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The drawings and the objects create a threshold. Like spacing between two words they are between what is real and what is not. The “real” towers are in the models and the fictional reality is in the drawings. The towers are permanently temporary, forever in a state of -always- and -never-. Under construction. Their function is a monument of the non-functional, a representation of nothing; paper architecture, an architecture with a purpose of having no purpose. In one way, the towers are nothing but functional and at the same time they are completely redundant.

Robin Evans (and Tschumi and probably others have expressed similar thoughts) wrote “Architects do not make buildings, they make drawings for buildings.” If drawings and buildings are not the same, what is the difference? Peter Eisenman said in an interview that “The ‘real architecture’ only exists in the drawings. The ‘real building’ exists outside the drawings. The difference here is that ‘architecture’ and ‘building’ are not the same.” If architecture and building is not the same, what is the difference?

A quote from the National Encyclopedia “duality, […] describing a phenomena in two different ways, both needed for a full description, that can be translated within each other or who both refers to a common underlying unit.” What is the relationship between object and representation? What is representation doing that the object will not and vice versa? What can a duality, or an investigation at the threshold, between object and representation add to the process of creating and experiencing architecture?

A text describing the search for duality and the method used is described in Part II.

Representations are the architects means to negotiate the gap between idea and object; a series of languages through which the architect translates and imagines reality to convey an idea about reality.

John Hejduk, Mask of Medusa:
“Whatever the medium used - be it a pencil sketch on paper, a small-scale model, the building itself, a sketch of the built building, a model of the built building, or a photograph of the above realities, a process is taking place. Some sort of distortion is occurring, a distortion that has to do with intuition as primal yearning, which, in turn, has something to do with the interpretation and re-interpretation of space and all the mysteries the word space encompasses, (including its spirit).”

The experience is the meeting of the subject (the person/the body) and architecture (direct through the built object or indirect through representation such as drawing, model, text or other abstractions of the space). Our experience is a sum of our senses and our past experience.

The object has a direct relationship to your body and you senses, the position of your body in relation to the object determines the experience.

Representation, object and experience are a few of the words I have been working around, all of the collected in the vocabulary for the project.

The site is the in the center of Stockholm, today, next to the Central Station, on the other side the City Hall with its tall tower. In front of the site is the everchanging water and flowing around it elevated roads. The building material for the towers derive from the representations of the buildings on site, building permits where the oldest is from 1775 and the newest from 2007.

Drawings are the building material; old and new, built and unbuilt, big and small, public and private, good and bad. These documents of moments in time are carelessly deconstructed and carefully reconstructed, prefabricated pieces of walls and voids.

The Tower of Walls is named after the wall pieces used as building material. It is constructed around a triangle, making it symmetrical or asymmetrical depending on your position. Every piece is a part of the construction, all of them necessary to form the whole piece. The pieces push and pull, weave, bend, carry, lean, twist and lock each other.

The Tower of Voids is constructed at the diagonal of a square, with three (major) different outer forms. One is symmetrical with a base, middle and top, the second is pyramid shaped and the third edge varies in width by stepping inward and outwards.

The Tower of Drawings is constructed by the rotation of a square. The pieces used are both surface and volume and create an outer form that feel symmetrical but is constructed of different pieces. From one side it feels massive, but as you turn around it is almost hollow and seems to lean.

The architectural process is reversed, first came the object. A quote from Robin Evans discussing the process of architecture:

“... the peculiar disadvantage under which architects labor, never working directly with the object of their thought, always working it through some intervening medium, almost always the drawing, […] Nearly always the most intense activity is the construction and manipulation of the final artefact, the purpose of preliminary studies being to give sufficient definition for final work to begin, not to provide a complete determination in advance, as in an architectural drawing.”

Built in a way they could not have been drawn, (or rather, if they had been drawn before being built they would have looked completely different). The towers are built with themselves as references, the size and shape of each component determines the position of the next, a set of rules are made and broken. Every piece is depending on the ones before and the ones coming after. Interfaced, as the present with the past and the future.
The duality between object and representation, or to be more specific the duality between the building and drawing or the model.

Lisa Palm
STATEMENT
This is a personal and precise investigation not a quantitative analysis.
This is a project not a building.
This is a process not a product.
This is paper architecture not paper architecture.
This is an investigation of the relation between object and representation not representational architecture.
This is an investigation of architectural experience through translations and transitions between objects and representations, not what you feel when you enter a building.
This is moving between representation and object through translations.
A threshold is not a border. It is like a blank space between words, separating and connecting.
A representation is not a building. It is like one frame in a movie.
An object is not architecture until it is defined as such.

MAIN REFERENCES:
Åsa Dahlin: On Architecture, Aesthetic Experience and the Embodied Mind, 2002
- Iman Ansari in conversation with Peter Eisenman
Robin Evans, Translations from Drawing to Building and Other Essays, 1997
Adrian Forty, Words and buildings, 2000
Henri Lefevre, The production of Space, 1974
Robin Evans (and Tschumi and probably others have expressed similar thoughts) wrote “Architects do not make buildings, they make drawings for buildings.” Is architecture the object or its representation? I am searching for a duality in the experience of the drawing/model and the building; I am trying to find the threshold between object and representation.

Representations are the architects means to negotiate the gap between idea and object; a series of techniques through which the architect translates and imagines reality to convey an idea about reality. The architectural object is the product of the architectural process achieved by representation. The architectural object is built and used. The object is sometimes the building.

The experience is the meeting of the subject (the person/the body) and architecture (direct through the built object or indirect through representation such as drawing, model, text or other abstractions of the space).

Åsa Dahlin is writing in her book On Architecture, Aesthetic Experience and the Embodied Mind about experience and language: “Experience is in its nature evasive, subjective, and dependent on the situation in which it takes place[...].” At Wittgenstein has radically shown us, the role that language plays in this objectification of our experienced world is thus of particular interest in the development of an aesthetic awareness, when experience is discussed. But it is also important to understand what is beyond or before language,...”

1. Where do I stand when it comes to the relationship between object and representation, do I agree with Peter Eisenmans statement that “the ‘real building’ exists outside the drawing” and “you can’t take pictures of it or draw it, but you feel something, an experience you cannot capture in drawing or photographs”, or Peter Eisenmans statement from the same interview that “the ‘real architecture’ only exists in the drawings” and “I’m not trying to represent something; I’m trying to make it real and the only way it can be real is through my drawings”?

2. Through a process of using drawings from the site as a building components, first deconstructing them through different processes (laser cutting paper and hot wire cutting foam) and then rebuilding them into new objects. The rebuilding is made with the spatial experience of drawings and architectural objects (for example the lines of a drawings or relation between the body and the object) and the process of working directly with the object (instead of working with the object through representations).

With the aim to investigate the spatial experience, how can I use this process to create an architecture that holds a duality between object and representation?

---

1) Robin Evans, Translations from Drawing to Building and Other Essays, 1997
Page 156: “... the peculiar disadvantage under which architects labor, never working directly with the object of their thought, always working it through some intervening medium, almost always the drawing. [...] Nearly always the most intense activity is the construction and manipulation of the final artefact, the purpose of preliminary studies being to give sufficient definition for final work to begin, not to provide a complete determination in advance, as in an architectural drawing.”
If duality is to describe a phenomena in tow different ways, and both of them are needed for a full description1: what is the relationship between object and representation? Do we need them both to fully understand architecture? What is representation doing that the object will not and vice versa?2 What can a duality and a merge between object and representation add to the experience of architecture?

I am trying to create a duality in the experience of object and representation, using the characteristics that defines object and representation. These extremes are not static, all objects and representations can have these qualities more or less. The model is closer to the object than the drawing, it does not have the flatness of the drawing and responds to daylight and gravity (though in the same way as ants, most models would cave under their weight if scaled up). The model does not have a place just like the drawing, it is made to be moved.

1) http://www.np.se/oppdagverk/encyklopedi/lång/dualitet
"Beskrivning av ett fenomen på två olika sätt, som båda behövs för en fullständig beskrivning, som kan överrördas i varandra eller som båda hänför sig till en gemensam bakomliggande enhet."
My translation: "...describing a phenomena in two different ways, both needed for a full description, that can be translated within each other or who both refers to a common underlying unit."

2) Peter Eisenman says in an interview for Architectural Review in 2013: "The ‘real architecture’ only exists in the drawings. The ‘real building’ exists outside the drawings. The difference here is that ‘architecture’ and ‘building’ are not the same."

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OBJECT</th>
<th>REPR.</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>direct</td>
<td>indirect</td>
<td>The object has a direct relation to the body, the representation is an abstraction that communicates and is interpreted. This also applies to the construction of object or representation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>impact</td>
<td>imagination</td>
<td>Your imagination constructs the space from the representation, being in a spaces has an impact on you.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>body</td>
<td>language</td>
<td>Representation is a use of symbols and conventions to create and read spaces. They can show more then the object, what happens inside the wall?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>senses</td>
<td>abstraction</td>
<td>In representation you still use your senses, but through abstractions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>position</td>
<td>projection</td>
<td>Your position in relation to the object gives a set viewpoint, a drawing has endless (or none) viewpoints. The model is three dimensional but your point of view is different from the full scale object.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dynamic</td>
<td>static</td>
<td>Experiencing the object, the space change as you move around. This also happens in a model, but with a different viewpoint and often from the outside.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
true size | scale | The representation always has a scale, even when it is 1:1.
space | surface | The drawing can imply or pretend to be three dimensional but is a surface. It is also projected on a rectangular surface, often A-format or in the US, D-format.¹
materiality | symbols | In representations materials are abstract symbols or patterns, the object is its own material, sometimes pretending to look like another material.
place | non-place | The object can move, but is always in relationship with the surroundings, the representation is created to be read anywhere, to disregard the space its in.
gravity | floating | On the paper or the screen, anything can be up or down.
process | frozen | Through time and movement, the object is changing. The representation is frozen, in a drawing is the door either 90 degrees, 30 degrees or closed.

¹ Robin Evans, *The Projective Cast*, 1995

"A plan, which can be any shape, may tend to be rectangular for a host of reasons, but the internal logic of parallel projection will push it that way too. Five minutes at a drawing board will convince anyone unfamiliar with the technique that this is the way things have to be set out. The instruments at your disposal will lead you to produce frontal pictures of the several sides of boxes..."

Is there anything that is similar between object and representation? The object is physical, the representation is abstract. The object has a direct relationship to your body and you senses, the position of your body in relation to the object determines the experience. The experience of the object is limited to the spaces you can enter and you viewpoint. The experience of a drawing is being at all places at once: you are inside and outside, above and below; you see the relationship between the spaces (symmetry/asymmetry, repetition, size), the geometrical composition and the ventilation shafts. What is in front of the section or plan cut is hidden, you cannot turn around to see what is behind your back.

Our experience is a sum of our senses and our past experiences and knowledge. Our experience is emotional and intellectual, the two are distinguishable but not separable from each other (to borrow a line from Lefebvre).
Figure 1: Map of the Ocean
(taken from Lewis Carroll’s *Hunting of the Snark*)

1) Georges Perec, *Species of Spaces*
The search began with the objectified everyday, building permits from the 18th century that from the beginning only were representations of buildings with the purpose of getting them built. Today they are almost fetishly nostalgic objects. Through time they have transformed; from a representation of what is going to be built, to an archived representation of what is built (or what was planned to be built), to a representation of what was built after the building is torn down, to an object given its own aesthetic value.

Floor plans that could be manipulated and abstracted easily, but with the familiar characteristics of an old building: the thick walls, the door frames and the trims. The floor plans are of everyday buildings: a cellar, a small bakery, an apartment building, and none of them exist today, except through their representation.
The drawings were translated into new objects through two different representational languages; hot wire and foam, laser cutter and paper. The two techniques are chosen because they follow the logic of the drawing, lines and surfaces\(^1\). The goal was to get a three dimensional object with the tectonic characteristics of the method and material.

1. The foam creates solids from void, the floor plans are projected on two sides and the form cut out along the edge of the walls. They cut through each other, creating forms that are a combination of the walls and the voids. They are familiar to their origin and their own simultaneously. The forms are a consequence of the technique and then valued. Associations are mass/void, monolithic, corners, mass.

2. The laser cutter either cuts through or etches, pieces and folds. The process of making an three dimensional object was much more a choice then a consequence, the assemblage was intricate and intentional with the goal to get the paper to hold itself with nothing else. Associations are tectonic, assemblage, surface, tension/pressure.

---

1) [http://dictionary.cambridge.org/dictionary/english/projection](http://dictionary.cambridge.org/dictionary/english/projection)

"a drawing that represents a solid shape or a line that is seen from a particular direction"

2) James S. Ackerman, *Introduction: The conventions and rhetoric of architectural drawing:*

"... it may be a delicate line executed on drafting paper with a fine steel pen [...] it may be loose brushwork applied to a variety of rough surfaces..."
THE METHOD

FRAGMENTS FOAM

Two drawings, projected on a foam box, the wall line is followed in one cut. This creates a series of forms; the shell with the removed massive void, the massive voids cut through each other creating new mass and voids.

This mode is a combination of a asymmetrical drawing with four spaces, all connected and a asymmetrical drawing with three spaces in a row, all connected.

The outcome is a series of forms with combinations of walls and voids. The piece on the top is a combination of the two outer walls, creating a form that is enclosing space but still hollow.

The second form is the outer walls from one drawing and the in-between space of the other drawing. This form is heavier and more massive, still an enclosure.

The third form is the voids cutting into each other. The form is massive with deep hollow cuts.

The next three forms are a combination of walls and voids, creating forms that are flat from one side and massive from another view.
Three forms from this combination. The first one is a combination of walls from the larger floorplan and the void from the other. The form is an interesting combination of mass and void, enclosed and open, abstract and origin and different thicknesses of the foam.

The second form is also a combination of walls and voids, but with a different character. It creates one enclosure and has a symmetrical effect.

The third form is massive, two in-between spaces, or voids, creates a positive form reminding more of a sculpture then architecture, an art object rather than an architectural object.
THE METHOD
FRAGMENTS PAPER

The same drawings as in the previous study, but the paper is laser cut. The walls are cut out and the lines of, for example, the stair is etched. The paper is folded so the two drawings have the same relationship as in the cut foam models, and then the wall components are used to hold the paper in place.
THE METHOD
FRAGMENTS PAPER

unfolded traced original elevation plan
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THE METHOD
COMPOSITES
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THE TOWERS

ORIGIN

The towers were raised on a site in the city of Stockholm, where a conference center is placed today. Drawings from the site are used as in the previous study, the oldest is from 1775 and the newest from 2007.
Two components, sliding or of order.

Two horizontal components in embracing and bending the vertical component.

A vertical component between two blocks, tucked in or caught.

One component weaving two pieces together.
PART I

VOCABULARY

A set of words connected to the project, their meaning to me and some questions raised through them. All words are in an architectural context, whatever that is.

Lisa Palm
MAIN REFERENCES:

Åsa Dahlin: On Architecture, Aesthetic Experience and the Embodied Mind. 2002

- Iman Ansari in conversation with Peter Eisenman

Robin Evans, Translations from Drawing to Building and Other Essays, 1997

Adrian Forty, Words and buildings, 2000

Henri Lefevre, The production of Space, 1974

ABSTRACT

“Apart from concrete realities, specific objects or actual instances.”

The abstract can either be something not yet realized or a representation of something existing. When making something abstract enough (7) information is left out. The abstraction is represented through a medium.

1) http://dictionary.reference.com/browse/abstract
Some rules, to be broken (note that built is not specified):
1.a Containing bodies, smaller or larger it is either furniture or city
1.b More still than moving
2. Function, how the bodies interact with the space; arenas, office, housing, storage, shopping malls, churches
3. Processes, conversations about architecture, participatory design, research

1.a Is architecture the object or the body in relation to the object?
Page 99, “A: Architecture = the aesthetic value of architecture is determined by the interaction between an experiencing human being and architectural objects (presence of human centrality).
B: Architecture = architectural objects have an aesthetic value of their own, independent of an experiencing human being (absence of human centrality).”

A or B, what is an architectural object? How does it separate itself from other objects? Man made or man used; the cave or the fireplace; shelter or community?
Usually it is about protecting bodies from nature, the wind, the snow, the heat the cold, in history from dangerous animals, today from rats and doves.
Some architecture is easy to define but where is the border? Are cities and furniture architecture or are some of them just made by architects? For an architect everything can be architecture, but for everyone else the term is limited to buildings.

Is everything built architecture? Just as with art, some definitions are quality based, in theory, process and product.
Not all architecture contain bodies, but maybe all of them are made to be accessible by bodies? Even water towers and electrical stations have doors, stairs and lighting.

1.b Buildings can be built on water, standing or floating, they are transported as whole units to their permanent site.
Houseboats and campers, are they architecture? When they look like a building or are designed by an architect they are defined as architecture, but most larger boats (motorboats and sailing boats for example) have the same components as a house: kitchens, toilets, beds and are not seen as architecture. The difference is that they are designed by someone else than an architect and the primary function is to move.

“For example, socio-psychological evidence suggests that architectural objects cause behavior, and much of architectural design is predicated on this claim.”

“If we examine, for example, any type of domestic architecture we will find already inscribed within the architecture a complex array of mentalities and practices concerning the relations between genders,


between parents and children, between ‘inside’ and ‘outside’, between what is supposed to be “public” and what is supposed to be private, between what is supposed to be seen, smelt, or heard and what isn’t, and so forth.”

3. Does an architect have to be involved for it to be called architecture? No. Do we define architecture by what it can be or what it usually is?

“...the outputs of architecture are not limited to built structures but include as well models, sketches, and plans, and this variety prompts questions as to whether these are all reasonably considered architectural objects and which, if any, such form of output represents a primary sort of object in architecture.”

“...there is a debate in architecture today, the lasting debate is between architecture as a conceptual, cultural, and intellectual enterprise and architecture as a phenomenological enterprise—that is, the experience of the subject in architecture, the experience of materiality, of light, of color, of space, and etc. I have always been on the side opposed to phenomenology.”


Iman Ansari in conversation with Peter Eisenman

ARCHITECTURE continuing II

Is the definition of architecture found in another field?

“In information technology, especially computers and more recently networks, architecture is a term applied to both the process and the outcome of thinking out and specifying the overall structure, logical components, and the logical interrelationships.”

Is the laws around architecture part of architecture or only something to consider? Or rather; is the definition of architecture constant and timeless or bound to the discourse of the present? (How is the architectural history affecting the field today? How is it relevant? What mistakes have we learned from?)

1) [http://whatis.techtarget.com/definition/architecture](http://whatis.techtarget.com/definition/architecture)

ARCHITECTURE continuing III
The relationship between the body, space and time is inseparable in the experience of architecture. The experience is the meeting of the subject (the person/the body) and the object (the architecture through the built object, drawing, model, text or other abstractions of the space).

Page 5: “Experience is in its nature evasive, subjective, and dependent on the situation in which it takes place. [...] As Wittgenstein has radically shown us, the role that language plays in this objectification of our experienced world is thus of particular interest in the development of an aesthetic awareness, when experience is discussed. But it is also important to understand what is beyond or before language.”  

Who (the subject) meets the building (the object) affects how it is perceived. (A rough comparison; How judges feel, walking through the monumental doors of the courthouse, compared to the feeling of a person getting a verdict, meeting the large doors and echoing hallway dressed in marble) We as architects are not neutral; space is not neutral; the user is not neutral; we encourage, we allow, we offend, we judge, we separate, we set rules, etc.

How is experience affected by representation? If representation is language and there is only a limited capacity to what we can say, how do we choose? Is realism the best way? When do we stop explaining and start exaggerating? Is representation promises not held?

Our experience is a sum of our senses and our past experience. Our experience is emotional and intellectual, (to borrow a line from Lefebvre) the two are distinguishable but not separable from each other.

The other meaning of experience, gained knowledge, can be reached either by observing or participation. The knowledge gained is either abstract or direct.

A quote from Richard Shusterman, writing about John Dewey: “For Dewey, the essence and value of art are not in the mere artifacts we typically regard as art, but in the dynamic and developing experimental activity through which they are created and perceived. He therefore begins by distinguishing between ‘the art product’—an object like a painting, sculpture or printed text that, once created, can exist, ‘externally and physically’, ‘apart from human experience’—and ‘the actual work of art [which] is what the product does with and in experience.”

Page 70: “... separate two widely different methods of gaining knowledge about a thing: - To circle round a thing—this method stops at the relative and can be reached though analysis and concepts. - To penetrate a thing—this method can reach the absolute through intuition.”

ARCHITECTURAL EXPERIENCE /ˈɑːr.kɪ.tek.tʃɚ/ /ɪkˈspɪr.i.əns/
Is architectural experience only about the aesthetics; the form, the style, what is seen?

Even when we work with the other senses, the expression is also visual. If the object is built, the acoustic and other sensory qualities will be visual as well.

The mass of an individual, connected to the world through senses (the most common ones): sight, feeling, hearing, taste, smell, balance, thermoreception (heat and cold) and proprioception (the awareness of the position of the body and it’s parts).

Page 182: “One paces oneself at the center, designates oneself, and uses oneself as measure. One is, in short a subject.”

Page 194: “But what conception of the body are we to adopt or readopt, discover or rediscover as our point of departure? […] Descartes’s body-as-object or the body-as-subject of phenomenology and existentialism? A fragmented body, represented by images, by words and traded retail?”

Architecture is mostly focused on the visual and se seeing part of the body, both when representing and expressing space.

1) Henri Lefèvre, The production of Space, 1974
A set of rules you have to follow when building in urban areas. The rules are nationwide but specifications define an additional set of regulations for each plot, formulated depending on the location, history and usage. The characteristics of the place is compared with the characteristics of the object when allowing the object to be a part of its future place.

The complexity of allowance and regulations have increased over time, alongside with building technology and processes. Today, even though everything is public, the forest of permits and cataloging of every single new sign put up on a building obscures the building itself.

"Architects do not make buildings, they make drawings for buildings." Robin Evans.

Did the profession -architect- begin with making drawings? Before there were builders, but with the drawing came the architect.

The intention of building permits is the closest thing to pure representation, they exist only for legal purpose. But when they get old enough, and the building is long gone, nostalgia and fetishizing the representation turns the drawings into objects.
**DUALITY**

/duːˈæl.ə.t̬ i/

“the state of combining two different things” 1

Theses things does not have to be unified by any similar characteristics, but can be contradictive and ambiguous.

“...beskrivning av ett fenomen på två olika sätt, som båda behövs för en fullständig beskrivning, som kan översättas i varandra eller som båda hänför sig till en gemensam bakomliggande enhet.” 2

My translation: “...describing a phenomena in two different ways, both needed for a full description, that can be translated within eachother or who both refers to a common underlying unit.” 2

1) http://dictionary.cambridge.org/dictionary/english/duality
2) http://www.ne.se/uppslagsverk/encyklopedi/lång/dualitet

---

**DRAWING**

/ˈdrɑː.ɪŋ/

“a drawing that represents a solid shape or a line that is seen from a particular direction” 1

Drawings are the architects means to negotiate the gap between idea and reality: a series of techniques through which the architect translates reality into abstraction to convey an idea about reality.

The drawing is a two dimensional representation of buildings and objects. Lines and surfaces create a pattern that can be read as a building. Drawings can be instructive, for builders, but are also a part of the method, for making decisions. Drawings are intentions, expectations and explanations.

Drawings are made up by a set of rules and conventions. The projection has a certain perspective, and reveals a view of the object, but will leave out the other side of the cutting line.

“Architecture has nevertheless been though of as an attempt at maximum preservation in which both meaning and likeness are transported from idea through drawing or building with minimum loss.” 2

1) http://dictionary.cambridge.org/dictionary/english/projection
2) Robin Evans, *Translations From Drawing to Building and Other Essays*, 1997
Imagination is not bound to your perception but is allowing the body to experience without sensing. Your imagination connects you to objects or representations, adding a layer of interpretation and your view on the world.

Imagination can be used to test and formulate statements, to translate words into images, to translate reality into something else, to suspend gravity and any other law.

“a system of communication...”

Page 409 (my translation): “We cannot abandon language, because then we can’t talk to each other. But we can’t say what we want, because we only have language to communicate. [...] the bandwidth (capacity, my note) of language is much smaller than of perception. Most of what we know about the world we can never tell each other.”

“Finally, the conventions are, in a sense, elements of a language, like words and sentences, they are invented or arrived at by mutual agreement and, once in place, remain with little change for centuries.”

For me language is liked to representation rather than object, both as the parts and the whole. The representations as a tool for communication and with a set of rules, and like any other rule they have exceptions, interpretations and variations.

The color purple was seen as a variation of brown until it got named as its own color.

1) http://dictionary.cambridge.org/dictionary/english/language
2) Tor Nørretranders, Märk Världen (The User Illusion is the English version), 1991
3) James S. Ackerman, Introduction: The conventions and rhetoric of architectural drawing
A three dimensional representation of an architectural project.

The architectural model is often white, like a canvas the spectator can use to imagine the colors and materials that are going to be there. Architectural models are not like doll houses or Märklin models. Materials, colors and nature are abstracted to show the formal qualities of the proposal.

Common materials that are easy to work with are white cardboard, balsa, white foam or corrugated cardboard (very good to imitate soil or bricks).

For presentation models the proposal can be accentuated with a different material such as steel or wood in the white abstracted landscape.

"a thing that you can see or touch..."  
Existing as a separable unit, having a place in the world, and can be experienced by a subject. What physical qualities are limited to the object? A cloud at a distance is an object, but if you are inside it the cloud is merely even a space (this might be an argument for the experience based definition of architecture and objects).

3.1 Ontology: “Yet another way to pick out architectural objects is to set them apart from other art objects or artifacts.”

1) http://dictionary.cambridge.org/dictionary/english/object
A space seen as separable, containing a set of objects and characteristics. A specified area, that is limited either by law or by spatial qualities. It is often outside, and a location can have many layers of places; the village has a housing block has park has a playground.

Places hold a collection of objects, contributing to or altering the characteristics of the place. The intention when creating the collection varies, and unintentional objects are often seen as trash.

Places often get valued by their capabilities of making us feel safe, happy, calm, belonging (and the next step, at home), etc.

“We cannot here enter into all the details, but want to emphasize that the landscape as such gets its value through the bridge. Before, the meaning of the landscape was “hidden”, and the building of the bridge brings it out into the open. […] This place however, did not exist as an entity before the bridge (although there were always many sites along the river bank where it could arise), but comes-to-presence with and as the bridge.”

Places hold memories of the past. The places don’t remember everything, their memory is selective, nostalgic and highly valued. Or; “that ‘memory’ on its own is not interesting - what matters is the tension between memory and forgetting.”

What is true and false when you describe a place?

1) Christian Norberg-Schultz, Genius Loci, towards a phenomenology of architecture. 1976
2) Adrian Forty, Words and buildings, 2000

The usage of abstractions (projections, models, images and text) to describe an object. The abstractions are also objects, but hold a series of characteristics that could be seen as opposites to an object:

- scale (in architecture usually between 1:10 and 1:5000)
- non-place (the drawings and models are made for moving around and being used in various conditions)
- abstracted (the information about the object is reduced depending on usage and scale)
- floating (gravity and other forces apply in various amount)

Objects can hold a series of symbols and representations of other objects, or maybe do all objects hold references and symbols to other objects that already exist? As with language, is it possible to create without “speaking” contemporary (or referential) words?

The layers of representation vary from applications on (in, under, between) the object, similar to reference, to existing as a way to describe the object.

“The meaning of a Romanesque or Gothic cathedral was in itself; it was de facto. Renaissance buildings, on the other hand - and all buildings after them that pretended to be architecture - received their value by representing an already valued architecture, by being simulacra (representations of representations) of antique buildings; they were de jure. The message of the past was used to verify the meaning of the present. Precisely because of this need to verify, Renaissance architecture was the first simulation, an unwitting fiction
The moderns' attempt to represent realism with an undecorated, functional object was a fiction equivalent to the simulacrum of the classical in Renaissance representation. For what made function any more real a source of imagery than elements chosen from antiquity?  

"An architectural drawing may be not just means to an end, but an end in itself. Since at least the eighteenth century, architectural drawings have been prized by collectors and exhibited as works of art, and have acquired a value on the art market. They can become an object of fashion quite disconnected from the making of buildings, to the extent of being quite unbuildable (in what sense is the fashion of drawing like that of clothes?) or an advertisement (presentation drawings, competition drawings)."

The more we try to create an architectural object, the more we use the representational languages.

"So to me drawing is a form of writing, and a form of reading what I write. So I don’t see any difference. To me drawing is not making pretty things or making representations. It’s not representing anything; It is the incarnation of the thing.”

1) Peter Eisenman, The end of the classical. 1984
2) James S. Ackerman, Introduction: The conventions and rhetoric of architectural drawing
   Iman Ansari in conversation with Peter Eisenman

(Architectural) Space is where the (architectural) experience take place.

Page 175: “Time is distinguishable but not separable from space.”  

Body, space and time are universal words with alternative meanings depending on who you ask: the physicist, the writer, the architect or the cleaner.  

“Much of the ambiguity of the term ‘space’ in modern architectural use comes from a willingness to confuse it with a general philosophical category of ‘space’. To put this issue slightly differently, as well as being a physical property of dimension or extent, ‘space’ is also a property of the mind, part of the apparatus through which we perceive the world. It is thus simultaneously a thing within the world, that architects can manipulate and a mental construct through which the mind knows the world, and thus entirely outside the realm of architectural practice (although it may affect the way in which the result is perceived).”

Henri Lefebvre makes a distinction between 'architectural space' and 'space of architects', the first being space used and reproduced as architecture, and the latter the creation of space by architects.

1) Henri Lefevre, The production of Space, 1974
2) Adrian Forty, Words and buildings, 2000
and that the techniques used when creating architecture are too abstracted and focused on seeing and no other senses.

What is the difference between space and place? Is it phenomenological, or just as east as the first talks about interior architecture and the latter about the landscape around the architecture?

Bernard Tschumi links space to the experience of architecture, and not linked to the concept.

Page 175: “Time is distinguishable but not separable from space.”

The experience of architecture is linked to time through the movement in space; it is perceived, made possible and defined by time.

Time is irreversible, and a lot of things can only be transformed in one way. Once you folded a paper you can unfold it, but the trace of the fold remains. The same law applies to experiences too, you can never have the same experience twice, the next time you see something it will be affected by you past experience, what happened in between these experiences and the different situation in the present.

Time is not progress.

In representations time stands still. They convey an idea about the future but say more about the present. They talk as if the building is still to come (and in documentations about a chosen moment in the buildings time line) even after the building is erected, there is no difference in the drawing whether the building exists or not.

1) Henri Lefebvre, The production of Space, 1974
A structure with a height larger than the base. Burj Khalifa is the tallest existing structure, the tallest skyscraper, the building with most floors, world's highest installation of an aluminum and glass facade and the tallest structure ever built in the world but only has the second highest swimming pool.  

The height relation to other towers and the surrounding is important when erecting a new tower. Towers are functional in one way or another, even when you can not enter them. They can be one or more of these things: transmitters, for navigation, occupied (residential, office, hotel, multi-use and others), communicating (belfry, minaret) outlooks, chimneys, tanks, symbols (of power, of progress, of gods, of wealth etc).  

A tower is about the collective, it is built by, used by and seen by a lot of people (and sometimes to alienate a lot of people).  

Depending on the surroundings, the tower is either a solitary mark or in a forest of towers, or trees.

1) https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Burj_Khalifa

---

**TOWER**

/ˈtaʊ.ɚ/

**TRANSLATION**

/trænsˈleɪ.ʃən/

A structure with a height larger than the base. Burj Khalifa is the tallest existing structure, the tallest skyscraper, the building with most floors, world's highest installation of an aluminum and glass facade and the tallest structure ever built in the world but only has the second highest swimming pool.  

The height relation to other towers and the surrounding is important when erecting a new tower. Towers are functional in one way or another, even when you can not enter them. They can be one or more of these things: transmitters, for navigation, occupied (residential, office, hotel, multi-use and others), communicating (belfry, minaret) outlooks, chimneys, tanks, symbols (of power, of progress, of gods, of wealth etc).  

A tower is about the collective, it is built by, used by and seen by a lot of people (and sometimes to alienate a lot of people).  

Depending on the surroundings, the tower is either a solitary mark or in a forest of towers, or trees.

1) "Whatever the medium used - be it a pencil sketch on paper, a small-scale model, the building itself, a sketch of the built building, a model of the built building, or a photograph of the above realities, a process is taking place. Some sort of distortion is occurring, a distortion that has to do with intuition as primal yearning, which, in turn, has something to do with the interpretation and re-interpretation of space and all the mysteries the word space encompasses, including its spirit."

John Hejduk, Mask of Medusa, 1985
The place is in the center of Stockholm, between the Central Station and the City Hall, with the water in front of it, isolated by roads flowing around it. The place is elevated, easy to find, difficult to reach. The conference centre finished in 2010 with its shield in steel is even harder to access. The building was meant to be a contrast to the massive City Hall, but still feels clumsy.

The postal terminal that stood there before lasted twenty years, how long will the conference centre last?
Map from 1899.
The place is in the center of Stockholm, behind the Central Station and with the water in front of it.

Now, it is just a matter of time before the gas plant is gone for good. This central location is just too good for a factory, especially such a messy one! The bath in the south

The mill standing on the other side of the stream stands as a reminder of what can happen to these types of buildings. Just a decade ago it was burned to the ground, the new one being an exact copy.

The tower is just by the gas plant, but on a nice day it is still used by the inhabitants. The spectacular view from the tower inspires Ragnar Östberg when he designs the City Hall ten years later.
A vertical component between two blocks, nestled in or caught.

Whatever you can hold on to, hope that it will let you hang there.

Surface and mass, from the same origin, meeting again.

Something to lean on.
THE TOWER OF WALLS

ELEVATION 1:100
On the right: not to scale
An interplay of vertical components pulling the horizontal level in different directions.

Two horizontal components are embracing and bending the vertical component.

One component weaving two pieces together.

The vertical component is locked between two horizontal parts.
ELEVATION 1:100
On the right: not to scale
Corners meet and join.

An act of balance.

Two components, sliding out of order.

Two components stacked, different combinations of drawings but with the same thickness, creating the illusion of being one piece.