GUIDE TO ESSAY WRITING AND REFERENCING

WRITING AN ESSAY
Mark Cousins
Director of History and Theory Studies

These notes are designed to help students understand the importance of writing during their training at the AA, to understand the nature of an essay, and to provide advice on how best to prepare to write an essay, and how to plan it. It may be that some lucky individual students already possess a proven way of doing this and if this is the case then they can continue with their method and the habits that suit them. But experience teaches us that very few students have thought about the issue carefully and have developed a successful solution to the problems involved. Hopefully this guide will help them to approach the question in an intelligent way.

Architecture and writing
Often students take a negative view of the role of essay writing in their work as students at the AA. I have often heard it said that students feel that their ‘real’ work as students is design and learning to design. In this sense students often experience the obligation to write essays as a rather unwelcome supplement, as if essay writing is an onerous diversion from their real work. And so the first issue to be addressed is why essay writing is a vital part of a student’s work. Firstly, essay writing is central to the overall objective of enabling a student over a five year period, to develop an individual identity not just through their design work but through the capacity to articulate an independent and critical intelligence in respect to architecture. At the end of five years students should know what they think and should be able to justify that in terms of argument. One of the central functions of writing essays is to develop a skill in argument, which is the student’s own argument. This skill determines their capacity to explain and justify their own design work and to assess the designs of others. These are skills, they can be learned and the best way to learn them is to practice them. The second point which needs to be made is that professionally speaking, arguing in both speech and in writing is a fundamental dimension of the work of an architect and someone who lacks the skills will soon find themselves severely disadvantaged in practice. To this should also be added the general point that architects need to be able to describe architecture and architectural projects in words whether written or spoken. But the verbal description of architecture is a complex skill. We may think that architecture is best represented by plans, elevations, sections, etc. and we may use various forms of imagery to describe buildings and projects but this does not dispense with the centrality of the word. A student who graduates without having acquired the skill of describing buildings will not be able to animate their relation to architecture with the power of speaking or writing. The essay is a crucial starting point of being able to represent architecture in discourse. It is a skill just as much as drawing.

What is an essay?
An essay is the attempt to answer a question through argument and the presentation of evidence for the argument. In this sense a good essay requires a good question. You cannot write an essay on a topic. It makes no sense to write an essay on the architecture of Michelangelo or of Le Corbusier. A topic is just a title. It provides the student with no definition of the essay- which is a problem to be solved. All that a topic invites is information. But information can never be the basis of an essay even though information has a subordinate role as evidence. This is why from the beginning reliance upon sources of information such as Wikipedia or encyclopedias, or even scholarly books can never provide the basis of an essay. Of course information or ‘facts’ are crucial in the field of evidence. You cannot construct a reasonable argument which doesn’t have evidence or which runs counter to the
evidence. In this sense an essay is by its nature hybrid, it is an argument but one which must appeal to the evidence. In practice this means that every time you use a fact in an essay it must be in support of an argument. An essay then is an answer to a question based upon an argument which in turn justifies itself by reference to evidence or facts.

But what is an argument? This is worth asking because the answer is to some extent counter to the ways in which some educational systems have developed. There are still some systems in which a certain privilege is accorded to an official ‘line’ whether that is expressed by the lecturer or manifest in a textbook. In this case learning, memorizing, and repeating the ‘line’ is the desired outcome. If anything the essay would simply be a test to the student’s capacity to reproduce the ‘line’. This is absolutely what we do not mean by an essay. Taken to an extreme this is actually what we would call plagiarism. Perhaps this is why there is still some confusion about what the AA and other universities mean by plagiarism. Had one been brought up in an authoritarian educational system, the uncritical reproduction of the official ‘line’, be it the professor’s or the textbook’s, then what we call plagiarism would presumably be judged as a virtuous form of the completion of an academic task. We do not take this view at all. While we would hope that you find lectures helpful and interesting and while we insist that you read more than you do, the objective of the essay is not to reproduce them but to ask you what you think about them. In this sense the essay is a subjective response to a question. You ask yourself what you think about the question and your essay will be guided by your conclusions. In this way you are using the essay to come to a decision about what you yourself think. This may take the form of agreement with what you’ve read or it may take the form of violent disagreement. But in either case what is important is what you think. Only in this way can you come to learn what you think. Perhaps you will change your mind next year but this doesn’t matter, you will still be using the basic skill of asking yourself what you think now.

We have established that an argument must be made from a subjective point of view. It must be from your point of view. But that does not mean that it is what we might call ‘merely subjective’. An essay is not just the dogmatic presentation of personal opinions. While the whole essay is from a subjective point of view, at the same time it is controlled by the need to justify your claims and perhaps to changing your views in the light of the evidence which you have been studying. An argument is different from the expression of an opinion because it is constructed via the use of evidence. The evidence you use will support your argument. Central to the nature of the essay is this connection between the argument and the evidence. To establish your argument you need to select and present evidence that supports it. Sometimes this might involve your need to deal with the fact that your argument is in opposition to other arguments. In this case you will use evidence to reject the opposing arguments. So the fact that the essay is subjective, is your own argument, nonetheless has to be justified in terms of evidence. We might think of evidence as the public space of arguments. My definition of the essay is one which both insists upon its subjective character, that it is your answer and what you think but that this is quite different from it being just a personal expression of feeling and intuitions. You are as it were subjecting your subjectivity to the public forum of evidence. The essay is both subjective and public. You can see then that it follows the basic logic of design- of a private creation transformed into a public object.

Preparing for the essay
Having tried to explain what an essay is, let us look at the stages of preparing for it. Obviously it is here that you will be preparing by consulting a range of sources. It would be too much to call this research but it has about it the elements of research and the skills which you acquire here will enable you to undertake larger projects than just the essay. Assuming that you have attended the lectures and have done the reading indicated by the course bibliographies and assuming that perhaps in conjunction with your tutor, you have formulated an appropriate question at a certain point you will be ready to prepare the essay. You should regard this preparation as a vital and independent stage. Many students still leave no gap between the research they have been doing and starting to write the essay. It is as if they are largely concerned to get the essay ‘done’. This is a minor but real piece of insanity. You cannot start writing without knowing what to write. You need to prepare for the essay by thinking about the essay. Some will do this with a piece of paper, some will do it by going for a
walk, and some will ask a friend to listen to their proposal. Each person will probably find a different way of performing this task. You should follow whatever device seems to suit you. But in one way or another it is a vital and indispensable moment. You are asking yourself what you think and you are coming to some sort of conclusion. As we have already implied, those conclusions which will form the outline of your argument need to be fitted together with the evidence for them.

Planning the essay
Many students’ essays do the students a real injustice. The essay they produce, one can tell, is not nearly as good as it could have been. This is not necessarily about the quality of the student or the amount of research done, it stems solely from the student’s failure to plan the essay and therefore to organize the argument of the essay. They could have done it but they didn’t. No one can write an essay expecting to answer the question as a result of just writing it. You must make a clear distinction in your mind between the structure of your argument and the process of writing. In other words you must have a plan which contains both the argument you wish to make and what is a separate issue, the sequence in which you are going to make it. If perhaps out of urgency if you think you will just start writing and hope that the argument will miraculously appear, you will inevitably produce a much poorer essay than you are capable of. You cannot burden the process of writing with too many simultaneous tasks. If we look at this problem carefully we see that there are in effect three quite separate tasks. The first we can call the argument as such or the ‘logic’ of the argument. You should put down, and it need not take more than half a sheet of paper what the overall argument is and how it connects to different pieces of evidence. The second stage is a somewhat different task- it is how you are going to sequence the first stage in a continuous piece of writing. You may, for example, decide to start the essay in a way which is different from a logical sequence of your argument. Often successful openings concentrate upon the nature of the question rather than stating the logical sequence of the argument. Often conclusions return to the opening paragraph as a way of ending the essay. The end of an essay is rather different from the conclusion of the essay. If the first stage is a plan for the logic of the essay, the second outline concerns a plan of the sequence of the essay- what we might call the rhetoric of the essay. In all events this process of planning the essay should leave you in no doubt about what you are going to argue and how you are going to argue. You are now ready to write the essay, and can now concentrate on the literary task of writing it in as clear and interesting a way as you can. You are no longer burdening the writing with all the other tasks of organization within the essay. You now know at every moment in writing the essay what is coming next. Indeed if you have planned properly, you yourself will no longer be burdened with the anxiety of what you are going to say next. You already know. I would hope at this point that you begin to experience the pleasure which can come from writing. If you experience it as a dreaded punishment, it almost certainly means that you haven’t prepared the argument.

The essay and the paragraph
This section is implied by the previous section but looks at the problem from a functional point of view. The essays you are asked to do are really very short. But even in a short piece of writing it is worth breaking it down further into basic units. We might say that the basic unit of an essay is the paragraph. In an essay of say 3,500 words there are only a limited number of paragraphs- perhaps between ten and twelve. There is here a useful convergence between the number of paragraphs and the number of points which you might make in the essay. Each paragraph is the place where you make a point, an element of your overall argument. In this case we can look at the essay overall in which it is useful to think of the first paragraph as a statement of your overall argument. Paradoxically the first paragraph is really a statement of your conclusion. Apart from anything else this makes it much easier on the reader. It is as if the reader is now in the position of immediately seeing what it is overall that you wish to argue. The reader can now understand where you are going in the essay. This is very important. Too often students write essays without any sense that the essay is designed to be read by someone else. Too often one reads an essay which might in itself be full of interesting observations. But at the same time one has no idea where the essay is going and you begin to suspect that the writer did not either.
These points establish a kind of strategic link between the opening paragraph and all subsequent paragraphs. Indeed what is true of the essay as a whole is true about each paragraph. One can regard each paragraph in terms of an opening sentence which establishes the nature of the point that the rest of the paragraph argues for as well as presenting evidence that supports the argument. This advice should not become a mechanical formula for the essay but it is certainly worth applying it to the plan for the essay. The actual essay will deal with the plan by drawing it back to considerations of the essay in terms of its literary composition. But I have never seen an essay which suffered from too much clarity.

Footnotes and Bibliography
Overall these notes are designed to help students think about how to do an essay. There are of course published guides on how to write an essay but they tend both to be very obvious and not very concerned with how skills of argument and writing are in fact part of the general skill of an architect. But such guides might be useful in establishing a number of conventions such as how to present footnotes and bibliographies. My only observations on these issues would be that footnotes are mostly used by students to identify the source of a quotation. Obviously students must always acknowledge quotations, or they risk being accused of plagiarism. Certainly the correct way to acknowledge a quotation is to provide the source with a footnote. But there are other uses of a footnote. Sometimes one will have some very interesting piece of information which one wishes to express to the reader although it may not be relevant to the argument. It might confuse the reader if it were in the main body of the text. In this case it is better to put it as a footnote and to free the main text from it. Sometimes it is worth putting in your own thoughts in a footnote if they do not directly bear on the argument.

Conclusion
Although these notes were intended to deal with issues which are not usually part of the practical guides to essay writing, they also I hope serve as a justification for the importance of essay writing. An essay is an opportunity to develop your skills in argument and writing. These skills at an intellectual level are an absolute condition of acquiring an independent identity as an architect. Like all skills it is neither natural nor spontaneous, it develops only through and with practice. In professional terms it cannot be overstated how important these skills are. Without them, a student would emerge into a professional world with one hand tied permanently behind his or her back. It is the means through which you will be able to translate your design skills into a public world of architecture. The practice of architecture requires skills of analysis, of advocacy, and of analysis. The architect is by definition a public intellectual. No one can and no one can afford to neglect the centrality of these skills. Their effective employment is one which is both required and rewarded in architecture. I hope you find these notes useful and I am more than willing to discuss them individually with students during the year.
Referencing may seem constraining or overly detailed. Keep in mind, these systems exist to facilitate research. Once you learn a system, it becomes automatic and enhances your research and writing. Referencing is a type of hypertext link. Instead of connecting you to another website, references indicate other sites of knowledge.

Bibliographies are a way to categorise information, enabling you to work with sources in more creative ways. A bibliography places a work within a larger constellation of works, showing the corpus of knowledge from which it is drawn and the position it takes in regard to previous arguments. A footnote can lead to unexpected material, indicating new possibilities or holes in the argument.

Notes document as well as develop connections and arguments not central to the main arguments of the paper. In some styles of writing, footnotes carry the burden of academic proof and argument, which allows the main text to become more fluid.

Inconsistent referencing is unacceptable. Casual citation displays a general lack of rigour; it becomes unclear how you have utilised the materials of the course and how you understand and interpret them; your arguments are less clear, and it is difficult to discern what you are trying to say versus the opinions the other authors are referencing. In extreme cases, casual referencing practices veer into plagiarism.

Do not plagiarise. You must cite the words of another author. This is not confined to verbatim transposition; excessive paraphrasing is also plagiarism. Cite anything you did not generate that is not of “general knowledge.” Cite images. Cite music. Cite recognisable code.

Every academic professional journal requires standard referencing. If you are interested in writing or publishing your design work, learn the conventions as soon as possible. Transforming or developing variations of a standard referencing style is often effective as long as you understand exactly what is being altered. Referencing must be treated in a precise and critical manner.

For “creative referencing” that falls within acceptable academic parameters see Rosalind Krauss’ annotated referencing style in The Optical Unconscious.

Referencing Manuals

The following are perhaps the two most complete reference books used for referencing and for the preparation of manuscripts. Most academic journals use one of these as their model. These compendiums have an example for every type of reference imaginable including referencing samples for electronic sites and databases. They are available in most libraries and bookstores. Alternately, the notes, used by a major publisher may clarify more common citations. Be careful which publisher you use and utilize the same one throughout (MIT Press is a good example).

The Chicago Manual of Style, 15th edition
http://www.press.uchicago.edu/Misc/Chicago/cmosfaq/cmosfaq.html

The Humanities Referencing Style

This form of referencing puts the bibliographic information into a footnote or endnote called out in
the text by corresponding superscript number. Short articles may be accompanied by a bibliography, although this is unnecessary if every source is cited in a reference. Longer works almost always have a bibliography. Please note, according to this style, references within a note or within the bibliography have slightly different forms. It’s also the most common within architecture.

Referencing with a footnote- at the bottom of the page for a footnote or at the end of the text as with endnotes, you have the following citation:


The reference marker occurs within the body of the text, usually as a superscript number. Full footnotes appear at the bottom of the page on which the reference occurs, endnotes at the end of a chapter or at the end of an entire work. Both footnotes and endnotes refer to a quote, paraphrase or reference to a text or object.

Don’t over footnote; provide one whenever you are utilising an idea from another writer that is not a well-known fact / something that could be assumed to be common knowledge.

Referencing with the bibliography- at the end of the text you may have a bibliography in which the book appears in alphabetical order according to author:


Bibliographies should list every book used in the construction of your argument, whether explicitly cited in the text or not. More traditionally a bibliography would list the complete corpus of writings on a topic; anything less complete would be called “References” or “Works Cited.” Bibliographic citations have different forms than the footnote/endnote and are listed alphabetically according to the author’s last name. If you use more than one work from a single author, list these in ascending chronological order. If a text has more than one author (e.g. Deleuze and Guattari), use the name that appears first on the title page of the text.

Remember that bibliographic references and footnotes/endnotes vary slightly in form. The former is considered a complete and independent phrase; the latter is a dependent, an extrapolation, or refers to the main text.

Using “ibid” and “op. Cit.”- Most people who use “ibid” within their citations do so improperly. Ibid may be used only when a reference is exactly the same as the one immediately preceding it. You may not use ibid if any aspect of the reference is different besides the page number.

For example:

35 Ibid, 67

“op. cit.” or “loc. cit.” [Latin abbreviations for “in the works cited” and “in the place cited” respectively] are often used to refer to a previously cited work.

For example:

57 Krauss, op. cit., 78

Both of these methods can confuse the reader and are prone to mistakes. For example, what if you also referred to another book by Krauss earlier in the text, but overlooked this fact? Or, of the last reference was pages before, the reader must do too much work to find the information. In such a case,
using “op. cit.” could misdirect the reader. As a result, general use of “ibid” and “op. cit.” is now discouraged. Instead, use the short form of author, date, page number. This does not take any more time, is clearer, and avoids any confusion due to mistakes in referencing. For word processing, it has the added advantage of remaining correct even if the citation moves to a different point in the text; this is not necessarily so with the abbreviations.

Examples of some basic references:

Footnote:


The footnote’s bibliographic reference:


The following examples are offered as bibliographic references.

Two authors:


An article in a journal:


An article or essay on an edited anthology or monograph:


An edited anthology or monograph:


An entire internet site:


Information from a website:


Quoting Material

If a quoted passage of text is shorter than three lines, it should be indicated by quote marks (“and”)

If you leave out part of the quote, use an ellipsis (...) at the point of omission unless it is absolutely
obvious the quote is a fragment. If the omission occurs at the end of a sentence add a period or ending punctuation. If the omission is longer than three lines of text, indicate this by breaking the quoted text into a new paragraph after the ellipsis. For example:

As Georges Bataille states “monsters thus would be the dialectical opposite of geometric regularity.”

If longer than three lines it should be set on its own without the use of quotes, the following paragraph is an example:

As Georges Bataille states in his short essay, “Deviations of Nature:”

Without broaching…the question of the metaphysical foundations of any given dialectic, one can affirm that the determination of a dialectical development of facts as concrete as visible forms would be literally overwhelming…

From this statement, one can begin to understand the problematic moment when the ideal, the average becomes epistemologically consonant – they are, as Georges Canguilhem argues, degree zero of monstrosity.

Quotes within quotes should use single marks (‘and’)-

As Georges Bataille states, “a ‘freak’ in any given fair provokes a positive impression…”
This course introduces foundational concepts and seeks to create a dialogue between contemporary practice and themes of investigation within the history of architecture and urbanism from antiquity to the present. Employing wide-view thematic lenses such as authority, pluralism, language, media, landscape, ecology, technology, utopia and fantasy, we will explore key moments in a global history of buildings, cities and texts. Although rooted in the Western tradition, our discussion will draw upon case examples from a range of continents and cultures.

Our approach will incorporate an analysis of evolving theoretical concepts of formal production and aesthetics and will also situate built environment constructs within their social and political contexts. Course readings will provide an orientation in fundamental ideas while writing assignments emphasize the development of original arguments and criticism.

**Autumn:**
1. Introduction
2. Authority
3. Cosmos
4. Language
5. John Soane house: lecture + visit
6. Pluralism (Architecture)
7. Pluralism (Urbanism)
8. Media

**Winter:**
1. Landscape
2. Ecology
3. Technology
4. The Barbican: lecture + visit
5. Infrastructure
6. Utopia
7. Fantasy
8. Conclusion

**Course Texts:**
- Kostof, Spiro.  A History of Architecture: Settings and Rituals
- Ching, Francis, Jarzombek, Mark and Prakash, Vikramaditya. A Global History of Architecture
- Trachtenberg, Marvin. Architecture from Pre-history to Postmodernity
- Curtis, William. Modern Architecture since 1900
- Frampton, Kenneth. Modern Architecture: a critical history
- Ockman, Joan ed. Architecture culture 1943-1968: a documentary anthology
Select Readings:

Tafuri, Manfredo. *Architecture and utopia: design and capitalist development*
Foucault, Michel. *Discipline and punish*
Hardt, Michael and Negri, Antonio. *Empire*
Easterling, Keller. *Enduring Innocence: global architecture and its political masquerades*
Gandelsonas, Mario. “From Structure to Subject: the formation of an architectural language”
Frampton, Kenneth. “Industrialization and the Crises in Architecture.”
Fisher, Ole W. “Precisions on ‘Precisions’ – Architecture, Art and Science”
Picon, Antoine. “Architecture and the Sciences: Scientific Accuracy or Productive Misunderstanding?”
ARCHITECTURES: THEIR PASTS AND THEIR CULTURES

Course Lecturer: MARK COUSINS
Course Tutor: RYAN DILLON
Teaching Assistants: ALEJANDRA CELEDON and IVONNE SANTOYO

The 2nd Year History and Theory course has typically been a history course. This is certainly not a ‘survey’ course. Thus, we will focus on the variety of types of architecture both in historical terms and within different cultures. In this sense, the lecture and seminar course is about how culture influences architecture and about how architecture influences culture. The aim of the lecture series will attempt to show how different cultural forms produce different architectural forms. To demonstrate this we look at how different religious forms have been related to different architectural forms; or how different forms of political power have produced different types of architecture; or how people have argued that different national identities have resulted in different architectural styles. The course attempts to make students aware of the relation between architectural form and a range of social focus.

The lectures will cover a wide range of topics exposing the relationship of architecture to culture. We will look at the variety of ways in which buildings are designed in many cultures and traditions throughout time. We will investigate modernity’s recent invention of the figure of the ‘architect’ while comparing this with other building traditions, as well as buildings without an architecture and with vernacular architecture. The concentration of architectural designs within the profession of trained architects would strike many cultures as strange and it is important to be aware of the other methods and design practices that are devoid of the ‘architect’.

A central dimension of the course is to provide an opportunity for students to develop their own arguments through the practice of writing. Unlike previous courses, the Thursday morning session will start with the seminar and conclude with the lecture. The seminar will provide the students a forum to discuss readings, present readings to the class in groups, and engage with graphic exercises that are aimed at developing arguments through research and writing. Time will be set aside to deal with the problem of how to research and write well-structured essays. This course-booklet contains an example paper on how to think about writing an essay. We hope you find it and the course useful in improving your ability to construct an argument through the important skill of writing.

Autumn Term
Please note that all assigned readings for each lecture topic will be discussed in the seminar portion of the class during the following week. For example, Week 1 readings on ‘Architecture’ will be discussed during the Week 2 Seminar.

Week 1 – ARCHITECTURE
How is architecture defined, and how is it distinguished from building, from the vernacular and from ‘architecture without architects’.

Required Seminar Readings:
Readings for this week will be a collection of short texts provided by the tutors from a diverse selection of many publications including but not limited too the following: Vitruvius, Then Books on Architecture; Alberti, L.B., On the Art of Building in Ten Books; Laugier, Marc-Antoine, An Essay on Architecture; Durand, Jean-Nicolas-Louis, Précis de the Lecture on Architecture; Le Corbusier, Towards a New Architecture; Gideon, Sigfried, Space, Time and
These texts will be handed out to the students prior during Week 1 Seminar

**Week 2 – DESIGN**
What is design? How did it evolve? How does it relate to the emergence of architectural representation, plans, sections, etc.?

**Required Seminar Readings:**

**Suggested Seminar Readings:**

**Week 3 – THE ARCHITECT**
Can there be architecture without architects? How did the figure of the architect evolve?

**Required Seminar Readings:**

**Suggested Seminar Readings:**

**Week 4 – PROFESSION**
The nineteen-century emergence of architecture as a profession is compared with medicine.
Why has the architect occupied a weaker position then the lawyer or the doctor?

**Required Seminar Readings:**

**Suggested Seminar Readings:**
Week 5 – **ARCHITECTURAL HISTORY**
An account of how architectural history has evolved as a concept and as a practise in the nineteenth-century. Why is it based upon a narrative of a successions of styles, classical, gothic, renaissance, baroque, etc. and why this is a problem for architectural students?

**Required Seminar Readings:**

**Suggested Seminar Readings:**

Week 6 – **RELIGION**
Each of the major monotheist religions is associated with major architectural outcomes. The lecture will question the extent to which the religions in themselves stamped particular forms upon architecture. It shows how each of them derived from Roman and other forms.

**Required Seminar Readings:**

**Suggested Seminar Readings:**

Week 7 – **POWER**
Architecture has emerged as always been central to the exercise and expression of power. Rulers have tried to convey their power through architecture; different types of regimes have sought to clarify their nature through architecture. Considers the form of the ‘palace’ and its mutations.

**Required Seminar Readings:**


Suggested Seminar Readings:


Week 8 – THE HOUSE

Describes why the house, a site of human shelter has often been regarded as its fundamental unit of architecture and why I argue that this is wrong. Considers the emergence of the nineteenth-century of the category of ‘housing’ as a category of urbanism.

Required Seminar Readings:


Suggested Seminar Readings:


Winter Term

Week 9 – MODERNITY AND ITS EXPORT

The lecture will look at the new types of architecture, which evolve in industrial capitalism. The Factory, the Office, the Railway Station.

Required Seminar Readings:


Suggested Seminar Readings:

**Week 10 – THE ENGINEER AND INFRASTRUCTURE**
The lecture traces the overlap between architects and engineers in building and projects to provide an infrastructure for cities, for transports, etc. It will also attempt to specify the different by tracing the hostility of architects to the proposal for the Eiffel Tower.

**Required Seminar Readings:**

**Suggested Seminar Readings:**

**Week 11 – NATIONAL IDENTITY AND ARCHITECTURE**
In what sense are the national identities, which are expressed in architecture? The lecture will discuss of contemporary India and China, architecture and national identity.

**Required Seminar Readings:**

**Suggested Seminar Readings:**

**Week 12 – POLITICAL IDENTITY AND ARCHITECTURE**
Can we speak of architectural forms as an expression or representation of politics? Was there a Nazi architecture, or a Fascist architecture, or a Communist architecture? What does it mean by calling a building conservative, or indeed revolutionary?

**Required Seminar Readings:**

**Suggested Seminar Readings:**

**Week 13 – THE MONUMENT**
Architecture has had a traditional task to help the remembrance of events and persons. How can one think of dimensions of memory within the contemporary city and architecture?

**Required Seminar Readings:**

**Suggested Seminar Readings:**

**Week 14 – ARCHITECTURE WITHOUT BUILDING**
Architects have traditionally designed objects, which are not ‘built’ – theatrical entertainment, pageants into twentieth-century projects for staging, exhibition, design as well as furniture and household objects. How does architecture relate to the general industrial field of design?

**Required Seminar Readings:**

**Suggested Seminar Readings:**
‘Power of Ten’, Film Documentary by Ray and Charles Eames, 1968

**Week 15 – THE LIFE AND DEATH OF ARCHITECTURE**
Most architectural histories treat ‘history’ of a building as the date of design and construction. But one important dimension of architecture is that it frequently survives. Through the case study of the Parthenon and its new Museum the life span of the building will be addressed.

**Required Seminar Readings:**
Hugo, Victor, *The Hunchback of Notre Dame*,

**Required Seminar Readings:**
Forster, Kurt, ‘Monument/Memory and the Mortality of Architecture’, p. 25-35 in *Oppositions Reader*

Week 16 – **CONCLUSION**
Why should we be concerned with the architectural past? What is it?
In 2010/11 Year 3 will continue to re-calibrate its sixteen entries to a twentieth-century architectural canon while also introducing an equal number of alternative, less consensual, projects that signal other important architectural trajectories in the rise of modern architecture in Western Europe. The course will start with the Amsterdam Bourse and Adolf Loos’s “Ornament and Crime” and this finish with the Vanna Venturi House and Denise Scott Brown’s and Robert Venturi’s, “On Ducks and Decoration”. On a week-by-week basis students will come to understand and interpret key texts and decipher their different terms and issues. At the same time, they will learn ways to comprehend and analyse wildly different architectural projects and consider and question the role of the architect in practice. Between design and architectural theory there is a constant exchange of categories and students will develop knowledge of these and the wide range of debates and practices defining modern architecture.

In short, this course will make the discourse of modern architecture more intelligible, while expanding and interrogating its definition, and ground the idea of an experimental or critical modern practice and the relationship between architectural theories and projects. The autumn term will chart the arrival of modern architecture at the start of the 20thc to pre-World War II. The winter term will trace the expanding nature and geography of this architectural discourse up to 1968. It prioritizes individual buildings over urban schemes (like ones that consumed Kahn, Corbusier and Niemeyer in the middle of the century) and it privileges built work, although a few un-built projects have slipped in. You will gain a clear and rigorous historical sense of the emergence of contemporary practice and develop a robust knowledge of the history and theory necessary for the practice, analysis and interpretation of modern and contemporary architecture and urbanism.

AUTUMN TERM

**Session 1**
**Reading**
Adolf Loos, “Ornament and Crime” (1908)

**Project**
Hendrik P. Berlage, Stock Exchange, Amsterdam (1898-1903)

**Alternative Reading**
Hermann Muthesius – “New Ornament and New Art” (1901)

**Alternative Project**
Antonio Gaudí, Colonia Güell, Santa Coloma de Cervelló (1900, unfinished)

**Session 2**
**Reading**
Robin Evans, “Translations from Drawing to Building” (1986)

**Alternative Reading**
Theo van Doesburg, “Towards a Plastic Architecture” (1924)

**Alternative Project**
Eileen Gray, House E-1027, Roquebrune-Cap-Martin, France
Session 4  Architecture as Publication
  Session 4 Reading 1  Beatriz Colomina, “Publicity”, in Privacy and Publicity (1994)
  Session 5 Reading  Walter Gropius, “Principles of Bauhaus Production [Dessau]” (1926)
  Session 5 Project  Walter Gropius, Bauhaus, Dessau (1926)
  Alternative Reading  Werner Oechslin, “Raumplan versus Plan libre”
  Alternative Project  Ivan Illich Leonidov, Lenin Institute, Moscow (1927)
Session 6  ‘Architecture as Provocation’
  Session 6 Reading  Antonio Sant'Elia and Filippo Tommaso Marinetti, “Futurist Architecture” (1914)
Session 7  Reading  Henry-Russell Hitchcock and Philip Johnson, Intro to “The International Style” (1932)
  Session 7 Project  Giuseppe Terrangi, Casa del Fascio, Como (1932-1936)
  Alternative Reading  R. Buckminster Fuller, “Designing a New Industry” (1946)
  Alternative Project  R. Buckminster Fuller, Dymaxion House (c. 1920-1945)
Session 8  ‘Architecture as Portfolio’
  Session 8 Reading  Peter Eisenman, Diagram Diaries (1999)

Key Source Texts

WINTER TERM
Session 9 Reading  José Luis Sert, Fernand Léger, Sigfried Giedion, “Nine Points on Monumentality” (1943)
  Session 9 Project  Oscar Niemeyer, Casino, Pampulha, Brazil (1942)
  Alternative Reading  Ludwig Mies van der Rohe, “Technology and Architecture” (1950)
  Alternative Project  Ludwig Mies van der Rohe, Farnsworth House, Plano, Illinois (1946-1951)
  Session 10 Project  Gordon Bunshaft, Lever House, NY (1950-1952)
Alternative Project  Alvar Aalto, Säynätsalo Town Hall, Finland (1951)

**Session 11 Reading**  Philip Johnson, “The Seven Crutches of Modern Architecture” (1954)
**Session 11 Project**  Le Corbusier, Unité d’Habitation, Marseilles, France (1947-53)

Alternative Reading  William Katavolos, “Organics” (1960)
Alternative Project  Constant, New Babylon (1959-)

**Session 12 Reading**  ‘Situationists’: International Manifesto (1960)
**Session 12 Project**  Frank Lloyd Wright, Solomon R. Guggenheim Museum, NY (1943-1959)

Alternative Project  Pierre Koenig, Case Study House 21, Los Angeles (1958)

**Session 13 Reading**  Manfredo Tafuri, “Modern Architecture and the Eclipse of History“ (1968)
**Session 13 Project**  Le Corbusier, Palais des Congrès-Strasbourg, France (1962-64)

Alternative Reading  Aldo van Eyck, “Steps toward a Configurative Discipline (1962)
Alternative Project  James Stirling and Gowan, Leicester University Engineering Building (1959)

**Session 14 Reading**  Werner Ruhnau/Yves Klein, “Project for an aerial architecture” (1960)
**Session 14 Project**  Eero Saarinen, TWA Terminal, New York (1956-62)

Alternative Reading  Peter Cook, “Zoom and ‘Real’ Architecture” (1964)
Alternative Project  Friedrich Kiesler, Endless House (1958-60)

**Session 15 Reading**  Charles W. Moore, “Plug it in, Rameses, and See if it Lights Up” (1967)
**Session 15 Project**  Jorn Utzon, Sydney Opera House (1965)

Alternative Reading  Reyner Banham, “A Home is Not a House” (1965)
Alternative Project  Paul Rudolph, Art & Architecture Building, Yale University (1963)

**Session 16 Reading**  Denise Scott Brown and Robert Venturi, “On Ducks and Decoration” (1968)
**Session 16 Project**  Robert Venturi, Vanna Venturi House, Chestnut Hill, PA (1959-1964)

Alternative Reading  Alan Colquhoun, “Typology and Design Method” (1967)
Alternative Project  Claude Parent & Paul Virilio, Church of Saint Bernadette, Nevers, France (1966)

**Key Source Texts**
Submissions
The submission, which will be discussed in group and individual tutorials, is to develop and present an in-depth understanding of a single project/building (built or un-built) or text which has not been directly addressed in the lectures and that was conceived or written between 1900 and 1968. You will be expected to present your initial ideas to your tutorial group in the form of a short PowerPoint presentation outlining your essay topic and outline during the middle part of the term. The form of the final submission will normally be a written submission. However we are willing to accept submissions in other forms e.g. drawing etc., although we will expect that the alternative submission format be substantial enough to replace a 3,000-word essay.
LABOUR, CITY, FORM: TOWARDS A COMMON ARCHITECTURAL LANGUAGE
PIER VITTORIO AURELI

The seminar addresses the development of the modern city through the lens of architectural and urban theories from the 15th to the 20th century. The aim is to trace implicit and explicit ideas of and for the city that can be found in speculations about architectural and urban form. Instead of viewing form as the by-product of forces that transcend the materiality of the city, the seminar addresses form as the necessary precondition any project of political and economic government of the city. Form will be addressed as the dialectical relationship between two categories that have a fundamental impact on the development of the modern city: the concept of the political and the concept of labour. As such the concept of form will be addressed as mode of relationship, as the organizational principle that binds the constituent elements of the city. The hypothesis that the seminar maintains is that issues that are internal to the discipline of architecture such as order, representation, imitation, composition, abstraction, genericness are rooted within the transformations of the organization of labour. From the 15th century with the rise of Capital the organization of labour has been a fundamental, if not the most important, act of government. Even if, according to the famous definition of Hannah Arendt, political action must be considered autonomous from the other two essential spheres of the human condition – labour and work - labour has been a fundamental site of political struggle. It is for this reason the relationship between form and labour is never a symmetrical relationship. The destabilizing factor is always the possibility of political decision. Political decision intervenes by directing the organization of labour in order to confront and tame the class of producers. The outcome of this process has consequences on (and sometimes is anticipated by) issues of formal syntax in architecture, and invention of new urban types. In this process architecture and urban form become a fundamental instrument of government whose subject is not only the power(s) that architecture celebrates, but also those new emerging subjects whose power is suppose to be subjugated. Subjugation, or better subjectification, is here intended as the establishment of apparatuses whose goal is to subtly control emerging subjects by giving to them the possibility of development. This process of subjectification – a process that in history has taken radically different forms from language, to culture, to space, to art - has forced urban form to evolve and transform itself. In order to analyze deep into architecture the conditions of this process the seminar will analyze architectural and urban theories that have formulated an idea of form either for architecture, for the city, or for both. Categories such as abstraction, reification, and the generic in relationship with the rise and affirmation of capital will be addressed as the fundamental conceptual background of the evolution of architectural language and its consequences on the form of the city.
General Readings for the Seminar:


1st Session:
What is a city? What is labour? Notes on the organization of the city from the Ancients to the Moderns.

Readings:

2nd Session:
The order of space: On Filippo Brunelleschi’s perspectival space, and Leon Battista Alberti’s concept of Concinnitas.

Readings:

3rd session:
The order of form: On Sebastiano Serlio’s materialist approach to architecture.

Readings:

4th session:
Towards Inclusivism: On Jean Nicholas Louis Durand’s rational design method

5th Session:
Background Architecture: On Pierre Le Muet’s architecture d’accompagnement

Readings:

6th session
From city to Urbanization: On Ildefonso Cerdà’s. *Teoría general de la urbanización*

Readings:

Joan Busquets with the Harvard University Graduate School of Design, *Barcelona: The Urban Evolution of a Compact City* (Rovereto: Nicolodi; Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Graduate School of Design, 2005).

**7th session:**
*Towards Nothingness*: on Ludwig Hilberseimer and Mies Van Der Rohe and the rise of post-fordism.

Readings:

**8th session:**
*The dissolution of the city*: on Cedric Price, and Archizoom’s city without form.

Conclusions

Readings:

**FLOW**

**LARA BELKIND**

This seminar investigates the spaces and infrastructures of an emerging 21st century urban paradigm: the polycentric megacity or ‘city of flows.’ Focusing on high-speed transport and communications links, we will employ frameworks from the field of science, technology, and society studies (STS), including the work of Bruno Latour, to explore the cultural complexity underlying technological megaprojects. In addition, we will make use of a technological megaproject currently unfolding in Paris, *Supermétro*, as a field in which to test conceptual ideas.

On one hand, the evolution of the city from node to network has been characterized by splintering and specialization. The design of a network is a battleground upon which metropolitan culture, form, and power relations are determined – lines between civil and social engineering are finely drawn. Yet infrastructure may open a ‘other space’ within the city, a heterotopia as conceptualized by Michel Foucault. Networks are also liminal zones that invite participation or subversion in a dispersed, polarized metropolis. Here is a new public sphere, one appropriated by graffiti artists, political protest, happenings, teen subcultures, and the subtle everyday exchanges of urban dwellers.

**Autumn:**
1. Flows and Networks
2. Remaking Paris as the City of Flows
3. Technology and Conflict
Infrastructure as Heterotopia
Civil and Social Engineers
Paris Workshop
Presentations
Presentations

READINGS
L’Architecture d’Aujourd’hui # 376, Special Volume on Grand Paris (Feb-March 2010)
Marc Augé, Non-places: Introduction to an Anthropology of Supermodernity (1995)
Michiel Dehaene and Lieven de Cauter eds., Heterotopia and the City: public space in a postcivil society (2008)
Gilles Delalex, Go With the Flow: Architecture, Infrastructure and the Everyday Experience of Mobility (2006)
Michel Foucault, “Of Other Spaces” (1967)
Stephen Graham and Simon Marvin, Splintering Urbanism: Networked Infrastructures, Technological Mobilities and the Urban Condition (2001)
Bruno Latour, Reassembling the Social: An Introduction to Actor-Network-Theory
Lars Lerup, “Stim and Dross: Rethinking the Metropolis” in After the City (2000)
François Maspero, Roissy Express: A Journey through the Paris Suburbs (1990/1994)
Tommaso Venturini, “Representing Controversies” (2008)

VIEWINGS:
Chantal Akerman, News from Home (1977)
Luc Besson, Subway (1985)
Laurent Cantet, Entre les Murs (2008)
Walter Hill, The Warriors (1979)
Mathieu Kassovitz, La Haine (1995)
Tony Silver and Henry Chalfant, Style Wars (1983)
Scratch beneath the surface of normality and you are likely to find the complete opposite – the perverse, paranoid, or maladjusted. This course will examine the architectural dynamics of normalcy and perversion in the post-war American suburb through a critical reading of a series of textual, cultural, and filmic references. As JG Ballard once offered, this architecture expressed his fear that “nothing exciting or new or interesting is ever going to happen again, the future is just going to be a vast, conforming suburb of the soul.”

Course Outline:


Session 8: Dead Ends: Richard Hofstadter, ‘The Paranoid Style in American Politics’ (1964), The Zapruder Film (1963) and *Parallax View* (1974)

Bibliography:


Georges Canguilhem, *The Normal and the Pathological* (1943)


Joan Didion, *The White Album* (1979)

Sigmund Freud, *Psycho-Analytic Notes on an Autobiographical Account of a Case of Paranoia (Dementia Paranoïdès)* (1911), *A Case Of Paranoia Running Counter To The Psycho-Analytic Theory Of The Disease* (1915)

Siegfried Giedion, *Mechanization Takes Command* (1946)

Richard Hofstadter, ‘The Paranoid Style in American Politics’ (1964)


Daniel Paul Schreber, *Memoirs of My Nervous Illness* (1903)


Hunter S. Thompson, *Fear and Loathing in Las Vegas: A Savage Journey to the Heart of the American Dream* (1972)


**Mark Campbell** is a PhD candidate in the School of Architecture at Princeton University. His research interests include contemporary American culture between 1960 and 1975, paranoia, cultural exhaustion and dreams. A practising architect, he is a founding principal of paperaeroplane and has taught at Auckland University, Princeton University and the Cooper Union.

---

**THE HISTORY OF HOMECOMING**

**MARK COUSINS**

In our culture the term ‘home’ is usually associated with a built object—the home. But the equation is not always or everywhere true. Even now when a migrant or an exile speaks of home, we do not assume that this is the same as a house. To start, the course will consider how we have come to conflate the house with the idea of home, a largely modern and urban phenomenon.

In order to organize a large body of literature, the course will concentrate upon the aspect of the topic which we will call homecoming. What has the subject ‘lost’ by needing to return home? The course will look at the most famous case of homecoming, that of Odysseus, told by Homer. It considers how the emotional appeal of ‘returning’ has an effect, not simply on narrative but within philosophy. It then considers how culturally the loss of home led in the seventeenth century to the clarification of ‘nostalgia’ as an illness. From that it investigates the role of exile as a figure, within modernity of displacement.

At the same time it considers how ‘home’ became territorialized leading to the discourse of patriotism and nationalism, in which the defence of ‘home’ became the basis for exclusionary
strategies. Part of this involves understanding the relation of the family and terms of kinship in which father and mother are projected onto geography.

As a way of tracing these themes into the contemporary, the course will engage in a detailed analysis of Jean Luc Godard’s film ‘Le mépris’ (Contempt) which concerns a film about Odysseus being made and its location in Capri and the famous twentieth century house La Casa Malaparte, as well as the apartment of the central couple.

Lectures
1. The home/house and its role in architecture.
2. The loss of home: exile and nostalgia.
3. Odysseus and the epic of the return to Ithaca.
4. The ‘return’ as a figure in culture and knowledge.
5. The territorialization of home.
6. Dwelling and Heidegger.
7. Le mépris (Contempt)
8. The Casa Malaparte

Bibliography
J. L. Godard: Le Mepris (DVD)
M. I. Finley: The World of Odysseus
Homer: The Odyssey
J. P. Vernant: The Universe, The Gods and Mortals
Cavafy: Poems
A. Moravia: Contempt
M. Cousins: Away from Home

THE JEAN-ERIC
Or
EIGHT LECTURES ON EVERYTHING ZAHA HATES
Or
IF THIS CRISIS IS THE SPECTACLE, WHERE IS THE REAL?
P AUL DAVIES

Jonathan Meades ten page essay (Zaha; The First Great Female Architect; Intelligent Life, The Economist 2008) is the ‘best thing I’ve read about architecture for years’ said a good friend of mine, who was the best architect I knew, until he started throwing so much coke up his nose. In that sentence resides the content of the course; a penetrating if oblique and over stylish essay; a smart but inebriated and now dulled individual (lost) a hoity, self aggrandising and often preposterous discourse to be slapped around; a concern for the everyday, for the wider facts (whatever they are) with Bukowskiesque leanings.

When people ask me what the generic in architecture might be (not often) since reading Jonathan Meades essay, I say ‘By the look of it, everything Zaha hates.’

By outlining what she dislikes, I hope to show (each of us in our own minds) what she is for, or what in general contemporary architectural genius seems to consist of. As JM points out, ZH appears to talk perfect sense about everything OTHER than architecture. This would seem problematic. It is not easy to tell what Zaha does and why and how she does it. It is no longer easy to work out what architecture students are doing and how and why they do it either (as you know from personal experience).

The process will be rather satirical, but grounded in the analysis of deeply troubling historical processes.
Sessions:
2. General Questions of representation of space and time.
3. General Questions on the future in the past
4. General Questions as to being a great architect today
5. General Questions as to architecture and everyday life
6. Particular discussion of theories supporting the ugly and the ordinary
7. Particular discussion of architecture in the service economy
8. Group discussion of essay topics.

Reading List
Chase, J: Glitter Stucco and Dumpster Diving
Badiou, A: The Communist Hypothesis
Jerde, J: You are Here
Hickey, D: Air Guitar
Fuller, B: Ownership Manual for Spaceship Earth
Waugh, E: Decline and Fall
Venturi, R: LFLV
Girouard, M: Big Jim
Klosterman, C: Chuck Klosterman IV
Eagleton, T: After Theory
Hudson, M: Super Imperialism

ORNAMENT: BETWEEN VIRTUE AND INIQUITY
OLIVER DOMEISEN

The Rococo of the 18th century, the stylistic eclecticism of the 19th century, and the Art Nouveau of the early 20th century have habitually been described as architectural periods of decline and decadence. But who is it that condemns such ornamental virtuosity? And what are their ulterior motives? Are there alternative points of view? Using source texts from all three periods we will discover how ornament had repeatedly become the battleground upon which the future of architecture was forged. Authors such as William Hogarth, Gottfried Semper, Owen Jones, Alois Riegl, John Ruskin, Louis Sullivan or Adolf Loos have all defined ornament for their own age and for their own wilful objectives. We will discuss the historical contexts, underlying pathologies and enduring legacies of these seminal texts, and we will determine their relevance in establishing a desperately needed contemporary theoretical framework. We will also discover how each author provides us with interpretative tools that allow us to critically assess contemporary ornamental production, be it by Herzog & de Meuron, Toyo Ito or yourself. This course will give you a glimpse into one of architecture’s biggest conspiracies and equip you with the knowledge and vocabulary to partake in a rapidly emerging discourse.

Sessions will take place on Wednesday afternoons from 3pm.

Session 1 (06/10/2010): Introduction: The Four Elements of Ornament (Naturalism, Geometry, Materialism, Iconography)

Session 2 (13/10/2010): 18th Century: The Rocaille: Line of Beauty or Micromegalic Intemperance?

Required reading:
WILLIAM HOGARTH, The Analysis of Beauty, 1753.

**Session 3 (20/10/2010)**  
19th Century (1): *Ornament as Symbolic Mask or Expression of Structure?*  
**Required reading:**  
GOTTFRIED SEMPER, *Style in the Technical and Tectonic Arts; or, Practical Aesthetics* 1860.  
**Recommended reading:**  

**Session 4 (27/10/2010)**  
19th Century (2): *Style as Formal Eclecticism or Historical Evolution?*  
**Required reading:**  
**Recommended reading:**  

**Session 5 (03/11/2010)**  
19th Century (3): *Ornament as Indexical Icon or Machined Decoration?*  
**Required reading:**  
**Recommended reading:**  
William Morris, *The Arts and Crafts of To-day*, 1889.

**Session 6 (10/11/2010)**  
20th C. (1): *Ornament as Emotional Expression or Machined Impression?*  
**Required reading:**  
**Recommended reading:**  

Session 7 (17/11/2010)

20th C. (2): *Ornament as Crime or Redemption?*

**Required reading:**
- ADOLF LOOS, *Ornament and Education*, 1924.

**Recommended reading:**

Session 8 (24/11/2010)

21st C.: *Future Ornament: A Production of Meaning or Pattern?*

**Required reading:**

**Recommended reading:**

**Required Submission:** Illustrated essay, min. 2000 words (incl. captions). The essay will describe and compare the ornament of two buildings, one historical and one contemporary, in light of relevant theories discussed during the seminar. You will present your selection of buildings and bibliography during session 8 (or earlier). Submissions are due Friday 10th December.

Oliver Domeisen AA dipl. produces, teaches, curates and writes about architecture, currently with a focus on ornament. He produced the “Re-sampling Ornament” exhibition for the Swiss Architecture Museum Basel and Arkitekturmuseet Stockholm in 2008-09. He as lectured on the topic at the V&A, Eikones Institute Basel, Yale University, Art Basel and the Werner Oechslin Foundation. His writings on ornament were published in Detail, S AM, Volume, A.D., Archithese et al. He has been a Unit Master at the AA since 2001, currently teaching Diploma Unit 13. Previously a project architect at Zaha Hadid he founded dlm architectural designers ltd in 2000.
This course concerns itself with physical (and not ethical) error in architecture; though as we shall see morality does permeate all questions of error. Head in the clouds, feet in the clay: the cliché adroitly defines architects by their location between abstraction and materialisation. The architect’s feat: to put into material that which is outside of materiality is necessarily plagued by the error that accompanies all physicality. Not for nothing then are the architect’s relations to precision, error and matter both highly convoluted and highly compromised.  This course is a critique of these relations. Through an analysis of Aristotle’s original conflation of matter with error the seminars will argue that examination of error as a category in its own right provides a potential ‘way in’ to the sticky question of matter. Establishing a distinction between enforceable and redundant precision, the sessions will argue further that the symptomatic excess of precision in architectural culture, inflated above all reasonable performance, is nothing less than the architect’s fear of matter itself. Not surprisingly then do we find a complex architecture of fortification erected to protect all formal production from incursions by erroneous matter: margins for error, standards and specifications, tolerance and material failure thresholds. Within this, at a systemic level, strategies of inference, approximation and ideological weighting have been imported from other fields to establish a false economy of precision deployed versus error controlled. Meanwhile in the cultures of architecture, ever-increasing apparent precision (often largely redundant in its error reducing efficacy) is highly fetishised. Suffice to say there is little neutral or rational about architecture’s relations to error and the currency of precision. Through critical analysis of key operative and historical moments in architectural production and its representation - see session outlines below - we will examine the construction of these relations and the peculiar economy it engenders.

Session presentations will be illustrated with slide and video material and followed by discussion informed by weekly reading of specified chapters or passages in texts listed below. Students are required to submit a 3000 word written (and drawn if appropriate) essay to be discussed initially mid term and presented in progress to the group in session 8 before final submission in term 2.

Session 1: Error & Precision  
*The Troping of Precision: From Hooke’s needles to Wittgenstein’s beads.*  
In order to look critically at the economy of error and precision in architectural production, this introductory seminar plots the historic shifts in the meaning of precision - itself a most ‘imprecise’ term – and the consequent changing role of approximation.

**Required reading:**  
**Further reading:**  

Session 2: Error & Matter  
*Forensics of an Ideology*  
In *Metaphysics*, Aristotle set out the architecture of form and matter relations, which, despite the many changes C20th ‘matter’ has undergone, to this day underpin almost all material and formal thought. Crucially, within this schema, error is conflated with matter, emerging as both a possible agent of matter, and, its only physical (formal) register.
Session 3: Error & Material I - Indeterminacy
Room for doubt: Instrumentalism, Inference and Ideology.
The architect’s engagement is of course not with matter per se, but with material, always mediated by material technology. In the period between the wars, a massive cultural shift in material tolerance saw a wholesale rejection of organic materials, even in the perhaps most sacred site of technological instrumentalism: aviation engineering. This seminar examines what happens when, haunted by error, technological sites become ideological. How does the latent indeterminacy inherent in such sites provide prime territory for false inference and ideological colonisation? Given this, how then can architecture apply to technology as acultural arbitrator of its own conflicts?

Required reading:

Further reading:

Session 4: Error & Material II: Authorship
Abdicated Measures: The Politics of Optimisation
One hundred years before parametric optimisation, in pursuit of the miraculous potential of buildings that could literally be poured into being, the construction industry embarked on the frenzied invention of standards and specifications: as lab coats first walked into the dust of the construction site to contain unruly slurry, precision and error relations in architecture reconfigured forever. Through joint examination of the rhetoric of Le Corbusier’s euphoria at his drawing being “poured in from above” and that of contemporary writing on parametric production where form “is found”, this seminar asks: what does instantaneity do to the cultural economies of architectural production? What does it do to authorship and its potential abdication? How is it that the instantaneous, when properly marketed, has the authority of the immaculate and, more curiously, the neutrality of the ‘optimised’?

Required reading:
Various sample articles regarding parametricisation – see folder provided.

Further reading:

Session 5: Error & Representation
Radical Exteriorisation: Visuality, Vitality and Viridicality
In seminal accounts of the genesis of architectural form a crucial middle stage is always eclipsed - usually by an over emphasised beginning (concept sketch) and end (rendered perspectives). However in recent years ‘concept’ has been declared dead. If so, with it must go the metaphoric internalisation of gestation: morphogenesis concealed. This class focuses on the radical exteriorisation of methodological interiority in Gordon Matta-Clark’s Unbuilding works and Mary Kelly’s Frankenstein.
in order to ask: if concept is dead, then how might the exteriorising action of representation now meet the previously hidden phases of architectural production? With reference to Aristotle’s inflection of matter with impermanence, and therefore vitality, putting matter firmly on the wrong side of the visuality/vitality axis that so polarised Newton and Hooke, (then becoming Bohr’s battle between ‘light and life’), we will ask: exactly how does matter disrupt representation? How are these battles now manifest in the representations of architecture where, increasingly, we are able to conjure up vitality that is not there and a viridicality (truthfulness) that is not reliable? As imaging technology homes in on matter, does its illusion of apparent precision paradoxically only obscures matter further?

Required reading/viewing:

Further reading/viewing:
Video of Jane Crawford lecture at AA.

Session 6: Error & Reproduction
Matter and Message

“A question that can be deferred, though not forever, is whether there is some other matter in addition to that of substances of the kinds that we have been examining, whether we should look for some other sort of substance, such as, perhaps, numbers.”
Aristotle, Zeta 11

“They are law code and executive power – or, to use another simile, they are architects plan and builders craft – in one”
Schrödinger 1944 on chromosomes

“A hen is merely an egg’s way of making another egg” Wiener, God Golem Inc

Matter and error in the digital model: Behind the digital model is the cybernetic machine. Within the cybernetic machine that is increasingly central to the way we not only make but also think architecture is the body that has always been embedded in architecture’s discourses of production: the reproducing body. This session examines how the cybernetic tools that drive contemporary practice owe their origins to the critical return to embryogenesis in the 1960’s in order to crucially account for and incorporate difference and nonlinearity. Here, Aristotle’ lingering doubt and the post-war cells that would not obey Schrödinger ‘architects’ met a somatic body and message conflated, and matter was allowed to become information.

Required reading:
Session 7: Error & Ornament

The sublimation of ornament: Lineament, Error and the Indexicalised Surface

Ornamentation has traditionally been the key surface strategy for the incorporation (and concealment) of error: the fertile sites of ornament are the seminal low tolerance junctions, the meeting of wall and floor, wall and ceiling. With reference to Loos’ surface lineament and Wittgenstein’s saturation precision, this chapter examines the relations between the rise of a desire for an effect of precision that marks modernism and the concurrent reorganisation of the space of ornament. An analysis of Loos’ lineament of veneers, argues that ornament was not ‘removed’ as such but in fact sublimated; and second, of Wittgenstein’s house, that sublimated ornament here resurfaces as a not localised but uniform distribution of precision, prefiguring the distribution of precision in the digital. This session concludes that redundant precision is, in fact, the ornament of our age.

Required reading:

Further Reading:

Session 8: Conclusion and student presentations

This final session will be used for a general conclusive discussion and for students to present a full synopsis of their submission.

Having taught at the Bartlett for 5 years, Francesca Hughes joined the AA in 2003 where she has been unit master of Dip 15 since 2004 and intermittently taught HTS. She has lectured internationally and served as external examiner in numerous schools, both in the U.K. and abroad. Author/editor of The Architect: Reconstructing her Practice (MIT Press: 1996), she is currently completing a book entitled Error. Hughes Meyer Studio is an art/architecture practice whose work has been published by AR, ANY, Art Forum, Merrel, Routledge and Wiley and exhibited in the UK and abroad.

POLITY AND SPACE

JOHN PALMESINO

The seminar investigates the relations between the process of construction of inhabited space and the forms of polity in the twenty-first century. Using architecture as both the object and the method of inquiry, we will analyse a series of complex territorial transformations to reveal the underlying organisational processes in the theoretical junctures between notions of inhabitation, architecture, space, territory, government, intervention. The contemporary territory is the seat of a multiplicity of transformational patterns and evolutive rhythms wrought by concurrent and often distant interests and promoted by a growing number of actors. Their interplay and competition reshapes, carves, moulds and reorganises their spaces of operation. Natural, mineral, technological, linguistic, biological, economic, political, cultural, social and institutional factors constantly interact and form the materials that constitute the complex dynamics of the contemporary territory. The seminar with explore a series of transformations in the connections between organisation of contemporary politics and their spaces of operation with architecture and urbanism being agents of that relation.

Course Outline:
Session 1: Observing transformations: uncertainty in the inhabited landscapes
Session 2: Between space and society
Session 3: Self-organisation: multiple autonomous agents
Session 4: A Nature: contemporary sovereignties
Session 5: Territories, circulations, boundaries, horizons: knowledge production and architecture
Session 6: Inter Alia: architecture as a practice amongst other practices
Session 7: Agency
Session 8: Potentialities

**Bibliography:**

Étienne Balibar, ‘We, The People of Europe? Reflections on Transnational Citizenship’, 2004
Okwui Enwezor et al. (eds.) ‘Democracy Unrealized. Documenta 11 Platform 1’, Ostfildern: Hatje Cantz 2002
Those outside the architectural profession often perceive a building to be brilliant for the aesthetic experience it offers. And yet bizarrely, from the advent of modernism, architects have invented a multitude of strategies to absolve themselves from making visual judgments. The prevailing architecture of the 20th century with its impersonal nature resulted with a consistent reduction of the complexity of our profession where its cultural, artistic, poetic, or metaphysic aspects were questioned too often while rationality, economy, utility and technologies were always deployed.

Objectifying the design process, enhancing a cerebral input and reducing the intuitive personal moves, especially involving the eye as a tool of judgment (the ‘I’ and the ‘eye’) and not resorting to it as a secret weapon, led in time to a lack of confidence in how much intellectual depth can be captured by intuitive architectural imagery.

The modern usage of the word ‘aesthetics’, meaning taste or ‘sense’ of beauty, tied the term to a personal attitude and therefore conflicted with an objectified architectural process. Self expression doesn't necessarily lead to beauty, but when the self is removed beauty is avoided.

The battle among vanguard architects is at a new peak; there are new voices for who the removal of the Self is not an issue anymore and the ‘I’ goes along with the ‘eye’ as they generate form and spatial experience with character and atmosphere. The computational design process does not limit the presence of personalities if the aspiration is there.

We will discuss the Troubled Relationship between Architecture and Beauty, based on my new book written with Fleur Watson entitled: Architecture and Beauty, Conversations with Architects about A Troubled Relationship, published by Wiley at 2010.

We will focus on the architectural culture that brought this troubled relationship through the profile of sixteen leading architects of different generations discussing their formative experiences, creative processes and motivations, whether they think beauty is integral or non-essential to architecture.
We will raise poignant issues regarding the place of beauty, aesthetics and self-expression, within the psychology of the design process of the architectural avant-garde, and many more relevant terms that influenced the discourse, such as determinism in design, non-determinism, lateral visual thinking, architectural contents, the notion of vision, imagery, poetics and aesthetics.

*Frank O. Gehry, Zvi Hecker, Peter Cook, Juhani Pallasmaa, Lebbeus Woods, Gaetano Pesce, Wolf D. Prix (Coop Himmelblau), Thom Mayne (Morphosis), Eric Owen Moss, Will Alsop, Zaha Hadid, Odile Decq, Mark Goulthorpe (dECOi), Greg Lynn, Kolatan-McDonald (Kol/Mac), Hernan Diaz Alonso

1st session
Introduction- As seen by Reisner: the genesis of a troubled relationship between architecture and beauty & Pallasmaa’s view on Beauty in architecture.


2nd Session
Frank Gehry, Wolf Prix and Zaha Hadid - Deconstructivist Architecture

Domenig, Gunther, Stone House at Steindorf, Drawings and Models, Ritter Verlag, Klagenfurt, 1993


3rd Session
Zvi Hecker, Lebbeus Woods and Gaetano Pesce.
Ethics vs. Aesthetics; Art Povera, Social critic Angst and Humor.
Required reading:

Recommended Reading:


4th Session
Peter Cook, Will Alsop and Odile Decq - Drawings Models Metaphors and Imagery
Required reading:

Recommended Reading:


5th Session
Thom Mayne and Eric Moss - Complex Systems vs. A Deterministic Voice
Required reading:

Recommended Reading:


6th Session
Mark Goulthorpe and Greg Lynn - Indifferent Beauty, Form and Technique
Required reading:

Recommended Reading:
Big Bang, Creation and Destruction in the 20th Century, Centre Pompidou, 2005.[exhibition catalogue]
The Modern Big Bang by Catherine Grenier pp.13-20

Goulthorpe, Mark ‘Notes on Digital Nesting: A Poetics of Evolutionary Form’, AD magazine, ‘Poetics in Architecture’ ,March 2002
Carpo, Mario ‘L’architecture a lere du pli’, L’architecture d’aujourd’hui Vol 349, Nov-Dec 2003, p.98 (in English)

Lynn, Greg (ed), AD magazine, ‘Folding in Architecture’, 1993


7th Session
Kolatan–Mac Donald and Hernan Diaz Alonso - Creative Impurities & Virtuosity

Required reading:

Recommended Reading:

Kolatan, Sulan and McDonald, Bill ‘Lumping’ AD magazine, vol 72 no 2, Jan. 2002


8th Session
Conclusions & Students’ presentations*

Recommended reading:

*Students will submit one page submission abstract and an eight minutes presentation as an introduction to their essay.

Seminar Requirements: attendance, weekly readings, active participation, production of a 3000 word illustrated essay (including captions) with relevant images.

Bibliography

Books in general

Yael Reisner with Fleur Watson, Architecture and Beauty, Conversations with Architects about A Troubled Relationship, Wiley, 2010. (The seminar is based on Reisner’s new book)


2. Architects’ Monographs


Domenig, Gunther, *Stone House at Steindorf, Drawings and Models*, Ritter Verlag, Klagenfurt, 1993


3. Exhibition catalogues

*Big Bang, Creation and Destruction in the 20th Century*, Centre Pompidou, 2005. [exhibition catalogue] (The Modern Big Bang by Catherine Grenier pp. 13-20)


4. Magazines


Goulthorpe, Mark ‘Notes on Digital Nesting: A Poetics of Evolutionary Form’ , AD magazine, ‘Poetics in Architecture’ , March 2002, pp...
Dr. Yael Reisner has a PhD in Architecture from RMIT in Australia, a Diploma from the Architectural Association in London and a BSc in Biology from the Hebrew University in Jerusalem. Born in Tel Aviv, she lives in London since 1990 where she runs her own Studio of Architecture and Design. She currently teaches internationally after nine years of teaching at the Bartlett (UCL) where she was the Master course coordinator, a group tutor and a Unit master of Diploma Unit 11. Her book with Fleur Watson Architecture and Beauty, Conversations with Architects about A Troubled Relationship was published in April 2010 by Wiley UK. She is one of the contributors for the AD Magazine on the issue of Exuberance, March 2010. Lately she was commissioned by the Karelic company to be the art director of a new porcelain lighting line, to be designed by architects.

www.yaelreisner.com

TRAVELS IN KEILLERLAND

PATRICK WRIGHT

This course develops on a recent collaboration between Patrick Wright, the architect and film-maker Patrick Keiller and the geographer Doreen Massey (‘Landscape and Mobility’, 2007-2010). Intended as the elaboration of a critical perspective connected to contemporary urbanism, it will use Patrick Keiller’s films as the prompt for a broader enquiry into melancholy, ruin, facadism, memory and forgetting and other concepts central to the collaboration. We will also consider Keiller’s new film, Robinson in Ruins (2010).

Course Outline:

Session 1: Melancholia: archaic mental disorder or modern critical perspective? On the meaning and modern afterlife of Dürer’s angel (see the engraving ‘Melancolia I’).

Session 2: Film: London (1994)

Session 3: London’s East and the contemporary cult of ruin

Session 4: Pilgrimage in a land of Potemkinist facades: journeying as enlightenment or critique

Session 5: Film: Robinson in Space (1997)

Session 6: History/Heritage: remembering and forgetting

Session 7: Film: The Dilapidated Dwelling (2000)

Session 8: Enclosure and Clearance: the legacy of Speenhamland

Film: Robinson in Ruins (2010)

Bibliography (in approximate order of appearance)


A DVD set combining Patrick Keiller’s films *London* and *Robinson in Space* is issued by the BFI. Copies of *The Dilapidated Dwelling* are available in the AA. The new film, *Robinson in Ruins*, is to be distributed by the British Film Institute.

What is a reference? Academic writing does not stand alone. Everything that is written contributes to a conversation which has spanned centuries. This is exactly what Sir Isaac Newton was referring to when he made his famous quote about standing on the shoulders of giants. The primary role of all citation systems is to give your readers the means to retrace your steps through this ongoing conversation.

Getting it Right Every Time You Write an Essay. I can not overstate the importance of referring specifically to the style guide prescribed by the course you are enrolled in. This article represents our attempt to give you a quick outline to understand referencing. But there are many specific criteria requested by different institutions. referencing Appendix 1: Analytical essay. 3 4 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 20 20 21. ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS. Thanks to Jamie Pormfrett for providing original materials for this guide. Thanks also to Jamie, Debra Dank and David McClay PhD for reviewing this document. Lesley MacGibbon PhD ACIKE Staff Development Charles Darwin University. Essay topic: Using personal reflection, write a 1000 word essay on how rising food prices are impacting on people’s diets. Brainstorm 1: The student has decided to focus the essay on fruit process as a sub-group of food. Evidence is what others have written and published about the particular issue. Evidence from a reputable academic journal or book has more credibility than evidence from magazines or newspapers.