Elena Manferdini: Thesis projects are a Trojan horse for the delivery of new principles of contemporary architecture to other architects; but some problems simply matter more than other problems at a specific time in history. In your opinion, which projects need to be addressed today if we need to own the choice of what thesis needs to think about?

David Ruy: There seems to be so many different takes on what makes a thesis today. One thing that I can point to as the remaining relevance in a thesis is the one moment where the student can stop being a student and they are given a chance to make a contribution to the field. And that is why thesis is doomed to fail. It remains my only criteria for a great thesis. Your initial question is a relevant one because you cannot have random catharsis to give yourself some psychological closure to the education. SCI-Arc has far more agility than any other institution. Therefore the perpetual danger for this school is slipping into parochialism and developing an accidental orthodoxy. Everybody is going to have a different take on what would be an important contribution today. I am interested in what could constitute post-human aesthetics, and that is probably the thesis I would do.

Jeffrey Kipnis: But right now, David, your work is in the hypothesis. There is a period in research where you just do experiments and they do not correlate to a theme. But you have an intuition that you are going to look at various processes and effects that are likely to be a dead end, because every experiment in any field is likely to be a dead end. But we have to train that out first and much of our discussion is to prepare you for a whole period of hypothesis work. This launches into an investigation that will eventually diverge and then reformulate. Right now I have noticed that we are particularly effective through the discourse of affect. We are particularly effective at high impact performance of the work, though it has a short duration. Thomas Demand said, the first time you see a public sculpture, you stop, and you appreciate it. But if you are at the bus stop for twenty years, pretty soon it just becomes nonsense background. One thing I think is to increase the duration by decreasing the interest.

I believe in this idea: it is not history that produces architecture; it is architecture that produces history. A project is a great project, not only when we think it is a great project, but when we see all the other projects that we thought we knew well in a completely new way. That is one of the reasons I think slowing the effects down is important.

Another emphasis is on individuals and collectives. There are lots of social organizations between individual and collective that deserve enfranchisement or at least architectural exploration. I call this spectral thinking. Instead of having two poles—Postmodernism and Modernism—you produce a spectrum in between, but the spectrum has to be a discreet spectrum, not a continuous spectrum. We have worked through the continuous spectrum problem. For example, forms of attention. We have worked through distracted attention, and close attention. It is not that I want every form of attention, but are there intermediary forms of attention which will allow us to have a new work instruct us to see other work in a completely different way.

The business of architecture over the last 30 years has taken us from great achievements in architecture. One was imitative contextualism, how to relate to other buildings in your surrounds without precisely copying them or...
finding a beaux-arts typology. Then we gave in to iconicity because of the economics and globalization of the architectural effect. The final form of contextualism was weak form—the capacity of unusual geometries or liquid geometries to connect unlikely elements. We now have a more elaborate sense of what it means to speak of a set of relationships. But we are living in a world where relationships are no longer only remote. So what is cosmopolitan contextualism? These problems of relevance are not something that you have to struggle over.

Hernan Diaz Alonso: I have a much more simplistic point of view on the notion of relevance. I think the first thing is you need to worry about being good first; then to understand if you are good at it. Relevance comes by itself. It is hard to say in the moment if what you do is relevant or not. It is important for everybody to have the ambition of relevance, but it does not mean you should be working on the problem of relevance. You should be working on the problem of being good at the problem that you are working on.

Jeffrey Kipnis: When you say ‘good,’ good toward what end?

Hernan Diaz Alonso: To your own end—the ambition that you are setting up for the problem that you are working on. To me, that is what makes thesis interesting as a problem. The problem of relevance—first of all, there cannot be relevance without a conversation. At SCI-Arc the balance of power kind of becomes a plateau and the dialog happens. One could argue that the faculty and the students are always in dialog, but that is not quite true. A critical part of the relevance is when they start to provoke a change in the conversation. How much longer do we need to keep using the cane of historical precedents as a way to construct a thesis argument? Are we ready to eradicate that and move into a different format of thesis? A proof of concept that does not rely so much in showing a piece of the Renaissance, a piece of Modernism to say, ‘Okay, there is a foundation for it.’

Jeffrey Kipnis: It is a formula. The question is does it still have life in it? It always works.

Hernan Diaz Alonso: It always works, but can we add a new component to the formula? Can we introduce failure to the formula in a different way? So I would not say to get rid of precedent, but is there a way to reverse precedents and how we build a sense of the now or the culture of the now? Can we build a thesis that is purely based?

Jeffrey Kipnis: Should we get out of this question of the precedent? The way you get out of it is you start with all the way from quotation to direct reference. But it then has to back up. It cannot go away or else you have no problem set, so it has to go back to the point of illusion. The whole point of teaching history is not to have the history authorize the work, but to let the new work reinvent a whole relationship to the history. I always think of architecture as belonging to the arts, not to the sciences, and so it does not have a very strong discourse of demonstration. No one can tell you whether an architectural experiment is a success or not. The proof of concept has to do with the conversational sociology of architecture.

David Ruy: It sounds like there is a very important difference between the experiment, the theory, and the proof of concept. You have a thesis that takes a position that puts forward a possibility, and then it is tested in the proof of concept. But preceding the theory is experimentation, and there are relevant and non-relevant experiments.

Jeffrey Kipnis: I think every experiment is relevant. The null result is as important as the successful. The question is how you judge an experiment.

Hernan Diaz Alonso: I think one interesting thing about the notion of architecture is you never really develop a real proof of concept. What you create is the illusion of a proof of concept, which is different than in science. I think that’s something we need to make part
of the conversation because the truth remains that there is no absolute way to prove your point.

**Elena Manferdini:** I think thesis looks backwards as much as it looks forward, and, hopefully, that sets the medium for creating other theses and actually being able to have that double vision, front and back.

**Peter Trummer:** What I miss is a love for architecture and the risk you might fail. I feel there is a strong desire of getting rid of the formalist approach towards the object as a real thing and that we are in a time where the formal project is over. Meaning if I look back at work in the 1960s and what Eisenman did, the criticism within that generation is against a certain kind of formal approach. It does not turn into a formalist idea of a thesis but rather towards an imagined realness of object.

**Elena Manferdini:** So would you say that the formal project is done and that we are still in the phase of the critique of the formalist project? Have we yet to address things that matter after the form?

**Peter Trummer:** I learned through the American discourse that the disciplinary approach brought us back to have a sensibility for architecture. If I look now and ask myself what is it? What stand can we make today? What do we want? I would rather say there is a moment in history where we could radicalize the question 'What do we want to go for?' I think we are in the moment where we can risk saying that formalism replaced functionalism, and perhaps that realism replaces formalism today. What would a thesis be in a school with that kind of philosophical stake? I can imagine there could be realism; that is what I hear from other members in the faculty. It will be a real clarification when something is either a formal discipline approach or an object thing, because it looks like there is a single word that currently covers everything. I believe there may be very specific differences in understanding.

**Hernan Diaz Alonso:** We constantly update all the cultural and intellectual parameters of how we judge work. I think the parameter of failure has not been updated. I see a lot of failure, in the good sense, in thesis. There is this heroic sense of failure, which
some of the elders in L.A. and other places feel very comfortable with and I think it is unfair to impose that sense of failure as an interesting way of working in a completely different context. I would say on the students’ part, they should incorporate failure into the parameters of thesis. But I agree with David—I think all of these theses are set to fail. I think the question is, after creating, revealing and codifying the failures how do we judge and discuss them?

Elena Manferdini: What is more interesting to me are the architectural personalities within the school. We appropriate these kinds of identities as different personalities, so one might describe the collective discourse of the school as that of a shifting personality. I see 87 students presenting but I can catalog those into 12 groups. These 12 groups are different personalities that work within the dialog with the past and techniques that we project into the future. Is that something that you have a sense of?

Jeffrey Kipnis: As a social philosophy, I think you are right. As a philosophy of pedagogy, not only should you not do it, you cannot do it. You actually have to teach a kind of level of mediocrity. There are the great fascist Austrians and the great individualist Austrians. They derive from the same place. It is a repressive environment, and you either become Freud, Shoenberg or Godel or you become Raimund Abraham. I have never seen a permissive environment produce enough discipline that genius grows from it. I do not think our job is to teach students to explore their own genius. Our job is to teach them sufficient technique, skills and communication intelligence that those of them who have it will outgrow that.

Hernan Diaz Alonso: What Elena is asking has to do with the problem of the individual and the collective, and how at the end of the day we do not have any thesis. We really have eight or ten topics in which eighty people happened to work, and that gets represented by the combination of the students and faculty. I would argue that at any interesting school in history that has to happen. I think that people make the problems matter. It is the influence of that group of people making those problems interesting and visa versa. That is why I would argue the school is in an interesting moment, because it has the capacity to define certain tendencies that you then see elsewhere. The combination of highly individualistic and historical precedent at SCI-Arc is what keeps this institution from becoming rigidly dogmatic. I think that friction between the orthodox dogma and a kind of free spirit gesture is the most successful part of SCI-Arc because it highlights the moment the tension becomes evident.

Peter Trummer: The school is one huge studio. Everyone works in one space. Everyone sees. Everyone is out there. I think it was Hernan who once said the real secret of SCI-Arc is that—these are not my words—everything that is shit and everything that is genius is visible. Probably sometimes, there needs to be time where a little collective or a group can hide.

Hernan Diaz Alonso: Robert Rauschenberg went to study with Josef Albers, and Albers painted a thing called Homage to Squares. He painted 9000 squares. He was a Bauhaus guy and forced all of the students to do these Bauhaus studies, including Rauschenberg. And then Rauschenberg, at night, would go out and secretly paint with tar and shit to get his hatred of Albers out of his system. Now we have Josef Albers as a great artist and Robert Rauschenberg as a great artist. Had it been ‘do whatever you want,’ you get today’s painting world where you do not have any more great artists. You have a lot of good artists. It is rare for someone to have a sufficient compelling quality in a permissive environment to break through the noise. Increasing the noise is what he is talking about.
BLUSH

VIOLA AGO

Advisor: Elena Manferdini

This is a focused obsession of color and facial expression in architecturalizing the theatrical behavior of blushing. The ambition is to have the blush belong to the materiality of the architecture as it brings faciality into the behavior of the skin.

The blush is a response to the attention paid to surface in architecture, particularly the post-modern attempt of expressive façades, but without defaulting into the clichés of contemporary façade treatments such as perforated skins, transparencies and layers. Therefore, this thesis defies the application of ornamentation onto facades; instead, it is rooted on the idea of cosmetics in architecture, as being indiscreet and working as fields.

This project wants to intensify the expressiveness of the face of a building by literally using the facial qualities of a human face, a portrait. The abstraction of the portrait into a hierarchy of geometrical shapes suggests an overall figure of the face. The perception of the figure from form positions this thesis in close relation to sensation in an attempt to design a new diagram for contemporary sensibility.

Beyond formal manipulations, color embedded within the material makes the building blush. This thesis resides in the blushing occurring through the material and architecture as opposed to special effects of projections and animations. Specifically, the blush is underglazed coloration and its gradient effect is achieved by breaking it down into individual components that make possible the overall perception of a blushing façade.

In support of the argument that sensation is what is painted for color is in the body, this method re-establishes the potential of architectural surface and its dependency on the viewer and the sensitivities of his sensory apparatus as it offers something to see. Situated in Chicago, due to the existing frontality of buildings, The Auction House faces Grant Park on Michigan Ave., giving the opportunity for the building to be viewed at varying distances and angles. The front of the building is comprised of parts that delicately peel away from one another. This depth, carried through to the interior, establishes the separation between the font of the building and the exclusive, private auction house behind it.

2. Gilles Deleuze, Francis Bacon: The Logic of Sensation (University of Minnesota Press, 2003), 32.
3. Ibid.
My thesis project aims to challenge the prevailing notion in contemporary architecture that an architectural object (in this case a building) is an autonomous entity—conceived, developed and built free of extrinsic considerations. In fact, only by first considering the collective entity created by the continuous, never-ending feedback loop of typology and function and population and need, will the architectural object stand alone as an honest expression and representation of the city.

Developed from the inside out, the form is manifested through a volumetric sweep that will define the spatial needs of the public sequence and the programmatic needs of the theater. The result is one singular volume which overlaps and smooches against itself. That raw form will then be relaxed, which leads to new projections or inflections into space.

The finished object, a performance arts center in Den Hague, the Netherlands, consists of four theaters and additional rehearsal and practice rooms. Conceived, developed and built as an interwoven, interconnected and integral part of the urban fabric.
CONFOUNDING MEDIUMS
A Shift from Subordination to Symbiosis

ALBERTO ATAIDE
Advisor: Marcelyn Gow

This thesis aims to jostle Architecture from the subordinate role it often plays in mixed media relationships by exploring Architecture's "affective range" via the physicality of mixed mediums. Therefore, rediscovering the conceptual and material significance of form within the mixed media niche. Within this niche, architectural form and imagery have had a long relationship. In Kissing Architecture, Sylvia Lavin describes how these relationships work or perhaps do not work as:

Architecture extending and intensifying its effects through the short-term borrowing of a partner medium's flavor; boringly mute building[s] grasping for meaning; [and] banality is an integral part of why and how [this relationship sometimes] operate[s] architecturally.

The goal of this thesis is to shift this relationship towards symbiosis by creating a reciprocal harmony between image and form through the exploration of embedded imagery. Therefore, a host can begin to annex materiality from its partner medium, and the relationship between image and host can be confounded, offering new opportunities for the visualization of form.

Architectural poché offers characteristics conducive for the embedding of imagery. Material choice and the depth of architectural components help to establish relationships between the exterior and the interior by addressing issues of translucency, misregistration, deformation, duration, and stasis.
This thesis explores issues of materiality and scale, while interrogating the notion of “truth to materiality.” Acknowledging the allure of textiles specifically, the thesis seeks to move beyond the narratives often ascribed to a material and works to transcend such narratives by placing a value on “image” over performance—both evoking and challenging material expectations. The aim is to capture the sensation afforded by material qualities without succumbing to narrative techniques, or rather, to heighten the paradox of material as image and image as material.

Volume, or physical form, has often been associated with the process of fabrication; however, the paradigm of designing three-dimensional objects on two-dimensional planes, only to later be projected into space, needn’t be the only approach. Through the use of fabric and robotic articulation of spline geometry, the thesis is able to begin blending methods of physical design with contemporary practices of computation—allowing for more predictable results in a process with seemingly fortuitous properties. Such a digital/physical hybrid takes advantage of all the tools at our disposal, without privileging one method over another. And through this process, the thesis is not limited to the exploration of form, image, and narrative through the eyes of the general public, but also reconsiders the tools we use as architects by blurring our own architectural narratives of process.
A building has four sides—north, east, south, and west. It has a roof and a ground upon which it is built. That is a given, that is what we know, it is tradition—culturally embedded in how we perceive the architectural object.

This thesis seeks to investigate these conventional perceptions and works to affiliate itself with the challenges of the sectional object, and the relationship between object and ground. Furthermore, these challenges have been addressed through the creative works of artists such as Michael Heizer and Richard Serra, whose pieces are clear geometric shapes but are never understood as such. This thesis also highlights the tension between the object as a single unified image, as explored in the minimalist movement, and the picturesque qualities of Copenhagen's Botanical Garden in which the project is situated. It's relationship to the ground, as an object carved out of rather than built upon, suggests the artificial and man-made qualities of the object within its surroundings. The near material similarity between the carved ground and the object, which only distinguishes itself through its finish, further emphasizes the tension within the object's ambiguity as object and non-object. This allows for a redefining, instead of an adoption, of the artificial natural-looking masquerade of the garden.

While the project in its immediate form maintains all the ideas of an object, it works to challenge predetermined conventions and criticizes preexisting notions of perspective. This is achieved by removing the observer’s objective distance, which denies perspective the ability to control the way one engages with the object. The project's relation to the ground and monolithic appearance raises similar issues and questions that have been addressed by the Minimalist Movement and the International Style. Building on this idea, the observer is no longer confronted with a single unified image, but is asked instead to actively engage and take authorship of their interpretation and reading of the object.
This thesis focuses on creating ambiguous edges in architectural form by using the method of pixilation to achieve this effect.

Is it true? Is it not? That is the question. The visuals that we see are processed by the mind to create an interpretation. As Oscar Wilde quotes in his novel *The Picture of Dorian Gray*, “the world is full of visual mysteries.” The way we see the edges may not be the real ones. They could be an optical illusion. From the Pyramids of Egypt to the Roman mosaics, to the most recent portraits by Chuck Close; all have been an attempt to create misinterpreted edges. This assemblage of several similar objects, whether in two or three dimension, proved effective in misinterpreting edges over time. There have been several factors to control this effect. The tools that could create such a kind of illusion could be form, color, pattern or scale. The thesis emphasizes the factor of scale, revealing interesting scenarios to create ambiguous, misinterpreted edges. Inspirations were drawn from nature with examples such as soap bubbles and the flock of starlings at Otmoor in England.

The thesis focuses on the contemporary method of pixilation for Misinterpretation of Edges and suggests a method to create these effects in architectural form. A process to achieve misinterpretation of edges, by populating an abstract cloud form with three-dimensional pixels or geometry is tested. The aim of this pixilation technique is not only to create a surface articulation but also to create three-dimensional spaces. This achieved effect looks at the problem of perceiving the pixel as an individual entity as well as a system of elements. This, in turn, is used to create architectural and habitable spaces. A set of rules is followed in this process, which also govern the program design and planning.

The program is a ‘Cloud Space,’ an idea derived from the eponymous term used in computing, where the user defines the function of the building and the function is based on the perception of the user about the building. The site is chosen in such a way that it helps to create an environment conducive to the program.
This thesis explores the potential for an architecture that is concurrently fully interior and entirely exterior. The gap between the architecture’s interior and exterior has been eradicated. One is the outcome of the other. This thesis does otherwise. Rather than an interior/exterior relation in which you can read one and immediately understand the other, this project treats them as two separate entities. They are drawn and designed without referencing each other. The exterior is a strongly figural object—a form that is elusive in the center and defined at its edges. The interior is a blank introverted space—a volume defined from within and confined by an internal boundary. One is neither aware nor influenced by the other. The building is the outcome of a tension between two entities that never come entirely together.

& BLACK challenges our current representational conventions. It proposes alternative ways of understanding and representing architecture, not as a singular entity but as multiple states of being, almost schizophrenic. This implies a psychoanalysis that tries to make sense of things that aren’t immediately legible, similarly to the Rorschach test. The building reveals itself only through a close reading of its architectural elements and their relationships. This thesis brings forward the role of rendering as a critical project in architecture. From here, rendering becomes a tool for design instead of a means of representing the final project. As a generative design tool, rendering starts giving form and depth to the object.

Moving away from continuous lines, this kind of architecture is made of discrete representational parts. The parts are disparate and independent; the rooms are represented separately, the interior and exterior in contrast with one another. The building comes together through a new tectonic, a tectonic that exists in the medium of representation rather than in the building itself.

p.s. This project is a house.
What does it mean to say that a building is “iconic”? One characteristic is a distinct contrast with its context, in form and/or exterior material, that draws attention to the building and away from its surroundings. The relationship between iconicity and contemporary architecture has evolved, in particular since the late twentieth century, allowing regions in search of attractiveness and the production of an identity to become unique.

Architecture, in the last twenty years, has increasingly participated in a globalizing trend. The Sydney Opera House from 1973 marks the entry of Architecture into a competitive economy that uses the codes of liberal capitalism: promotion, communication, and image control. These are deliberately oriented and distributed. Extending from this, contemporary architecture has developed an articulate visual vocabulary for communicating. Photographs of iconic buildings generate the nicknames that these buildings become known by. This form of communication takes as its premise the production of a series of performances of contemporary architecture that permeate the unconscious and the collective imagination. Both the general press and the Internet, but also large specialized exhibitions, contribute to purveying the vision of a globalized architecture. Buildings that appear to be standardized forms begin to express the deterritorialization of Architecture, which leads us to wonder about the impact of this “imaging.” Does it create an identity for globalized places? Can we speak of a migration of the term “heritage” which would define a set of shared references, built by the diffusion of decontextualized production. Is it possible that contemporary architecture that is called iconic could “belong” to a global entity, that is to say that the world could legitimately claim it as their cultural heritage?

One of the main challenges of this work lies in the question regarding the inclusion of the imagery of contemporary architecture within a globalized heritage. This thesis will focus on the idea of decomposing this fixed idea of icon, finding a way to disrupt the figure it produces. One of the central questions of this work is how we can begin to dissolve this form of unconscious recognition.
A quarter to enter.
A second of shock.
A minute to witness.
A long-lasting impression.
An unforgettable memory.
A chance to return.
It consumes normalcy.
It chews and semi-digests its parts.
Only to spit out the ugly, mistreated, irregular, and irrational. And puts it on display for all to behold.
How horrifying, how distasteful, I want it…

Manifestations of the ‘event’ are continually explored in architecture, with a scope ranging from formal, stationary constructs to the more elusive, modular micro-explorations as present in installations. More recently, interests of such works appear more inclusive and internal to the field, propagating a presumably never-ending journal of individual experiments soon disposed of. Advances in technological access and production continue to accelerate societal shifts and duration of interest that promote fickle attitude and effect to design. Entertainment, however, suggests a viable solution to design as it both shapes and maintains the current times; with less interest in predicting the future, but slowly manipulating the present attitude concurrently to produce the possibility of a future.

As first established by Rem Koolhaas in Delirious New York, Ten-In-One attempts to continue the lineage of relationships between entertainment and the urban city. Given Coney Island serving as one of the major focal points of Koolhaas’ proposition to pinpoint the origins of Manhattan’s evolution, the controversial and amorphous side show is re-appropriated into the city by means of a similar unorthodox attitude and set of operations revealed at the critique’s inception. Harnessing the drastic effects of such an event challenges the “acceptable” formal, programmatic, and provisional aspects of the architectural discourse.

Precedent also follows American artist James Turrell, known for his transformative works that capture and exploit the familiar constructs of light and space using phenomenological techniques. Though simplistic and perhaps ordinary from an indirect standpoint (i.e. hearsay), the produced effect proves quite exhilarating in person and maintains a mystique and hidden iconography only to be discovered and revealed by a knowledgeable few.

Similarly, Ten-In-One employs varying techniques within the Historic Core of Downtown Los Angeles that indulge in that which is overlooked, mistreated, or remnant in the urbanscape. The intent is to showcase these selected zones in novel, and at times, unusual feats; yet only experienced (and appreciated) by the unsuspecting few that may pay the price of a time unwound.
“Such impracticalities of line as errant paths and wavy navigations can be then thought as transverses within architecture that infiltrate the clean, articulate, measurable space of orthogonal thought with something unwieldy, speechless, animal.”

– Cathrine Ingraham, *Burdens of Linearity*

*Lines and Beasts* represent two different orders. The line creates the sane and noble linearity in architecture. Le Corbusier defined this as the “orthogonal state of mind.” The beast is unruly, indirect and savage. This thesis defines the line as the exact order, the unruly as the inexact and somewhere between as the anexact. The line and the beast are two poles of the equation. The rationalized mind may seek to remove the beast from the equation to solve the formula, but what if one has an interest in the beast? What if the beast may be tamed in process yet released in product? This thesis examines the procedures and processes to generate a dialogue between degrees of representation, between the exact, anexact and inexact forms in architecture.

It seeks to revisit and swerve Greg Lynn’s argument into a consideration for the inexact in reference to his text *Probable Geometries*. The inexact form may result from exact, anexact, or inexact processes, or a combination of the three in varying degrees. The outcome becomes an artifact that is in fact reproducible through the process, yet unique in the product. It characterizes an aesthetic interest for formal logics that do not instantly reveal the ordering systems that underlay them. Through the analog and digital mixing of design and fabrication processes the beast is released and examined through the lens of architectural discourse and practice.

*Lines and Beasts* assigns the cube as the exact form and places this on the interior of the project. The anexact and inexact forms are studied and defined on the exterior of the project. The project is in a contact state of architectural discourse with itself. This thesis undergoes processes to generate results that can be studied and organized, yet which produce aesthetic irregularity with moments of linearity and symmetry. It argues against the copy of the original, scripted, perfect reproduction, as the process and outcome move away from a copy of the copy into the wilderness of the beast.

The project is a house and aviary located on the northeast side of Anegada, British Virgin Islands.
Deep Façade is a thesis that privileges the façade as an architectural element and pushes the façade to become the entire architectural experience.

Traditionally, a façade operates as a two-dimensional element that indexes the building and establishes boundary. It is the threshold that separates the interior from exterior, indicating a change in experience as one approaches and enters a building. By thickening the façade to an extreme, Deep Façade challenges this traditional notion of a thin surface façade, thereby prolonging the cadence of entering a building and blurring the distinction between interior and exterior. Deep Façade looks to the narthex, traditionally the room immediately beyond the façade that gives a non-believer a chance to be baptized before entering the congregation, in understanding an interstitial space that negotiates between two worlds and strives to achieve a similar progression of experience. Similarly to the narthex, by deepening the façade, a space is created in which one is aware that they have passed the threshold but not yet arrived at their destination. In exaggerating the depth of the façade, Deep Façade experiments with an excessive amount of surface that continuously twists and turns, creating both vertical and horizontal spaces that intertwine with one another. By having the façade surface be both exterior and interior, Deep Façade also defies the contemporary notion of a skin envelope taking on most of the architectural agenda while operating almost entirely independent from the interior.

Deep Façade is both boundary and space. It is both narthex and its destination. It challenges both the traditional notion of a thin façade and the contemporary expectation of skin envelope.
Urban realm as catalyst of activities and events is structured as a dynamic and complex system. It is an architects’ responsibility to observe the relationship between elements and linkage, between parts and whole, and between units and system. Upon understanding these relationships, one can find a new order for the city. However, the intention is never to over-organize the spatial relationship between building complexes. The city never sits at a static state with the flux of information and material traveling through it. Rather than an over-organized master plan, the city needs a “master form” that welcomes accidental increments.

As technologies are being developed through generations, social activities have been vastly invaded by mobile devices and social networks. People are more connected through the Internet, yet more isolated in the real world. The physical space remains largely the same as decades ago, while the virtual space becomes overwhelmingly pervasive. Not only, “the commodity completes its colonization of social life,” but the social life becomes the slave of the virtual networks.

This project explores the possibilities of urban fabric manifested in a way that the relationships between people and the city are embedded within the organization of the city, allowing space for the city to breathe, grow, and decay. How to develop a new mode of built environment so that it adapts to the invasion of the virtual world? What is the archetype of habitable space that could compete with the attraction from the invisible space? What is the manifestation of the social networks? The collective space becomes not only a node but also an attractor. It’s not about the space itself but the way each space is weaved into a network that corresponds to the authentic relations between people. The connectors between the parts become the place for the sharing of interests and activities. Therefore, new possibilities will be explored to create a built environment that encourages connection rather than isolation.
Trees have form. Electronic tablets have form. Boulders have form. 747s have form. Flowers have form. Glocks have form. The progenitors of these forms, both urban and rural, have none.

There was a time when urban form could advance its cause within a rural setting, allowing its dichotomous elements to play out on the horizon with great effect. This was the away game, fought hard and won often by inner-city champs, so the story goes. Yet those very same delineations, which had allowed us to read things as undoubtedly [this] or abso-fucking-lutely [that], have lost their agency.

Situated within the Forest of Fontainebleau, a site made famous by the Impressionistic painters of the Barbizon School, the [thing] is less an advance of urban form onto a rural stage than it is an abstraction of said form, made manifest from within. The former will only ever usher in strangers, but stranger still is the architectural form we can imagine as having been there the whole time—the sheep in wolf’s clothing, if you will, ready and willing to reclaim a lost horizon.

Relationships which had been read as near/far, open/closed, rural/urban now find themselves in greyer territory where technological, agricultural and economic polarities have seemingly found synthesis preempting the arrival of an architecture motivated to synthesize these formal tensions. The horizon, that elusory place between earth and sky, is but our privileged allegorical entity through which these contradictory associations can be tested. It is what I have never seen before that I recognize to be true.
Architecture has typically been defined and constrained by static readings of part-to-whole/part-to-part relationships. Contemporary architectural discourse has attempted to redefine these relationships or do away with them completely. The ambition of this project is to radicalize the terms by which we generally understand and control architecture. The moment that architecture is no longer thought of as a coherent, static body is the moment it begins to develop new relationships with itself and to its surroundings. This thesis aims to further that dialogue.

Because architecture oscillates between being read as a whole and an agglomeration, there is potential to undermine this relationship through formal manipulation. The goal is to imbue architecture with a certain plasticity that is characterized by excess and overlap. Displacement of mass produces figural indeterminacy. Converging volumes produce cleavages and bulges; areas of overlap yield unexpected pockets of space. Formal excess enables the architecture to elude static reading, engendering a sense of corporeality.

By extending these ambitions into the space of the city, the architecture introduces an urban posture that defies the homogeneity of its surroundings. Situated in the Chelsea district of Manhattan, NYC, the project proposes a destination train hall on the site of the James Farley Post office, a location chosen because of its prominent position within the city and the hollow monumentality of the existing program, to which the project responds as a counterpoint.

Ultimately, this thesis attempts to offer an alternative understanding of civic space through the manipulation of form as it plays out in the body of architecture.
A blur.

A silhouette.

A figure surfaces the darkness.

Kissing my conscious vaguely reminiscent of tomorrow.

Reds, greens and grays chasing each other distantly close to me.

Lines of black creeping hurriedly around the corner veil my sight.

A moment of choice, the thin passage draws me in curiously.

A crack in shiny disguise slithers away.

Imminent shadows whisper my name loudly promising places with no name.

Labyrinths of light suspensefully sculpting within.

Reflections dividing the space mirror the ambiguity.

A strayed flicker flirts coyly with me, blinding me.

Invisible presence echoes misunderstood desires.

A flow above carries me along Travelling through time.

Vivid memory of voices long forgotten washes over me.

Silent conversations indecently fill the air with violent agreement.

Loneliness slips away gradually never to return.

A cluster of grains bursts quietly spurring me on to grasp them.

Strata of suggestive edges out of which form slowly unravels.

Glowing.

Vibrating.

Mystifying.
Innately, we search for familiar figures and forms to help us understand our environment, but when a form is present yet distorted, we experience an oscillation between familiar and strange.

This project attempts to generate new kinds of geometrical atmospheric effects through distortion and deformation of the familiar. It seeks to create new possibilities for architectural elements. These elements have been associated with part to whole relationship and are rarely understood as single figure. This project is not intended to be a discussion of the nature of these elements or their function, but instead it focuses on how they are perceived. These elements are distant from their former life and are removed from their structural and spatial organization in pursuit of uncanny familiarities.

This house aims to explore new typological effects through transforming the cube, a basic unit for our built environment. A cube as an archetypal primitive registers with architecture through its six sides: four walls, a floor and a roof. The cubes are cut and then turned inside out, juxtaposing normal things in strange relationships. Through this process, the internal logic becomes corrupted. The elements that were originally inward are now outward, producing a strange sense of familiarity. They redefine themselves with new emerging qualities, flirting between familiar and strange.
I WANNA BE LIKE ME

RONALD ECKELS

Advisor: Elena Manferdini

I wanna be like me...
...it’s true. You’ll see that I do.

To Dr. Seuss no one is “Youer than You.” But in talks with King Lou I learn that someone like me can learn to be, like someone like me can learn to be, like someone like you. Does this then mean that you and I can be Me-er than Me?

Perhaps, and perhaps it’s best to begin with likeness. Likeness is a means of elucidation—a flexible legibility that is about reading things, but reading them in unexpected ways. It is an effort of association, which finds friends in projects already well underway. In this sense, I Wanna Be Like Me anticipates or introduces the imminent proliferation of disciplinary paradigms: an event, which presupposes an alternative to the politics of two through the politics of many.

In stating, “I wanna be like me,” one displaces oneself, an act that distances one from one’s own autonomy. Go ahead; ask yourself, “What is it like to be like me?” Go a step further, outright declare, “I wanna be like me.” It’s weird, not quite unsettling, but most definitely ticklish. But, HOW, how do I go about being like me and, well how do you be, you know, like you?
Perhaps, as cities fill with gigantic paperweights and desks are cluttered by tiny skyscrapers, it can be said that the problem of scale today belongs to computational media. Digital objects have no scale; they are merely projections of forms that swivel from size to size. They could just as easily sit on a desk or within a city. Initially a triumph of architecture’s independence from the real world, today the ability to be of any size is a defeat. Reduced to a tendency, it is a surrender of disciplinary mastery to the biases of computational media.

In the digital scenario, engineering formalizes scale. The habitual implementation of structural, technological, and environmental conventions bring the digital object towards a size. This is outside the realm of the architecture’s working space. Architecture is found in the drawing; its mark of scale occurs through plan articulations, inflections of geometry, and formal proportions. Paperweight seeks to formalize the inscription of scale in contemporary media. It denotes scale’s signs and markings as an architectural problem rather than an engineering solution. Ratios, proportions, drawing notations, and tectonic registers imprint the architectural drawing with scale. It is therefore within this context that Paperweight generates a form, marks its tectonic and drawing systems, and then specifies a size.

If the column was the primary site of architectural exploration, then the five orders were surely the initial inscription of measure onto a set of forms. Their proportions, ornament, and decorum indicated the prominence and size of architecture in the city: Doric for a house or Corinthian for a palace, for instance. Paperweight begins with the idea of the column: the revolution of a proportioned profile into a cylinder. Grids and proportions regulate the revolution and, much like a chess piece, produce a clear figure. Unlike the chess piece or the column, however, Paperweight builds upon contemporary notions of asymmetrical geometry and awkward posture to produce an unstable figure. Like the signification of the five orders, Paperweight develops five sizes of forms: XS, S, M, L, and XL. Each drawing or model’s actual size determines annotation, tectonic systems, and ratios, suggesting an uncertainty between the representation of one size from the next. By establishing a measure for each size, Paperweight imprints the heaviness of scaled representation into the form of architecture.
This thesis investigates the notion of duality in architecture by working across multiple genres rather than within a single one. It focuses on productive dichotomy as a form of development that does not aim to dissolve opposites, but rather, bring them together into an even more complex state of dualism. Specifically, the project examines the formal and figurative relationship between cohesive and random systems, particularly that of a pile and a monolith as they are applied to various vertical totemic forms.

Pile systems are composed of three or more primitives, which are placed randomly. Pile systems exhibit qualities of randomness and disorganization as well as perceive new forms. The monolith is a cohesive, organized form that acts as a single, uniform whole. The intention of this thesis is not to dwell pervasively on the opposition but rather in doing so, foster the emergence of a new formally heterogeneous genre.

This thesis explores the dichotomy between pile and monolithic forms where there is a strong correlation between randomness and cohesiveness, disorganization and organization. The analysis and close reading of randomness and cohesive design methods in architecture is an example of uncertainty and unpredictability as an intricate part of the design process.

This thesis attempts to create a transition between pile and monolithic forms. These two design methods create a strange duality, which is demonstrated through formal and tectonic methods.
Fable

With the word with begins then this text
Of which the first line states the truth,
But this tain under the one and the other
Can it be tolerated?
Dear reader already you judge
There as to our difficulties…

(AFTER seven years of misfortune
She broke her mirror.)
— Francis Ponge

Several acts of circumscription.¹²³⁴

“Once upon a time there was a Boojum—” the
Professor began, but stopped suddenly. “I
forget the rest of the Fable,” he said. “And
there was a lesson to be learned from it. I’m
afraid I forget that, too.”
— Lewis Carroll

1. Four houses: A house is a house is a house is a house,
when all’s said and done; even counting the banana trees.
2. Now inhabiting a diagram: A point on a (flattened) refer-
ence ellipsoid; a location (though it has no top or bottom;
no left or right) described by the coordinates: LAT. 39°50’
LONG. - 98°35’ NE 1/4 - SE 1/4 - S32 - T2S - R11W. About
this dead-center: Four houses–farmsteads—each located at
the center of a square whose sides are one mile long. Each
of these four squares has a vertex coterminal with the
dead-center. The squares do not overlap one another. The
top-right vertex of the top-right farmstead is locat-
ed at a point eleven and three miles (respectively) from
the top and left sides of a larger square whose sides are
thirty miles long. The corresponding sides of the larger
square are parallel to those of the four smaller squares.
A point half way along the top side of the larger square is
coterminal with a point lying on the top side of a larger
rectangle. This point is 174.42 miles from the top-left
vertex of this larger rectangle whose sides are 206 miles
long (top-to-bottom) and 397.70 miles long (left-to-right)
(save where a portion of the rectangle’s boundary to the
top-right is delineated by the course of a river and is
not easy to describe without the aid of a drawing). The
 corresponding sides of the larger rectangle are parallel to
those of the four smaller squares and larger square (save
in the case of the river). This dead-center constitutes
the centroid of a complex shape inscribed on a (flattened)
reference ellipsoid whose characteristics are determined
to the left and right by the erosive and accretive actions
of two oceans and to the top and bottom by the existence of
lakes, seas and political expediencies.
3. To diagram is to punish. Though inadequate to the
 task-part-priest, part-geodesist—the architect’s devilish
red-right-hand performs its acts of ruthless circumscrip-
tion with alacrity. At night, new orders of chaos reveal
themselves embedded in a phalanx of false necessities and
the fabricants of queasy moral schemas—providing meter to
the earth’s untrammeled matter—scrub themselves and their
soiled vestments.
4. Now working from the inside-out: Four houses–farmsteads—
each located at the center of a square whose sides are one
mile long. Forty feet above the center of each square is a
point that constitutes the centroid of a complex monochrome
volume that is not easy to describe without the aid of a
drawing. Each volume is oriented differently about its
centroid. Each volume is circumscribed by a configuration
of lines, curves, and surfaces so that its extremities are
incident on an enclosing configuration—its diagram. Each
volume is augmented de-constructively in accordance with
its diagram and via several projective techniques to create
a farmstead.
This thesis is an experiment in taking lessons learned from Asian urbanism and applying them to a Western site. It criticizes the classical Haussmann planning of Paris, and takes the notion of perspective phenomenon as an organizational strategy for the new development of Périphérique, Paris. As some of the most successful 20th century urbanism in Asia, studies of Hong Kong, Shinjuku, Singapore and Shanghai reveal the characteristics of Asian cities in planning, zoning, views and program. Through the comparison of the Asian cities and Paris, the possibilities of recombination, repetition, juxtaposition, and even some thoughts of Team X are discussed and further used to tackle the limitation of Paris’ growth and problems related to society, economy, ecology, and so on.

The new proposal extends from three main things—Perspectival Phenomenon, Economical Decision and Multiple Urban life—that categorize the features of new urbanism in Périphérique, and distinguishes itself from contemporary Asian urbanism and the new urban of La Defense. Analytical Diagrams are used to sort out complex information, and to also free design from conventional methodologies of urban design—figural ground—to diverse perspectives, sections, elevations and Serlio stage sets.
This thesis explores the possibility for Chinese and Japanese gardens to be combined into a new place that fosters gathering and meditation. It starts by thinking about the differences between principle order and concept order.

The Chinese garden is mostly placed at the rear of one’s villa as a way for people to escape from the outside world. The Chinese gardens have “yin” and “yang” elements: the architecture composes the “yang,” while the gardens represent the “yin.” Both elements are joined to compose a lobby and backyard that is organized according to a central axis. This axis promotes a continuous and orderly progression though the use of boundary passageways. Those define private space.

In contrast, the Japanese garden is influenced by Buddhism. It’s a place for meditation, utilizing features such as rock, water and plants to represent micro-scale elements of the universal. It creates a quiet public space.

The thesis seeks to use geometry as a means to replace the boundary passageways found in Chinese courtyards and use circulation to organize private space. The combination of these two approaches promotes the possibility for architecture to be a space that nurtures restorative balance.
IT'S NOT YOU BABY, IT'S THE ALGORITHM

JACK BARTON GAUMER

Advisor: Andrew Atwood

The trope ‘architects don’t make buildings, they make drawings’ is irrelevant, we make images. As drawings and renderings, our images have the power to start arguments, bring in donations, infuriate the public, and proliferate. They exist behind conventions of computer graphics that contemporary architecture has ignored. Computer graphics, of instantiated material objects or speculative representations, on walls and screens. Computer graphics, which “do not reproduce any extant things, surfaces, or spaces”–they exist on the surface of an interface as data through conventions of mathematical systems. This thesis shows presence and potential of these conventions, by controlling the exposition of the construction of renderings, such that a new reading of everything architects create is not just possible, it’s forced.

This project subverts the typical relegation of the rendering as mere production and idealized forgery. By confronting the process of computer graphics in its ubiquity, between the viewer and the object that image aims to represent, productive frictions essential for new possibilities in architecture can be reestablished through rendering. Controlling the algorithmic process of representation allows for the “invisible” to emerge from the systematic translation, which gives the rendering algorithm itself a subjectivity with its own aesthetic preferences. Management of how a computer thinks visually creates a rendering that is architectural, one whose agency is no longer simply that of a rendering of architecture. The materialization of these architectural renderings through their structure as computer graphics, and equally as systematic modeling methods, allows for the aesthetic of the algorithm to emerge as architectural form. This project brings architecture, computer graphics, and author of both, into the same shared new world of design.
Early Modernism’s apparent lack of interest in history and ambitions of creating new utopian architecture that addressed technological improvements of the time were constituted in a set of very distinct rules. These rules eventually created homogenous building forms and conformity. Perhaps lack of self-expression was the reason why post-modernist architects felt aggravated enough to break the dogma and refuse to follow many of the existing rules.

Considering the question of authorship, history and fidelity, this thesis explores how one perceives an object with all its specificities without recognizing what the original condition resembles. Neglecting the operational meanings of the objects, analogue processes question the qualitative association between the original and the concluding status of the objects. These procedures were accommodated to highlight relationships between the formal condition before and after the transformation. This exploration is not interested in the gradient of transformation, rather, it’s invested in the middle condition where the objects are neither as articulated as the start nor as banal as the end, and they are formed by discrete transitions within each collective. When it comes to the site, the manifestation of the middle condition tends to create a mystery that leaves strategic visual traces for further exploration by the inhabitant of the space. These visual traces and their relationships are used as means of creating curiosity and mobilization of the inhabitants in the site.
RECON(FIGURED) GROUND

CHENG GONG

Advisor: Marcelyn Gow

One conventional understanding of the ground/building relationship could be “content” (every ingredient within the facade) vs. “envelope.” The efforts of this thesis are focused on the process of how to construct a reconfigured ground.

Different levels of interpretation of “Reconfiguration” are embraced. One way to read this is through a programmatic reshuffling; the other way is through a hybridized formal/spatial generation.

In this thesis, the suggested building envelope performances aim to approach two alternative definitions: “massing=envelope” and “massing=structure.” A figural façade directly reflects the “content,” the sectional qualities of the programs embedded within. Intersections of surface extrusions produce oblique slabs (spatially) or densely populated geometries (structurally), which three-dimensionally sub-divide the pocket spaces in between the figures.

The conventional system of “structure, program, envelope” is challenged with the “deep surface” operation. Specifically, a figural and literal hybrid of an “outside>in” and an “inside>out” modeling process is tested. Dialogues between “context and massing,” “foyers and stages,” “positives and negatives” are conceived, reconfigured and re-operated within an urban perspective but they also perform on an architectural scale.

The suggested site of this thesis is bounded within 5th & 6th St., Main & Broadway in downtown Los Angeles with the existing programs of the LA theatre center as well as several parking garages. Cropped by the site boundaries and aligned with the building context, the design of the massing privileges a hidden gesture responding to the street proportions beneath the existing urban texture. Instead of the repeating and stacking of multiple theatres, as in a conventional approach, more dynamic/customized theatre forms are introduced. Circulation and foyer space in between the major programs are “re-configured” as the “stage extension,” both formally and functionally.
“Where am I?
    Look on your GPS.
How do I get there?
    Look on your GPS.
Is this the most direct way?
    Look on your GPS.”

Today more and more people rely on their GPS for orientation and directions.

Something is lost.

Curiosity is atrophied.

This thesis is about exploration, surprise, enigmatic form, and mystery. Questions are raised, some are left unanswered. Landscape or building? Path or sculpture? Rising or falling? Natural or man-made? Old or new? Some questions, most questions have multiple answers, answerable only through experience. It is this quality of experience that this thesis seeks to evoke.
