RARE NEW SPECIES III
Diploma Unit 5 / Architectural Association School of Architecture 2016-2017
Cristina Díaz Moreno
Efrén Gª Grinda
Benjamin Reynolds

EVERY, BUT NOT ANY

Introduction

What happens when you can search for, and presumably find anything? What happens when previous forms of coherence based on the origin of materials, or even ideological or aesthetic affiliation, succumb to a brutal, endless and flat ocean of information where there is no longer any connection between content and image? What happens when no-one cares to remember the origins of ideas or works and the authors behind them? Where lies creativity if we all remember having seen it all, but we have no experience or memory of having lived, because everything is stored on machines and not anymore in our memory? What is next if we all obsessive and thoroughly photographed, recorded, filmed, and spread anything rather than experiencing it, in an epoch when we can have apparently access any information? How does our practice lie when we all can see supposedly everything, when the memory of things is replaced by their image on a screen? What happens when the supposedly infinite memory of the Internet is constantly changing and countless cultural materials literally disappear without a trace? How can we articulate an architectural project that prioritises every- but not any- thing?

This year Diploma 5 will be building new ways of generating, sharing and joining cultural materials to be compatible with our current scenario by employing this potential to explore 'everything' but inverting its present association with endless, source-less information. As in previous years, our work will start from the premise that architecture is a public construct, which originates from and belongs to a community and its collective aims and ideals. This year the unit will continue investigating public space as a way to instigate meaningful symbolic associations and propose new forms of social utility and collective beauty, reacting critically to both the current overabundance of cultural materials and conventional notions of publicness. In investigating what could be a renewed notion of monumentality deprived of the nostalgic recall of the past but engaged with collective aspirations instead, we will hope to confront the prevailing aestheticisation of drawings and forms of representation and to propose architecturally engaged alternatives to the contemporary banal 'anything'. Our main goal will be to critically filter the architectural project through our possible access to 'everything' in its rawest and most direct manner, trying to articulate what could be public space nowadays, where the public sphere could be constantly redefined through the physical and direct interaction between individuals.

A New Epistemological Realm

The projects that the Diploma 5 students will address this year will be related with a global condition with no precedents; any kind of material cultural triggers a wild multiplicity of connections and links with other materials, things and situations, from people to machines, to abstract and not significant entities. The total coherence of these connections, as well as the meaning, connotations, or origin of cultural materials is no longer relevant in the form in which these materials are connected, but what really matters is the access universal and instant access to this infinite ocean of information, that compresses time since time began in a brutal and direct way. This new epistemological scenario is supported by machinic, abstract and automatic processes, of a purely technological nature, that silently govern our societies. The invisible invasion of technology affects all aspects of our daily lives, our work and leisure, in a way that our most minimal action and every single minute, become productive. While invented, carried out and supported by us, digital immersion and associated production processes do not have any more as a target the improvement of our living conditions, but the productive exploitation of any aspect of our lives. Humans are now part of bigger entities formed by amalgams of multiple things, composed by other humans, machines and biological entities of which we are not anymore necessarily neither the centre, nor the priority.

The nature of the cultural materials in which any work, construction or cultural event settles, refers to or make use of, has changed, radically. Each cultural material is inherently connected with a vast and extensive flow of other pieces of information, in a multimodal polyphony that relocates its production in relation with all of its connections. Consequently, any object, work or idea can be nowadays perceived and treated as an isolated fact and never again will anything be more than an autonomous entity which only has a single meaning, and understanding, set through its own characteristics. Today any material or immaterial commodity involves a multitude of meanings which are deployed at different levels, from the connotations associated with its physical constituent materials and their form of production, to the similarities and differences with other similar constructs, the symbolic associations that each social group project on it, the history of the type of object, or just the random connections established by the words contained in the documents where it can be found, as it is the case of any usual engine to search for content on the web.

For the first time in history the connections have exploded and multiplied exponentially, and these interrelationships are not formed through the interaction of individuals within a community or sanctioned by authorities, but its nature remains a diffused logic and, therefore, potentially confusing, completely unexpected and at the same time deeply logical and predictable. In this ocean of connotations of an externally curated nature, the logics that used to distinguish materials according to their physical provenance or materiality, its origin--high or low culture--the public that were directed to, or the media that distributed and broadcasted them, have stopped having a universal validity. What were once considered giant and predictable streams of information diffusion, are now lost within seemingly infinite voices that are considered equally relevant.

Individual and social mechanisms of critique that judged and classified cultural materials have changed completely, becoming a complex nature that requires on the one hand, to be familiar with the territories and disciplines that used to be autonomous and on the other, a constant revision and update of the parameters that serve as a reference. But above all a new sensitivity that allows us to be the actors in this new territory of complex connections and a new way of relating to the transmission of information is required.

Dip 5 is firmly convinced that we have just entered a new era of production, transmission and reception of immaterial content, and that it is necessary to assemble languages on the one hand compatible with this new environment - able to operate in this ocean of information without hierarchies- and on the other hand consistent with these new practices and sensitivities. This new sensibility, in which different levels of abstraction of the languages are not incompatible with symbolic contents or historical relations, is called in Dip5 *afterpop* or *macaronic*, taking the recently coined term by the writer Eloy Fernández Porta to refer to a set of cultural actors who made use of stylistic references from apparently inconsistent and heterogeneous sources to produce his works.

Worlding

New states of materiality (physical properties, functions, environments, culture) stemming from a further concreteness of the world we now know is attainable not only from faster networks and the velocity of communication, but from the radical shift in the capacity of personal computers to store/access information (processing). The recent shift in widespread use of 64-bit computers from the 32-bit variety, meant that personal computing went from having the capability to store/access 4 billion integers for processing (as 0's and 1's, ie. "true or false" or "yes or no") to being able store/access 18 quintillion, a muliplication by 4.5 billion.

Worlding is not interested in using this context to arrive to complete objectivism as in the sciences, nor lingering in the re-representation of old typologies, mathematical idealisms and biomimicry, instead this year Dip 5 will tease out the indeterminacies found between a reality of such cold abstraction of technology, and what makes us human. As previous years Dip 5 is concerned with acquiring an understanding of the roots of these changes--and as an unprecedented juncture in our potential to produce--in order explore the qualities and affects of this potential through an architectural project. For Dip 5, these new states of physical properties, functions, environments and culture are but contexts and the means to understand the world, as we simultaneously unfold it through the process of world-making, or Worlding.

The Technosocial Inquirer

The incessant activity of the digital networks, data exchange and markets, the speed of transmission and accumulation of property and data, as well as the traditional productive activities necessary to maintain this rhythm accelerated and without pause, produce a brutal desynchronization with all systems of biological basis, bringing its capacity and resilience to their limits.

For the first time a whole generation has been educated during the training of their brain capabilities in a total immersion in the digital networks, a new environment that demands different cognitive capabilities, a biological adaptation that is impossible to perform because that conditions have nothing to do with those to which we have been exposed during thousands of years. The facilitating and liberating appearance of these technologies has a dark and perverse back-end. Commercial digital technologies, userfriendly, determine with precision what you can do with them, how and to what extent, without any possibility to modify, soften or expand them. They establish an environment that apparently expands our capabilities of all kinds, but at the same time, they are confined and limited to channels, tools and established procedures, and they end up defining an oppressive environment that favours the passivity and concrete forms of making things. A flat horizon of banal and flattening tools and results emerges from these technological assemblages. Facing this dictatorship of technological origin that generates a *tabula rasa* that trivializes everything, as the vehicle of the most efficient and perverse satisfaction, supposedly neutral and innocent, we would like to propose an approach that considers the question on the technology as something subject to purposes, tools and processes of not only scientific and technological order, but also cultural. Technology for us is subject to the creativity and critical appreciation, in a sort of inquisitive attitude.

Then we could speak about the architect as a *Technosocial Inquirer*, the active actor in our discipline who investigates the relations between society and technology and selects, assembles and develops critically different techniques into an ad-hoc set of instruments and tools adapted to the specific *umwelt* that every project defines, altering intentionally our spatial environment in a critical way. Rather than the adaptation of acquired techniques developed through slow evolutionary processes —traditional approach— or the assimilation of high technology to constantly re-invent cutting-edge technologies —following the modern fascination with deterministic progress— the *Technosocial Inquirer* assembles techniques of all kind, with a high degree of specialization and precision to develop specific technologies that complement and expand those acquired by experience or education. These technological compounds may present unexpected mixtures of different tools including the development of scripting codes to the adaptation of traditional crafting techniques, but also processes of acquisition of information and field work, the definition of the methodology of design, including digital technologies of geometrical development and control, mechanical and thermodynamic simulation and the definition of new material compounds, manufacturing processes, technologies of representation or processes of diffusion and social interaction.

To critically assemble those ad-hoc technological compounds that could respond to this new realm is required a high degree of investigation, examination and inquiry about economic, material and social contexts, encompassing also heuristic strategies to creatively combine precise and specific methodologies appropriate to each situation. All this is combined in a new holistic and creative craftsmanship, which requires at the same time intensity in the work and innovative and creative responses. Far from arising as an oscillation between fixed, transmitted and acquired techniques, developed through slow evolutionary processes, and cutting-edge technologies, which are presented as the state of the art techniques that would require a constant mutation and renewal processes, this approach to technology in architecture seeks to respond critically to the way in which we generate, transmit and assimilate all kind of information and knowledge nowadays, as well to the way we approach objects and processes of technological nature that currently invade our everyday life.

Techymagination

This type of technological imagination cultivates an evolved form of ad-hoc awareness that has no aversion to planning or tendency to respond only to the urgent in an improvised way. It combines a meticulous, conscious and accurate celebration of what is within reach, the immediate and cheap, while at the same time using the processes of definition, control and interaction, simulation and other related digital technologies. It does not avoid the integration of different technologies within reach in compounds both monstrous and lucid. Through the process of trying to answer them in the most direct and brutal way, situations and solutions appear to dissolve them as problems. Juxtapositions and collisions between materials, ways of thinking and technology, seemingly incompatible, found within it reduce the complexity to an accessory, expensive and redundant circumlocution. This new kind of *ad-hocism* instead of responding with absolute truths and pre-constructed languages, is deep and physiologically allergic to any truth, technological process or design of a dogmatic nature.

Even the purely technological objects are subject to the symbolic and cultural appropriation. These displacements affect even those based on the direct and brutal satisfaction —without symbolic or cultural mediation with the armament and military technology— for a purpose which are destined, which does not mask their systems and are subject to a depriving of everything that is not strictly functional, can be directly assimilated by distilling their iconography and incorporating it into their symbolic systems. Being objects of absolute radicalism they can be assimilated even more quickly. While they are only subjected to the achievement of a purpose, they can present ideas, processes or visible aspects highly disruptive that can be assimilated and incorporated in an immediate and direct way, as assets belonging to a particular culture.

These transfers do not occur nowadays only in specialized production or research contexts, but in all types of environments. The transfer between the transmitter —or technologies producer— and the recipient —or consumer— occurs in contexts which introduce all kinds of interferences and that charge these constructions that used to be purely utilitarian with meanings and therefore with symbolic and cultural associations. Except in certain cases, they cannot fail to be perceived as bearer of symbolic associations. Accordingly, if the objects of a technological nature are subject also to the processes of cultural and symbolic appropriation, their design and development should integrate this fact as a fundamental part, being aware of how they can produce it and trying to induce them to consciously choosing the range of technologies embedded. The technological imagination is then centered not only to achieve goals with greater efficiency and cost-effectiveness, but also in the further process consisting of technological processes with symbolic associations to convert them into cultural assets. In other words, the fact that a technological object may have symbolic and cultural associations must condition the choice of techniques to be used in its definition and use. This process of back and forth would constitute a kind of relativistic and adaptive behaviorism, and can be defined as a *Non-linguistic Technological Contextualism*.

Macaronic Utterance

An overwhelming ocean of information surrounds us for the first time ever and constitutes an unexpected and without precedents abundance of information parallel to the abundance of goods and commodities in the postwar period in the US and UK. In that period this abundance of commodities triggered specific attitudes and languages in the art world that attempted to respond to it elaborating art works based on the aesthetics either than taken directly from the consumerism or elaborated as a critical answer to it. We would like to introduce the students in the urgency of elaborating projects and languages based on this unprecedented abundance of information and the technologies and iconography related with it.

Nowadays the uncritical overuse of any kind of language for any purpose, omnipresent both in traditional and in digital media, has led to the seemingly inevitable loss of connection between sign and meaning, between image and content. It seems that the immense ability that any person usually exposed to the media has developed for identify novelties, recurrences, repetitions and exceptions in images and signs, on the one hand has been transformed in an growing insensitivity to the visual stimuli due to pure saturation, and on the other, the ever changing use of alien signs outside and the constant appropriation of materials of any culture and historical moment, supposedly prevent to reconnect image and content, or sign and significant in an intelligible way.

Supposedly, there is not anymore the possibility of using signs and symbols so they can be intelligible and interpreted, and at the same time, any form of cultural appropriation that can seem insensitive with the identity of a local culture or with the past is nowadays starting to be repressed by western cultural institutions. It seems that anyone can use any language for anything, since they have lost any connotative value, if and when it is not linked with a sanctioned and verifiable entity, such as the past or fixed local culture. At the same time, known languages that do not belong to these perfectly verifiable categories seem to have lost their connotative value and therefore are no longer a critical tool for cultural agents. Any content can be reinterpreted in any form and acquire any visual language, since nothing matters. Anything can connote any meaning and any content can adopt any exterior appearance. Any sign has lost its connotative values and only represents itself. Therefore, the only thing that counts is the fascination power of the sign or the representation itself, and therefore the skilful management of them becomes the top priority for a multitude of cultural practices.

In opposition to this apparent anything goes that seems to dominate the network and in recent years, the discipline, Diploma 5 students will develop languages that recover the connotative powers of forms, spatial organizations, shapes, geometries and tectonics, creatively diving both in the value of abstraction and in the construction of new grammars. These afterpop languages will be as well compatible with the new sensibilities and practices necessarily related to specific contexts that the students will choose and define on the one hand and to this set of practices described on the other. To be more concrete, the targets will be to set up non purely linguistic discourses derived from the application of a socio-technological imagination and the process of amalgaming techniques and culturally assimilated and transmitted speeches. Rather than the usual pejorative meaning associated to the *macaronic* in different languages - English macaroni, affected or dandy, or the Spanish *macarra*, pimp, vulgar, aggressive or cocky – the term is used in accordance with its original sense. The *macaronic* was developed in the 15th century in the Venetian intellectual circles and introduced into the Classical Latin, words and popular expressions from Northern Italy dialects in a creative, playful and absurd way, to compose oral poetry dealing with philosophical issues through everyday aspects. It was presented for the first time in written form by Michele di Bartolomeo degli Odasi in his *Maccharonea* (1490) and

popularized by Teofilo Folengo, a monk from a noble family of Mantua who published *Liber Macaronicorum* (1520), to be subsequently recovered by Raymond Queneau in his *Exercices de Style* (1947).

It's a creative distortion of pre-established languages that mix critically, satirically or mordantly terms and syntactic substructures of different languages and dialects without differentiating them according to their origin, using the syntactic structure of the sanctioned language as its main framework. It produces *heteroglossia*, richness based on the coexistence and conflict between different kinds of discourses within a cultural artefact, and presents different levels of reading according to its context. Opposed by nature to the established and sanctioned discourses, transmitted mainly through education – in architecture the conventional practice assimilated through the craft, and the schools oriented to the preparation of mere professionals- this type of languages, as the authoritarian speeches, cannot enter in what Mikhail Bakhtin called *hybrid utterance* —discursive multiplicity— since they are perceived as obsolete, finished and hierarchically superior, and demand an unconditional allegiance rather than accepting open subjective interpretations. On the contrary, the *macaronic* is by nature open to be constantly reinvented and reinterpreted. Furthermore, it accepts and embraces the dialogistic imagination and the inter-connective quality of the conversational language. As in the simpler versions of this kind of language, the *macaronic* presents constant references and connections with many sources of various kinds, to enunciate and immediately assimilate complex speeches. Do not mislead with eclecticism, the visual style based on the arbitrary mixture of previous styles that appropriates their approaches, views and ideas to build a supposedly new, surprising and exotic speech without internal logic, coherence or critical understanding.

In Dip5 the creative task requires maximum courage. Known or assimilated responses are not accepted, neither leaks or influences from other contemporary practices of architecture or typical of the unit. We are asking for contributions to the construction of a personal language related to the objectives of the Unit. The aim is to produce new models of beauty adequate to this condition, that may seem ugly, exaggerated or inappropriate because they do not find stylistic references or known patterns to refer to. It is necessary we find any stylistic unity that can take reference from the seemingly infinite resources generated and now accessible simultaneously. There are no precedents for this approach. If anything as figurative art transferred to its abstract kind, so again a quantum leap in abstraction and stylistic evolution is required. In this search the impetus must come from the maximum coherence with the themes and contexts chosen by the students. But context means an extended notion coherent with that expanded world of connections, relationships and amalgamations of things, so it cannot be a conventional or automatic response.

The search and design of these languages does not aim only at the production of novelty, but it mainly comes from the relationship with the projection in the constructed objects of values that belong to the collective imagination, first at the level of the social group to which the project refers to, but also on a global scale to this new economic, productive, social and technological context that acts as a frame of reference necessary for our work.

On (Un)Monumentality

Monumentality has been commonly associated with power and its most common and direct output, the monument, was meant an artefact that triggers memory of past events, persons or concrete states or moments belonging to an specific community. Nevertheless, monument etymologically comes from the Latin term *monère*, literally the act of remembering, or bringing something from memory to our present thoughts. Diploma 5 will be interested in evolving this notion into a non-nostalgic, progressive and radical notion of remembering throughout architectural definition in this case intrinsically related with the collective body of a community. In other words, how through architecture we can trigger certain forms of symbolic associations between the definition of physical spaces and who are we, what is the collective notion of a group of individuals with a common identity, as a public body in permanent construction. As a response to the anterograde collective amnesia (anything goes, because nobody remembers anything, and nobody cares) and as an alternative to the classical notion of monument —an artefact meant to remember something belonging to the past— Diploma 5 will spend the course 2016-2017 constructing meaningful links between architectural expressions and the world of contemporary collective identity, replacing the fascination with the past with the passion to discover the present around us. Instead of the common associations with the classical reading of monuments including physical stability, remembrance, commemoration, we will be focused on contemporary critical values possibly associated with the collective that could triggered in a connotative level by architectural decisions such as organization, materiality, stability, form, shape, geometry, colour… in an epoch in which navigating recorded reflections of the world has been made increasingly user friendly; never before have we had at our disposal the kinds of resolution and bit depths (measurable increases in the quantity of data). The question of a new public monumentality may be linked to the phenomenon that the world is slowly making a digital copy of itself and that copy is digital copy is becoming ever more faithful, and at what point is history no longer a question of speculation? At what point does the digital copy leave its duty of recording the thing outside of itself (the real world) and become a world in its own right? We will speculate on the possibility that the tectonic-material/technological-scientific and the typological-organizational can be possibly the basis for this new (un)monumentality.

Similarly, during the decades after the World War II, the debate about monumentality and the past was at the heart of the conceptual and design renewal of the Modern Movement. At the basis of this concern about form being loaded with symbolic associations, mainly commanded by Giedion, lays the failure of modernity to articulate public spaces. The seminal text *Nine Points for a New Monumentality*, signed by Josep Lluís Sert, Fernand Léger and Sigfried Giedion in 1944, calls for the necessary evolution of the architecture of the Modern Movement towards the incorporation of symbolic connotations, which could be tuned with the ideals and aspirations of human communities. The position of Leger, Giedion and Sert was intended to situate a monumentality of democratic origin on the line of the evolution of the Modern Movement, released from any association with any kind of authoritarian power, as a consequence, not only inevitable but also desirable. The main difficulty consisted on inventing new forms of expression of a big scale, free of associations with repressive ideologies of the past and bombastic Historicism, that could not only be the expression of the *zeigeist* but also reflect the concerns and human ambitions, reinventing the way in which the collective aspirations of a new era could be reflected. The difficulties of the architecture of the Modern Movement in its more orthodox stream, to escape the pure rational approach and certain formal and programmatic repertoire were in the origin of this concern. The desire expressed in the text was intended to raise public spaces that would present the same spatial qualities as the examples of spaces based on the research on new materials made by engineers, that were often claimed as the origins of the modern movement. This strange dissociation and inability of the Modern Movement to undertake the project of large public spaces expressing the peculiarities of an era —that of mechanization— and

reconnecting with the same origin of architecture, will lay the foundations for later texts by Giedion as well as the debate on monumentality, which enormously influenced the VIII CIAM Congress in Hoddesdon (1951) significantly named The Heart of the City. The debate in the aforementioned CIAM Congress, just before the young members of the Team X started to ask for a more multidimensional approach to the previous generations, was focused however on the construction of civic infrastructures, the heart of the city, as the Conference was entitled, leaving the role of defining a new monumentality or define symbolic forms to artists, partially leaving the architects out of the realm of discussion, or at least by limiting their work to the mere catalyst of a so-called confluence of the fine arts. In that time, recovering the subject of monumentality could have been highly controversial, partially because figuration combined with an empty and bombastic monumental character had been reintroduced by Stalin's regime, and therefore perceived as the perfect representation of personalist and authoritarian regimes which had desolated Europe during the 20th century.

Forms of the Collective

Let us cast our minds back almost 2,400 years: Aristotle's view of the city was established in the first two chapters of Politics as the meeting point for the various oikos, for people from different places and families. The process of creation of the first cities is defined as *synoikismos*, literally, the process whereby different *oikos* would form a city by deciding to live together to provide mutual protection and assistance. Cities then became a gathering of people who were not the same or similar, but who accepted they had to coexist under the same system of rules, in reciprocal equality. More than a physically complete thing, the city was a tacit and ongoing process of negotiation and interaction, agreement and disagreement. However, putting aside this concept of the origins of the city and its potential relevance today, modern urban environments are in no way close to functioning as peaceful and harmonious melting pots of diversity in which social identity is built upon equal participation between different elements. Urban agglomerations are not only home to difference, but also host and provoke violence, conflicts and inequality. Consensus and equitable participation are only two of the possible scenarios that can arise from the dispute between different ways of life. Control, marginalisation and violence are others, as is the creation of elective communities, such as social groups or subcultures, which argue against mainstream cultural structures through style and the public exposure of alternative ways of life. Both direct forms of negotiation and interaction (for example, urban revolts of discontent) and mediated or indirect forms (public exposure of alternative aesthetics) are extreme examples of the range of potential manifestations of the constant public redefinition of social constructs.

Public space ceases to be mechanically associated with emptiness (as opposed to the built-up urban fabric), or with free and universal access, and becomes the space for a collision between dominant cultures and new practices that are attempting to discuss them. The process of being together physically and sharing space, while at the same time collectively building the scene through public interaction, becomes a process of constantly reviewing and reformulating identity for a given society, and therefore for the city itself. The pieces that make up the city work as incubators of alternative ways of approaching the world, promoting public dissidence and difference and embracing and inducing alternative lifestyles removed from the passive models of consumption. As a phenomenon of intermediation, public space is then defined not only by the architecture that contains it, but also by the actions of users and of the people who inhabit it: it becomes a meeting place for people and objects of all classes and origins – humans, non-humans, biotic materials, physical and virtual technologies – all in constant interaction.

There are a limited number of physical spaces within this special category. Usually associated with cult and religion, they have a public condition that extends far beyond the basic sphere of human activity, attaining a higher state through being invested with a set of meanings by a concrete social group. In many cases this 'publicness' is generated not only by a series of activities or rituals but by the meaningful use of certain features – language, ornamentation, materiality, iconography, the role of the objects – which evokes the beliefs or values that are shared among the group. Consequently, these are not universal and generic, but aesthetically and culturally grounded spaces.

Public Space, Publicness and Public Sphere

When we speak about public or public space, the polysemy of the term usually prevents fruitful conversations. The multitude of meanings of the concept "public" comprises at the same time the abstract space of exchange between individuals from language, politics or institutions, to a group of people gathered in a specific space, to the abstract entity of a set of individuals that have a common link or the goods or the physical space they share. As an adjective it gives a character that refers to a group of individuals with shared links: the *populus*. By definition in different physical settings, the notion of public will vary, since it refers to different sets of individuals whose links will be established in different ways and through different channels.

It is necessary, therefore to acquire a better understanding of the meaning of "public" in each context. To produce physical public spaces in which the seed of common and collective may appear. The Unit will work in 3 key concepts to clarify what ingredients and fundamental characteristics that will contribute to its formation.

On the one hand, the public sphere, is meant as the physical and virtual places where no domestic life develops to show with their actions and discourses; its willingness to participate in matters that have to do with the realization of collective goals. This task will be undertaken through readings to understand the meaning for different authors of the public sphere and the study and development of graphic documents that examine the institutions, the media and other mechanisms of participation of citizens in the public realm. Secondly, each student will define the concept of public (publicness) which will serve as the base of the proposal for a physical public space, specifying the mechanisms for participation for direct and symbolic use in the project, as well as the range of actions that will take place in the space to be able to begin to define the physical environment in a third step. In other words, the final task is to design every single aspect of a concrete and physical public space where the sphere of the public is reconsidered, and that take into account the notion of publicness elaborated by each student through the design of it.

Public Wilderness

Nature provided the source for literacy in the beginning of our species when it was realised that the world was patterned and it varied seasonally; that animals and plants lived and died; that there was a presence or absence of water. As our species became adept at understanding and forecasting nature

so changed our relationship to it. Crop cultivation, animal domestication, river diversion and irrigation came as products of new knowledge about nature which then lead to the idea of constructing permanent habitation. Architecture itself is a product of the control of nature.

Antiquity's mythical accounts on nature were made way for its rational inquiry. Later advances in scientific instrumentation brought both conceptual changes in the understanding of nature, but also newfound skepticism that nature was not what it seemed through the human eye. Nature no longer was defined by perceptible qualities such as color and sound but as equations and laws. The purpose of inquiry into nature went from a mere acquisition of knowledge to an abstract inquiry meant for fashioning nature according to wants and desires. In this light we can see the ecological predicament between us and nature has having naturally evolved out of our continuous cultural evolution.

"Rare New Species III" is concerned with public space that could be mistaken for wilderness. We see that the evolution of the understanding of nature has ended in our desire to construct an artificiality that is indistinguishable from nature. Through this, wilderness is understood as sufficiently complex artificiality (socially and materially), that produces a public space that is conceptually and spatially familiar to us as nature itself. And as interpretation of nature is never sufficient for all people in all places at all times, we're concerned with wilderness that springs from the contents and context that create it. An increase in the complexity of artificiality that we give birth to is a product of the tools that use. Currently we're are producing unprecedented complexity due to the raw power of technology that is causing large qualitative shifts in reality. The same technology has almost but eradicated the means through which we used to understand the world.

> 'Today ... it is the city and the urban that grows wild like the state of nature (when did the expression 'jungle' begin to be applied to its 'mysteries'?); whereas it is nature which has, in late capitalism and the green revolution—but perhaps all the way back to the original neolithic revolution itself— been subject to careful planning and engineering.' Jameson (2004, pp.49)
>
> Jameson, F., 2004. "The Politics of Utopia" in New Left Review 25(272), pp.35–54.

Perhaps our common notion of public space is thought of as less defined than the slow giants of buildings with their obsolete modes of production and reception; in previous installations of Dip 5, students have been required to rethink what building means today, in a society of global cultural homogeneity. Despite this preconception of its agile character, can our current notions about public space be challenged? Can we formulate a more accurate definition of wild public space given our current tools of inquiry? What does it mean that our naturally evolving cultural identities are no longer in harmony with nature and that our own species--although natural--identifies more with artificiality?

More than ever, the role of public space needs to be separated from its value as real estate investments and explored as recipients of meanings associated with a collectivity; as constructs that reflect a particular state of the technology or spaces of interaction; as vestiges of complex relationships in material and culture; as receptacles and means that facilitate a range of actions and associated functions. But also as receivers and emitters of critical content; as devices that exceed the mere requirement for production needs, as entities that far from being static, evolve over time.

Stages

The possible steps for the project can be read as both phases in development, but also stages on which to manifest/present the different and conflicting natures of every proposal. Every student is advice to follow strictly every single proposed step to accomplish the targets established by the brief and the calendar and they are advised to follow every single step. Our work will be to open new doors to the unknown which remain in a state of constant development and evolution throughout the different terms. Each student must firstly follow every single step preparing documents that respond to each of the briefs and secondly check the work over the weeks, connecting the consecutive steps each other and recreating the previously executed documents. As a necessary comprehensive task of definition of the nature of the project, it is crucial to review, develop and complete the documents for every review, pin-up and jury.

Constitution (1st term)

The idea of a constitution has numerous meanings: it serves as an artifact that presides over the functioning of something but it also captures notions of the body and the bodily; what something is made up of; its volume or structure. In "Timaeus" it is described how the first constitution was written to welcome anyone wanting to live in the city with others. Every student will define throughout the year a Constitution that must define the spatial conditions, location, extreme new Umwelt to which the project is referred, purpose, social and cultural background of the project and its location, trying to establish every single aspect of the project. Its content describes the specific aspects of the future project and must be related to abstract issues described in advance.

This set of desires, strategies, rules, conditions and puzzles will be followed by the student as an explicit agenda of the project and its redefinition will be part of the development. The content of the constitution defines the spatial conditions, climate and program in relation to a physical place, along with any other aspect that builds the future project. This includes a discussion of abstract issues, set out with an eye to intellectual clarity and ambition. The constitution determines any feature of the project. It is not a simple description, but an initial test of the conditions to be constructed, formed out of convictions, intuitions and materials extracted from different fields of knowledge. It is a stream, an evolving list, capable of storing history and defining the main characteristics of the project while being developed. It can be defined as a proviso, a kind of contract, or a manifesto. Every single student has to adjust content and form to convert it into a form of inquiry about the project and should be subjected to permanent revision along the year. The constitution is the tool to assess the work every day, and it will be constantly reviewed throughout the year, confronting the daily tasks with sets of rules, to redefine and critique the work. Along the year the constitution has to be gradually transformed into the final one, which shape, format and content has to reflect the final state of the project and to be converted into the basis for the oral public presentations.

Reading/Reflection (1st term)

The project's chosen means of visualisation must at the same time embed a critical spirit and a radical message by adding layers of knowledge and new levels of understanding of the proposal. In doing so, the proposals must avoid current trends in visualisation or even inherited models. To enhance the

richness of the discourse, students must--in parallel to making documents--be using reading as both an inspiration to create documents and also for grounding work with related, objective information. Reading and the extraction of meaningful content should be seen as direct impetus to make documents. The process of making documents is the time to reflect and draw precise and necessary conclusions from the reading process. It is integral that the conclusions drawn are a synthesis from reading and are thought of in light of the project's full understanding. We will construct a living archive of visual, textual, sonic references: essays, poems, books, drawings, art, (moving-)images, websites to materialise new-found links between reading and documenting as a process of forming a critical position and simultaneously question contemporary notions of beauty.

Deep Resolution (2nd term)

The term deep resolution is meant three-fold: one, resolution as a methodology to inquire with more rigour and to engender criticality; two, to adopt contemporary techniques of complex creation; and three, resolution in the technical descriptions of the project for advancing a modification of reality. Deep resolution is both an enactment of procedures to necessarily complete a project, and as a platform to pursue and transmit knowledge with which to understand it.

For the Consortium there is no culture without associated techné. Therefore the techniques associated with the project are central to the advancement of the modification of reality which is the project, and act as the practical cultural knowledge with which to understand it. They are neither tools, nor resources, but culturally constructed and transmitted operational modes to reimagine again the world and to manipulate it.

Manipulation of any kind requires techniques but any kind of practical knowledge that allows us to activate both the control and the fantasy of these manipulations. Therefore, cartographic systems that allow us to physically and conceptually position ourselves, as individuals and as a society; systems of representation that help us form a mental image of the world; analytical tools to quantify reality through analog and digital systems; geometry and atmosmetry to help us measure the world and its atmosphere; and intentional manipulation of perception can be the central subject of such techniques.

For us these techniques are also cultural materials. There are no inappropriate or improper techniques. The social and cultural appropriateness of the techniques and the discussion on which technique or which combination of techniques is developed is a crucial part of the development of the project.

Radical Media (3rd term)

The visualisation of the world and in particular the links that things establish with the world around us, is in fact the reconstruction and reenactment of that world, hence the same links that are responsible for the artificial-cum-nature paradigm, are the links we wish to use to create and visualise projects in Dip 5. These modes of visualisation are therefore inextricably linked to the nature of the project, its environment and the model of transformation of its *umwelt*? that it proposes. Therefore, the mode of representation and the content of the project must be necessarily linked to an argument and must be central in the understanding of the conditions of the specific context that the student has established. The documentation is therefore not indicative of the sake of producing, but it is a means to understand.

Notwithstanding the search for new visual languages must also be met with the conviction that the exploration of traditional models of content (and even format) mixed and hybridize with new technologies is a fertile territory for the desired convergence of content and media, richness and criticality. The invention of new hybrids and therefore of new Radical Media is an objective (indivisible of the quality of the proposal) for the transformation of our environment.

This year Radical Media will again pay particular attention to the forging of new visual languages, given that the projects should be reflective of new transformations of the world around them. The attention to refining the documents and indeed the notion of "beauty" that the project proposes and must pursue the maximum conceptual rigor and the most extreme beauty. From techniques of projection but also the to the methodologies of research and output should all possess an extreme quality and Deep Resolution with which they should be carried out.