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Summary
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This is a critical practice PhD undertaken through the production of a corpus of works produced by the architecture practice terroir. The thesis is articulated through this written document, an exhibition, exhibition presentation and panel discussion. The archival documents will include this text and a digital record of the exhibition, presentation and panel discussion and an appendix of PDF format drawings for key projects.

This PhD provides insight into designing. It offers a view on the nature and structures of design research proposing that design research occurs within the activity of designing. As a case study, the PhD provides an internal view of the emergent design process of a collaborative architecture design practice terroir. It proposes a way, (the ‘design-place’), in which design by collaboration operates within complex and often contradictory contexts.1 The thesis deals with questions of design in a contemporary, cosmopolitan condition and proposes that within such a condition design is an ethical endeavour.2 A key underlying proposition of the thesis is that architecture is fundamentally a critical activity.3 The PhD concludes by demonstrating through design projects how terroir has explored these questions in producing designs that operate at the level of personal and subjective experience in opening up a public, cosmopolitan realm.4

This text is divided into five sections. Section One provides a methodology and overview of the design research. Sections Two, Three and Four present the content of the thesis discussing the propositions, reflections, gaps and discoveries of the research. Section Five discusses a concluding project that evidences the end point of the thesis and looks forward to the implications for future practice.

Section One, Critical Practice Method, describes the difference between a more traditional history approach and a design research PhD addressing the emergent status of the latter.5 In discussing the structure of the design research approach, the text acknowledges that an appropriate method is one that can accommodate the ‘wicked problem’ nature of design.6

---

Section Two identifies the manner in which the critical practice of terroir began in questions of landscape as they relate to the formation of the constructed environment. It also discusses and questions early attempts to understand the practice of terroir in terms of normative moves. Section two concludes by describing a competition project through which it was possible to begin to articulate the terroir ways of designing.

Section Three discusses the further articulation and unravelling of the terroir design process particularly in the way in which the productive role of words in designing surfaced during the PhD. This Section demonstrates how the sufficiency of a critical landscape approach was interrogated and describes how a new proposition of the ‘design-place’ surfaced within the work that allowed terroir to re-position its practice.

Section Four explores the method through which the question of context is brought to the surface in the canonical absence characteristic of our contemporary condition thereby necessitating the contextual construction of design projects; that is, in such a condition the determination of contextual value is a key design move. This raises ethical questions in relation to that valuing and selection process.

Finally, Section Five explains the process by which the thesis proposition surfaced in three competition projects. The text concludes by discussing the thesis’ evidence in a current project, the Tasmanian Museum and Art Gallery Master Plan, and proposes how concepts such as ‘design-place’, multiplicity, the virtual, ethics, the cosmopolitan, and parallax will affect future practice.

1 Critical Practice Method

We learn about the world when we design. Lindsay Broughton, an artist who taught drawing at the University of Tasmania, observed that when people draw they come to know their subject in ways that they did not and could not otherwise know it. Drawing is a way of coming to know the world rather than simply representing what is already known. The idea of drawing or designing as knowledge-making can also extend beyond personal knowledge to shared knowledge. According to architecture historian Indra McEwen, Socrates credited Anaximander as the originator of philosophy. Of interest in McEwen’s account in terms of this argument is that Anaximander’s philosophy could not be understood independently of the crafted cosmic model constructed as part of the philosophising and by which Kosmos was made to appear. In other words in designing and making the model, order (new knowledge) was revealed.

One of the complications in this account is the move from a subjective investigation (drawing, crafting or designing) towards an objective knowledge more ably shared. This is one of the fascinating aspects of design: that while it can begin with the most intimate, inner and subjective reflection, it may end in the production of something that is widely shared and communal. This raises another issue of the parallax conditions of the designing of ‘the thing’ and ‘the thing’ as a completed object that will be approached in this thesis.

This is a critical-practice PhD, undertaken through a sequence of design projects of the collaborative architectural practice terroir. The PhD contributes to knowledge about design and particularly to the practice of designing. Therefore, the thesis oscillates between the subjective and more generalised aspects of terroir’s design practice. This includes the anecdotal and reminiscences although care has been taken to ensure that this approach extends beyond mere autobiographical description by contextualising personal accounts within a wider critical reflection on the process of designing. The thesis seeks to contribute to the body of knowledge in the emerging area of design research.

---

8 An observation made during a personal conversation in the early 1990s at the Centre for the Arts, University of Tasmania, Hobart.

First stage – traditional history approach

This PhD began in a qualitative history mode as a text-based investigation at the University of Queensland (with John Macarthur as Supervisor). It has concluded as a research-in-the-medium-of-design thesis employing a critical-practice method and undertaken at RMIT University (Leon van Schaik as Supervisor). The intent of this introduction is to explain the shift in approach.

The motivation to undertake a PhD in the first instance came from recognising the design potential that is to be found in uncovering ideas in a rigorous and systematic way. I had discovered, unintentionally, the potential of a research approach to designing while completing a Research Masters degree at the University of Melbourne (Philip Goad as supervisor), a higher degree that was completed at approximately the same time that Gerard Reinmuth, Scott Balmforth and I formed the office of terroir. On reflection, this is a potential that I have always felt and can trace through various interests and activities, many of which precede my engagement with architecture. These particular investigations (higher degrees) have provided both context and clarity for design work.

In his final year of the B.Arch at the University of Sydney, Reinmuth elected to complete an Honours Thesis (Jennifer Taylor as Supervisor) focussed on Twentieth Century Tasmanian architecture as my Masters had been. We both found that undertaking this research imparted depth to our own design work. We had discovered, unintentionally, the potential of a research approach to designing while completing a Research Masters degree at the University of Melbourne (Philip Goad as supervisor), a higher degree that was completed at approximately the same time that Gerard Reinmuth, Scott Balmforth and I formed the office of terroir. On reflection, this is a potential that I have always felt and can trace through various interests and activities, many of which precede my engagement with architecture. These particular investigations (higher degrees) have provided both context and clarity for design work.

In the beginning phases of the thesis, the core of the research question dealt with the issue of landscape that seemed to permeate terroir’s sense of “Tasmanianess.” It was seen as important to the way we designed; not in terms of a Romantic regional identity or vernacular language but in the way we operated and responded critically to place - something that we would come to understand later as spatial intelligence.\(^{10}\)

Tasmania has been the ground for international debate over questions of landscape value in relation to wilderness. The question of landscape value was evident at the time of European settlement and became hotly contested following the damming of Lake Pedder, a pristine sand lake that had been the subject of landscape artists and notable landscape photographers, Olegus Truchanas and Peter Dombrovskis.

The PhD subject, therefore, had a focus on the question of landscape and the way in which landscape is affective in the production of constructed environments. The question, as it was framed at that early stage touched on a history of landscape values generally in the formation of cultural identity. At the time of deciding to shift the focus of that investigation to one of design, the thesis was concerned with how Western landscape concepts (and particularly, wilderness) could be understood to be influential in the ways in which the unplanned city of Launceston in the northern part of the island of Tasmania had taken shape. These investigations were published in several forms, including two book chapters.\(^{11}\)

Limits of a traditional history approach

While the early, more conventional PhD work did feed into some terroir design projects (most notable of which were the GeoCenter Menz Klint International Design Competition, and Peppermint Bay project), it did not in any way deal with designing or with the relationship between the content of the thesis and the design process. Designing had, however, been the primary motivation for the thesis. The thesis as it stood at that point was, therefore, limited in the sense that it did not provide a way of engaging directly with designing.

The net effect of this gap was a distancing of the research from the process of designing; a distance that surfaced a number of unhelpful intelligence: Leon van Schaik, Spatial Intelligence: New Futures for Architecture (Chichester, UK: John Wiley & Sons, 2008).


tensions between design practice and this particular research method. In addition to the failure of a traditional qualitative history research method to build knowledge in relation to designing, tension emerged in relation to: the rapid turn over of projects set against the time frame of a singular research question; the process of reductive focus pulling against the way in which a series of projects continually opens up new questions; and the landscape emphasis that ultimately became limiting in relation to undertaking architectural projects, particularly ones in urban environments. This was a kind of ‘mini crisis’ that resulted from the unstated design intent of the PhD.

So, although a qualitative history method had proved to be of some benefit in providing insight and the sort of rigour that accompanies learning research techniques, design benefit can result from a wide range of practices – anything from the enlightened disciplines of philosophy and mathematics to, on occasion, mundane activities such as washing dishes. Therefore, the ‘beneficial proof’ (that is to say, what is beneficial is ipso facto significant) is not necessarily compelling. In other words, benefit should not be confused with adequacy. To be adequate, a method is needed that deals with the holistic condition of designing and in particular, one that does not thwart designing. An alternative design research approach was therefore desirable.

**Design Research**

Design research PhD’s, that is, PhD’s in which designing plays a significant role in the process, are new territory. This emergent state is described in Hilde Heynen’s article ‘Unthinkable Doctorates? Introduction’ in which she claims that “…a ‘doctorate in architecture’ which is constituted from the architect’s work itself – the verb ‘to architecture’ is as yet lacking from our vocabulary – has not yet really been explored.” While RMIT University had completed a number of Design Research Doctorates in Architecture and nearly twenty years of Masters projects by the time Heynen’s article was published, her comment demonstrates the pioneering nature of this work and the wider need to continue to develop robust models for Doctorates in Architecture. As Heynen correctly notes, the number of colloquia and conferences dedicated to the issue of the Design Doctorate also demonstrates the importance of this subject to a wider field than just architecture, extending the question to design disciplines generally.

I would agree with Heynen’s identification of a lack in the current circumstance, in the sense that Doctorates in Architectural Sciences (including history and theory) that are not design-based seek to “know about architecture as a product without knowing architecture in its structures and determinations.” As Heynen also points out, this lacking is one that the School of Architecture and Design, RMIT University, and The Bartlett School of Architecture, University College London, have sought to address.

However, Heynen goes on to propose a preference for “designerly research” nearer to artistic practices than to “professional architectural practices.” Jeremy Till made an eloquent distinction between the profession and the discipline at the 2008 Oxford Conference. While I acknowledge the importance of such a distinction, the intimate intersections of the discipline and the profession are nonetheless critical to design research in architecture. Maintaining the distinction without also working through the interdependencies may conceal these important aspects of design research. Often it is the interstices of the personal (artistic practice) and the limits of professional architectural practice (technical requirements, budgets, client idiosyncrasies, methods of communication) that are productive in a designerly sense.

---

13 The RMIT work has been well documented in, for example, Schaik, *The Practice of Practice: Research in the Medium of Design*, Leon van Schaik, *Mastering Architecture: Becoming a Creative Innovator in Practice* (John Wiley and Sons, 2005). In addition, the 2007 RIBA Research Symposium which was modelled around van Schaik’s book *Mastering Architecture* and included a paper by Blythe - Richard Blythe, “Reflections on Reflecting: An Archaeology of Reflective Design Practice or Research in the Medium of Design,” in RIBA Research Symposium (London: RIBA, 2007).


The distinction, then, although important must be balanced by an understanding of the productive role of practice in design research. This thesis is developed from design research undertaken within professional architectural practice.

Second stage – critical-practice in the medium of design and by corpus of works

At about the time that the ‘mini crisis’ of the first phase of the PhD emerged, terroir was invited by Professor Leon van Schaik to join the RMIT University Invitational Masters Program. terroir could see the potential benefit of being involved in a process that provided a project-based critical environment to continue what we had begun (critical practice) offering access to an expanded, international, critical audience. We did not, however, want to ‘split’ our research direction by undertaking research degrees in separate institutions and thereby dividing the conversation that sustains our practice.

At first, my two partners generously suggested that I could do both – finish my PhD at the University of Queensland, while simultaneously undertaking the Invitational Masters at RMIT (not forgetting, of course, the ongoing academic and practice work). Being somewhat less optimistic about that option, and following several conversations with van Schaik and Macarthur, I decided to shift to a project-based, critical-practice PhD at RMIT and join Balmforth and Reinmuth as they enrolled in the Invitational Masters Program. This switch in method resolved the issues that had arisen as a result of the conventional PhD approach.

This thesis holds to the premise that designing, when undertaken in a manner that is systematic, contextualized, communicable and open to peer review is a way of researching. There are at least three models for a PhD by project: written thesis with a project(s) as illustration; project(s) with attached exegesis; and by critical practice. This is a PhD by critical-practice. This text documents design projects - both the objects that are designed and the process of their designing - seeking to place these within a wider community of practice. The research has endeavoured to identify gaps, hypothesise about new possibilities that emerge from within those gaps and to reflect further through new design projects.

The purpose of the PhD is to provide evidence of how this critical-practice research has progressed systematically in ways that are communicable to others and that will contribute to the design-practice body of knowledge. I will seek to identify three qualitative shifts in the design practice of terroir and to evidence the ways in which these have resulted from critical-practice research (in the sections ‘Landscape’, ‘Design Place’ and ‘Ethics’). In the final section (‘Tickling Toys’: or surface twists), I will begin to explore future directions that result from this current research.

Structure and Process

The structure of the PhD is the result of the process described by van Schaik for an invitational critical-practice PhD undertaken in the medium of design. Van Schaik describes this process by means of what has become known (in Graduate Research Conference, or GRC circles, at least) as the ‘inverted cocktail glass drawing.’

The exhibition comprises text, images, audio and video. These are organised and arranged within a three dimensional object that serves as a kind of memory box. The exhibition and thesis are not a record of all the research, rather they seek to identify and describe key projects, process, observations, ideas and shifts.

The exhibition object is two-sided. One side displays large images of key projects. The opposite side is comprised of image sequences from the GRC presentations, video, and slots containing notebooks, journals and books produced by the author that were either central to the PhD process, or publications generated from the PhD.

During the course of the invitational PhD, presentations were made at two GRC’s each year. During the course of the candidature GRC’s have been numbered from 1-8 providing a temporal measure of progress and are referred to in this text by number – GRC1, etc. These

---

conferences took place between October 2004 (GRC1) and October 2008 (GRC8 = exhibition and examination). Therefore, this PhD includes eight GRC presentations over a four year period.

At each GRC candidates are typically allotted one hour. During the first half hour, candidates present their work to a panel. The panels were comprised of the Supervisor (Session Chair) and a changing group of critics some of whom saw the work only once and others who saw the work several times. This structure places a certain onus on the candidate to explain the total project on each occasion while also presenting details of recent projects in light of the unfolding thesis. At some GRC sessions, the three terroir directors/candidates presented jointly over three hours.

In the case of this PhD, each of these presentations was constructed as an image sequence that illustrated the discoveries, successes and failures of the total project in general with particular emphasis on those that emerged since the previous GRC. Many GRC sessions were recorded and the audio files used for further reflection. The image sequences and associated audio then, provide a map or ground upon which the thesis unfolds. Scanning across the full set of these image sequences reveals image sets that repeat and by their repetition indicate key moments and ideas. This has provided the organising principle for the exhibition and the structure for this text. GRC 7 was a penultimate presentation at which point the panel approved the thesis to go forward to examination.

---

18 Sand Helsel, Kate Heron, Jonathan Hill, Ranulph Glanville, Zeynep Mennan, Alan Powell, Ayse Senturer, Li Shiqiao, Johan Verbeke, John Frazer, Tom Kovac.

Figure 2: Design model for final exhibition

Van Schaik’s ‘inverted cocktail glass’ diagram of the PhD process is more profound when one witnesses its construction. Nevertheless, I will attempt to explain its various elements as it was constructed for me initially (and re-constructed at several points during the candidacy). The reproduction below is the version of the drawing constructed by van Schaik at an early supervisory session.
The inverted cone describes each stage of the PhD process as a layer of activity and development that moves from a broad base toward the PhD moment. The first stage, described in the lowest three rings, has three layers. The first layer is comprised of a body of work that has gained peer recognition through publication, exhibition and award. Van Schaik refers to this as “demonstrating mastery.” The second layer involves reflecting upon that body of work and the nature of the mastery raising questions: What drove the design work? What was at stake in the design process? How did the design process work? What is of value in these projects? What are your communities of practice? What enchainments are at play? In a three cornered debate on architecture which corner do you hold and who holds the other two? The research questions begin to emerge as a result of this reflection. The final layer of this first stage is a speculation about future practice and results in the clarification of the research question.

Having established the research direction and questions, a literature and projects review is undertaken which places the work within the candidate’s communities of practice. That is to say, the existing body of work and propositions about future work are placed in relation to the work of peers and mentors, and the various enchainments are identified and explored. The review process tends to be iterative, recurring at intervals throughout the course of the PhD. The idea of enchainments refers to the fact that no act of designing takes place in isolation. It occurs within conversations, exchanges and idea-sets that are particular to the designer and that spring from personal histories, habits and professional networks. Designers work from within these particular circumstances and they create communities of practice from them.

The review process results in the identification of gaps in the work and opens up new ground for design projects. Once complete, these new projects provide further material for reflection from which further gaps

---


20 These were questions that were ‘orienting’ questions from van Schaik and others during the GRC process.
emerge. The culmination of this stage is a project (or projects) that results from the identification of these second order gaps.

During the last stage of the process - the final two layers (including the tip of the cone) - the candidate reflects on and analyses the body of work – the candidate observing the candidate’s work. The final ‘PhD moment’ occurs when a thread can be drawn through all stages of the process bringing together a description of plateaux, reflections, speculations and new plateaux that comprise the research. This is identified as the ‘cocktail straw’ that pierces down through the preceding layers – the candidate observing the candidate observing the candidate’s work. This final stage describes what happened to the work as a result of the research and speculates on future practice.

Van Schaik’s model recognises the ‘wicked problem’ nature of design research. According to Mark Burry (working from Horst Rittel, 1973 and Jeffrey Conklin) design research can be understood as belonging to the class of wicked problems in that they are indefinable, endless, not black and white, unique, non-repeatable, and have no given alternative solutions (with other kinds of problems it is usually possible to define a limited set of alternative solutions). Because of this the research and the research question unfolds by speculative series’ and critical reflection.

This PhD work has resulted in a number of publications (listed at the end of this document), however, while these are referred to they are not reproduced in this text. Generally, the approach taken has been to paraphrase key arguments, rather than repeat them, and to provide references to the full texts.

**Critical Practice - terroir**

The architectural practice terroir commenced in 1999. The three Founding Directors are myself, Gerard Reinmuth and Scott Balmforth. It began almost by accident, through a chance meeting in Collins Street, Hobart, Tasmania between a lecturer and former student. Reinmuth had returned home from Sydney (where he had been working with Richard Johnston at Denton Corker Marshall, now Johnson Pilton Walker) and was looking to collaborate on some short projects before travelling to Scotland to work with Richard Murphy. I offered him some studio work assisting me at the University of Tasmania, omitting at the time the small detail that the studio was located in Launceston, 200km from Hobart. Over the next few months, we spent five hours a week in a car commuting to and from the studio discussing architecture. We found that in the studio, we could finish each other’s sentences. Sharing a common critical interest in the way that architecture operated inspired us to run a public lecture series in Hobart entitled ‘Critical’. We decided to work toward starting a practice and that the catalyst to move beyond wishful thinking to action would be a commission to design an art gallery.

Up until that point, our weekly routine would begin with me arriving at Reinmuth’s place of residence at the allotted time, to find the share-house in darkness. With the stress of a 200km drive ahead and forty-odd students waiting for us at the other end, I would climb through an open window, put on the coffee and wake him up. The morning that the practice could be said to have begun, I arrived to find the lights on and Reinmuth on the balcony waiting, coffees in hand. He had received a call from John McDonald (art critic for the *Sydney Morning Herald* and later Director of Australian Art at the National Art Gallery of Australia). We had our art gallery.

Following a discussion as to how we might set up the office, we both felt that we needed other collaborators. Scott Balmforth joined us as the third Founding Director of terroir. The practice was established in two offices simultaneously, and now operates from Elizabeth Street, Hobart and York Street, Sydney. There are currently a total of twenty-one people in the practice: three directors; four associates; and fourteen staff. Nine people are situated in the Hobart office, eleven in the Sydney office, and I work between the two. I have three roles in the practice: to work with the directors and associates in determining the strategic direction and structure of the office; to work with the directors...
to articulate the design philosophy of the practice; and to work with the
directors and project teams on key design projects. The design
research that underpins this PhD comprises projects undertaken by the
*terroir* team.

Balmforth and Reinmuth had both been third-year students in the first
studio I ran at the University of Tasmania in which I used film, literature
and fine art as a way of opening up what architecture could be. From
memory, the studio structure was crude; nevertheless, its fundamental
intent was to explore how architecture, as a critical endeavour, opens
up the world, and to challenge students to engage in speculative
methods. The question of speculation stayed with my teaching practice.
In 2003, in collaboration with fellow lecturer John Hall, I established a
studio at the University of Tasmania, School of Architecture, with that
title. Van Schaijk was one of the first people I invited to participate and
he became the most regular contributor participating each year until
2006, the last time I ran the unit before moving to RMIT, Melbourne.
The starting point for this critical-practice has its antecedents in myriad personal experiences and is informed by a range of other thinkers including, for example; Ignasi de Solà-Morales, Marcelo Stamm, Gaston Bachelard, Slavoj Žižek, John Rajchman and Rosi Braidotti. Designing is a subjective drive. In the following discussion, I will move from an architecture education experience, back through some personal history and conclude in a socio-political experience common to all Tasmanians during the 1980s including all three directors of terroir. The purpose of this discussion is to provide a background to the question of landscape that permeated the formation of terroir and provided the impetus for the first stage of this PhD. This was a silent driver in the sense that during the first stage of the PhD, the connection between these personal histories and the historical subject of the research remained unacknowledged and unexplored in terms of design practice. This shift to articulating those connections is a key distinguishing aspect of the critical-practice PhD.

The inside/outside relationship as it was represented through various modernist doctrines during my architecture education, was idealised as a kind of dissolution of the difference between the inside and the outside. In its most simplistic form, this approach used images of traditional Japanese architecture, sliding rice paper panels pulled well back, to reveal an almost seamless connection between the architecture of the interior and what was presented as ‘nature’. In my recollection, the same view was rarely, if ever, shown in lectures with the panels shut. ‘Nature’, in these images was in fact a highly stylised garden, a constructed nature. The idea of the seamless connection had more to do with Romanticism than with Japanese spatial thought, the latter operating on notions of metaphor and a play between original landscapes and their representation, often in miniaturised versions, in the constructed garden. The connection in the Japanese example was as much a connection inward to a reflective world of the imagination, and even subconscious, as it was a direct connection between the architectural interior and natural outer world. The artifice of the Japanese garden made the ideology even more ironic since in its ‘Australianised’ version, the exterior ‘nature’ was thought of largely as a naturalistic outside scene.

If the Japanese example was to be understood as potentially offering a kind of model for modernist space, then what was unclear was how the rich rhetorical relation between architecture and its metaphorical landscape could be dealt with in an Australian, Western context. The poetic value of the relation between the interior and ‘nature’ seemed to provide a much richer ground for architectural investigation than did a simplistic formal interpretation of the dissolution of their difference. Implicit in the arguments as they were presented was a rejection of the validity of Western spatial models in favour of an uncritical appropriation of alternative Asian, and sometimes indigenous, ones. This seemed futile to me. These questions of the nature of nature and of the relation of the interior to the exterior gave rise to two key lines of questioning that appeared in the earliest terroir projects and that were to be transformed through the PhD process.

---

2 Landscape

Given my personal history in relation to landscape (explained in the following text), I had held an interest (even prior to studying architecture) in exploring how nature and landscape are ‘read’. My suspicions of uncritical and romantic presentations of nature as landscape were fuelled by several key life events that shaped my spatial map and which overlap with both Reinmuth and Balmforth’s experiences. The first of these (an inherited quality to be contrary ...one I recognise now more clearly in the mirror of my own children), was important in shaping a critical disposition. My grandfather, also an architect and the inaugural Head of School at the Tasmanian School of Architecture, now incorporated in the University of Tasmania, fired this tendency.\textsuperscript{25}

I grew up in a house divided by an architectural office shared by my father and grandfather. My paternal grandparents lived on one side, and I lived on the other with my parents, brother and sister. The strongest memories I have of my grandfather are his laugh; building a lawn boat, swimming and arguing. He loved to argue and would take a contrary stand just to excite a discussion.

I recall taking the boat from Hobart to Sydney as a child. It was the first time I'd been in a big city. Arriving by boat was an incredible experience and we sailed right past the Sydney Opera House. When we returned home, I attempted to explain to my Grandpa how wonderful I thought the building was. I'll never forget his response: he asked of me how such extravagance could be justified when much of the world’s population lived in poverty? I believe that he had just arrived home from India. He would also argue about the relative value of private and public education and the wonders of Indian architecture (his daughter married Ikram Naqvi from Amroha). These were just two from among many pet subjects. He would argue virulently on any such topic until the tears welled up in one’s eyes, at which point he would toss his head back with a laugh and say, ‘That was a good argument, come on, let’s play billiards.”

In 2006 my colleague, John Hall made a comment on my teaching in the Speculation Studio. He said, “I like your Socratic approach. I like the way that any time a student asks you a question you ask them one in reply.” Perhaps this instinct to constantly shift the ground originated from my argumentative Grandpa. It’s also probably why I appreciate Bernard Tschumi’s essay ‘Questions of Space’ in which Tschumi opens a discussion about space through a string of lined questions in which each new question has its antecedent in the preceding one.\textsuperscript{26}

My maternal grandmother painted landscapes. She would complain bitterly about having to paint scenes of Cradle Mountain in colours to match the new furniture of her clients. I was inspired by the way she would head off into the bush to paint, often camping overnight in walking huts. I remember staying with her in my great-uncle’s hut near National Park. We took turns washing in the hot tin bath by the fire nipping outside to the toilet before bed, cold crisp air threads drawing through suppressed laughs that shivered into the night from a mixture of fear (of the dark and bush noises) and the sound and lantern-lit steam of my grandmother’s piss on the mossy ground.

My paternal grandmother was, according the London Times, the first English woman to climb the Matterhorn (elevation 4478m and 1029m prominence). Even in older age, she was a fearsome fisherwoman: my aunts recall arriving home from school to find the house empty and a note on the table: “Gone fishing, milk and biscuits on the table.” The stories told by both my grandmothers of their outdoor adventures inspired my interest in landscape from an early age.

On my first trip to Melbourne, I came to realise that landscape mattered (in terms of how one finds oneself in the world). Melbourne is located on a relatively flat plane. It is a grid city with wide streets running in one direction and alternating wide and narrow streets running in the other. This simple articulation, however, did not help me in finding my way around. I was disoriented. My problem was that I was unable to locate myself within the wider topography. I knew there was a river (the Yarra River) but could not see it from anywhere, and there was no mountain looming over the city. In Hobart two geographical features in the Derwent River and Mount Wellington, (1271m elevation and only 8km from the city centre and river’s edge) provide constant reference points.


\textsuperscript{26} Tschumi, Text 5: Questions of Space.
A glimpse of either one will tell you where you are and what the weather is doing.

On a second Melbourne trip, friends drove me out of the city to a place called Arthur’s Seat (approximately 312m elevation and 60km from the city centre). I was amused to find that this small hill had a chairlift running to its peak. When we reached the top we stood looking out across the landscape. My colleagues were marvelling at the mountains (Mt Macedon, 1010m elevation and 110km from the city). All I could see was a city skyline rising above a relatively flat horizon line with a few small ‘bumps’ on it (the mountains). Nothing loomed overhead. There were no clouds billowing over the ribbed basalt crest. These events demonstrate the individual way we develop a spatial map of the world and the way in which this map determines how we see and orient ourselves in it.

In 1978, the Tasmanian Government announced the next dam project, the Gordon-Below-Franklin Dam. Five years of dramatic and sometimes bitter protest followed. There were rallies in cities across Australia and as far away as Piccadilly in London, and blockades in the forests. The United Tasmania Group, who later became the Tasmanian Greens, now acknowledged as the world’s first Green party, spearheaded the movement against the dam proposal. Senator Bob Brown was one of its leaders. These events played out on the TV screens of Australian suburbia. In Tasmania, whether you were in school, at the pub or on a sports field, it was mandatory to take a position – ‘Pro-dams’ or ‘No-dams’? The dam decision was overturned in 1983 by the Federal Labour Party and the South West Tasmanian Wilderness declared a national park. This occurred during my first year at University studying humanities and these events left me with the sense that landscapes were highly contestable and politically constructed spaces.

The unusual intensity of the debate revealed many complex landscape issues, particularly in relation to concepts of wilderness. The landscape photographer Peter Dombrovskis’ image Morning Mist, Rock Island Bend became synonymous with the debate. It is an image of an unpopulated, wilderness, and an Eden-like scene taken on the Franklin River at a place called Rock Island Bend. The Franklin River was framed by proponents of the dam as a “leech-ridden ditch” and by opponents as the “last wild river.” The ‘leech-ridden ditch’ label was attributed to then Premier Robin Gray. A more detailed account is provided in Flanagan, Richard. "Wilderness and History." In Tasmanian Wilderness - World Heritage

---

**Figure 5: Hobart and Mt Wellington (Gerard Reinmuth).**

Events shared by individuals in the community are also important in forming our spatial selves. A galvanising community moment in the history of Tasmanian landscapes occurred when the Tasmanian Government announced the construction of a new hydro-electric dam across the Gordon River below its junction with the Franklin River. This proposal followed the damming of Lake Pedder in 1975. In 1967, the “national park” status of the lake (originally granted in 1955) was revoked by the Tasmanian Government to make way for construction of a dam. Despite the considerable public controversy, the dam was completed in 1972 and the photogenic pink quartzite sand banks, visible in the shallow, tannin-stained water of the original lake, disappeared in the increased depth. I have no personal recollection of the Lake Pedder events that took place between my second and seventh birthdays. I lived in Canberra for the last three of those years. I do, however, have vivid recollections of the dam project that followed six years later.

The unusual intensity of the debate revealed many complex landscape issues, particularly in relation to concepts of wilderness. The landscape photographer Peter Dombrovskis’ image Morning Mist, Rock Island Bend became synonymous with the debate. It is an image of an unpopulated, wilderness, and an Eden-like scene taken on the Franklin River at a place called Rock Island Bend. The Franklin River was framed by proponents of the dam as a “leech-ridden ditch” and by opponents as the “last wild river.”

---

27 I recall these diametric descriptors from conversations at the time. The ‘leech-ridden ditch’ label was attributed to then Premier Robin Gray. A more detailed account is provided in Flanagan, Richard. "Wilderness and History." In Tasmanian Wilderness - World Heritage
single image the sensibilities of the second group. *Rock Island Bend* appears in most GRC presentations and also throughout the first phase of the PhD indicating the significance of this image to the thesis.

![Image of Rock Island Bend](image1.jpg)

In the first stage of this thesis, I began to explore the constructed nature of this particular image, and the inherent artifice carefully hidden within the picture that we see. To explain how this is a highly constructed image, I would ask the viewer to visualise the photographer, Dombrovskis, standing behind his tripod. Imagine the photographer wearing specially developed clothing with hi-tech fabrics, and carrying vacuum-sealed freeze-dried foods in a backpack constructed with titanium clips and buckles to carry the camera and photographic film. Many wilderness-goers demand less imagination from us by photographing themselves or their colleagues, lone figures looking out across the wilds. Similar scenes can be identified in Romantic painting, for example, Casper David Friedrich’s ‘Wanderer Above the Mists’ in which a mountaineer stands clad in mountain clothes, holding a walking staff looking over the precipice and across the ranging landscape. The common aspect to all these images is the fact that they are not Eden-like, in the sense that they are intimately connected back to civilisation through the technology necessary to sustain human life in a place so far from our urban condition, and indeed, to sustain the image for our consumption of it. Even in Dombrovskis’ image, in which this technology is not seen, the image itself is not possible without the technology of the lens, and therefore, even in the absence of technology in the picture itself, the image, nonetheless, portrays its inherent technological dependency.

![Image of Dombrovskis and Friedrich](image2.jpg)


---

Following GRC7 and a number of the arguments put forward in our book, terroir: Cosmopolitan Ground, the Dombrovskis image is used to explain the gradual opening up of our understanding of landscapes as critical constructions. In this sense, terroir's approach could be understood to be in the manner of J. B. Jackson (critic of the American landscape) as opposed to a Jeffersonian agrarian or Thoreauian Romantic position. In the first phase of the thesis, the image was utilised as a way of unravelling wilderness concepts that were then used to demonstrate how they affected the spatial arrangement of an unplanned, Australian city. In the second, critical-practice phase, the image became a useful tool for explaining that all sites are complex and layered constructions. It was at the point at which sites could be explained in this way, that terroir was able to step beyond questions of landscape to understand how its architecture could embrace the urban - a question that had arisen at the first GRC. In the early stages of the thesis, it was unclear that terroir was taking a critical position.

There were certain contradictions at play in our references and explanations of projects in which Romantic notions of essence were overlaid by a poststructuralist critical approach. Observed in the process and content of the design projects, these conflicts and shifts form the basic material of the PhD.

Launceston

The first phase of the PhD began by evidencing ways in which underlying aesthetic constructs not only mediate the way we see landscapes but also how we arrange our constructed environment. The city of Launceston in Australia’s island state, Tasmania, provided a useful vehicle. The city is one of the oldest in Australia (1804) and second oldest in Tasmania by a matter of months.

My interest in this city was twofold. At the centre of the city, within a ten minute walk of the GPO is an extraordinary park. The Cataract Gorge Park is not only physically central to the city but also to the way in which the city sees itself. The city of Launceston, at least in its colonial origins, was an unplanned city. Unlike many other towns of this time, it began without a grid-form colonial government survey plan. It began this way because it was not supposed to be there. Governor Macquarie had ordered that the town be established downriver at what is now Georgetown, and a grid plan had been prepared for that purpose. The local citizens however, were fonder of Riching’s Park (now Launceston) upriver where the North and South Esks joined to form the Tamar River. On two occasions, on visiting the island, Macquarie ordered the settlement back to Georgetown. On both occasions, the citizens moved back to Launceston once Macquarie had left.
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My interest in this city was twofold. At the centre of the city, within a ten minute walk of the GPO is an extraordinary park. The Cataract Gorge Park is not only physically central to the city but also to the way in which the city sees itself. The city of Launceston, at least in its colonial origins, was an unplanned city. Unlike many other towns of this time, it began without a grid-form colonial government survey plan. It began this way because it was not supposed to be there. Governor Macquarie had ordered that the town be established downriver at what is now Georgetown, and a grid plan had been prepared for that purpose. The local citizens however, were fonder of Riching’s Park (now Launceston) upriver where the North and South Esks joined to form the Tamar River. On two occasions, on visiting the island, Macquarie ordered the settlement back to Georgetown. On both occasions, the citizens moved back to Launceston once Macquarie had left.

What was interesting in this scenario was the fact that the town took form without any formal guiding device. The only explanations for its arrangement provided in historical accounts related to issues of practicality: the slope of the land, provision of fresh water, proximity to navigable water, and so forth. There was no discussion of the ways in which aesthetics played a structuring role in the urban form. My research demonstrated that as a landscape, the Cataract Gorge typifies key aspects of the Sublime and the Picturesque, concepts that grew in influence during the 1700s-1800s. This is evident in colonial accounts provided of the trip up the Tamar River. The language used to describe the landscape of the Tamar Valley is largely utilitarian until arrival at the Cataract Gorge at which point the entire river system is rendered retrospectively beautiful. This is a place, a scene, which captures the imagination.33 To the Colonials, this particular landscape was not alien at all, but rather, its patterns were utterly familiar, a familiarity drawn from Romantic painting and literature that to some extent still permeate our spatial psyche.34

At its entrance, the Gorge is one hundred metres high and only fifty metres across. From this gaping mouth of vertical basalt pillars pours a sometimes roaring river that has collected its contents from a watershed of some 9500km². Heavy rains draw crowds of locals and tourists who line the path that runs through the Gorge to the point where it opens out into what is known as the First Basin. Seals come to play in the rapids and one can feel the ground rumbling underfoot as the white foam of the river billows and blows.

Having established that aesthetics were significant even to the First Settlers, a set of diagrams was developed based on the material available in historic records. The diagrams show how the town took

33 Ibid.

34 Tim Bonyhady, The Colonial Earth (Melbourne: Melbourne University Press, 2000). Bonyhady describes how the Australian landscape was understood in familiar terms by colonials reversing previous historical accounts that rendered the Australian landscape alien.
shape over its first twenty-one years. The sequence demonstrates that the Cataract Gorge is set up as a primary orientation point in the city—the 'wilderness' park of the Gorge set opposite the more formal grounds of City Park along what was the central and ceremonial spine of the town.

An important newspaper masthead of the 1800s positioned the view to the Gorge centrally in its composition thereby indicating the importance of this landscape to the image of the city. The placement in the masthead indicates that, in terms of identity, this landscape is more important than the city buildings and streets occupying windows on either side of the centred landscape.

The diagrams demonstrate the visual alignment of the two main cross streets (Cimetiere and Cameron) with the entrance of the Cataract Gorge. The contour diagram shows: the confluence of the North Esk River (to the left) and South Esk River (contained within the Gorge) at the head of the Tamar River exiting to the bottom of the diagram; Windmill Hill to the left; and Richings Park (on which the town was founded) stretching between Windmill Hill to the left and the Cataract Gorge to the right. Diagrams are based on Plan of Launceston by William Sharland, August 5, 1826 – Source: Queen Victoria Museum and Art Gallery Community History Archive.

This landscape investigation paralleled a series of design projects and provided techniques and concepts that were incorporated in the design process. Three projects undertaken during the first phase of the thesis (GeoCenter Møns Klint competition, Peppermint Bay, Tolman's Hill House) have been used repeatedly to explain the work and concepts from that time and seem to have survived as reasonably robust propositions, although they have been understood in quite different ways as the thesis has developed. At the end of seven GRCs, it became possible to look back over the images/concepts presented and to identify those that repeat, one indication of significance. Reflecting on the presentation and re-presentation of these images/concepts revealed shifts that explain how gaps were identified, and illustrate the process of finding new directions from within those gaps. One of the first important shifts was in understanding that terroir designing was not normative.
Beyond Normative Moves

The ‘Grimoire of Architecture’ symposium was the culminating point in early attempts to identify normative processes in terroir’s designing. These attempts at normative classification are evident in descriptions of the early projects (1999-2002) and include terms such as: cradle, line, armature, graft, parasite, filter, archaeological mark, poche, and threshold. Each of these terms represents an attempt to capture an architectural move associated with some experiential quality. For example the term ‘filter’, very much connected also with the term ‘threshold’ is described in the Longley house text in the following way:

This architectural threshold was understood as not just about a physical moderation of light, temperature and moisture between inside and out, but as a space of engagement and exchange - projection and introjection - between the world and us...A ‘filter’ was placed between these walls modulating the threshold between the house and the landscape both climatically and metaphysically. The three dimensional ‘zone’ is a critical response to the ‘louvered skin’ endemic for some time in Australian architecture. Through the intersession of carefully placed personal objects this architectural prosthetic allows the occupant to escape the distancing effect of objective ‘looker’ and to become subjectively engaged, an ‘actor’ and participant in (rather than simply an observer of) the landscape.36


Figure 13: Articulated ‘threshold’ façade of the Longley House (2000) (Richard Eastwood).

The idea of the threshold as being both physiological and psychological was a long standing interest. It is, of course, reflected in the name of the practice and also in my earliest expressive endeavours (and out of consideration for the reader, I will not be providing evidence of this). In 1999, Rory Spence, and I organised the Society of Architectural Historians Australia and New Zealand annual conference under the title ‘Thresholds’ and invited Mark Cousins and Neil Leach as keynote speakers, both of whom were interested in psychoanalysis and space. The concept of the ‘threshold’, the relation between the inside and

36
outside had also figured in my own teaching practice. For example, a project brief for a theory unit from the University of Tasmania in 2004 reads as follows:

Inside/outside

The problem of the inside and the outside is one that is endemic to architecture. In this project you are asked to create an interstitial space that is situated between the inside of the foyer and the outside of the courtyard. ...

In this object you are asked to explore ideas of inside/outside in relation to the text studied.

It is important to reflect on the nature of inside and outside. In architecture it is often referred to in entirely physical terms but to limit our understanding to just the physical is to miss much of the richness of the idea which manifests itself in every interstitial space. For example what does it mean to be ‘on the inside’? It could mean that you are simply inside a space. It could mean that you are the recipient of privileged information, ‘in the know’. It could also mean that you are jail.

Jail is an interesting example of what ‘inside’ means. Sitting in your jail cell (which I hope you never are) you are certainly inside the cell and also ‘on the inside’. However, having been separated from the rest of society and now existing in a kind of space that Foucault described as ‘a heterotopia’, you are now outside society…you have become an outsider. Inside in this sense, like the experience of being the holder of privileged information, might be thought of as having the capacity to control your immediate space; the ability to open the door or turn on or off the light. And so the inside might be understood as the space that offers a more privileged or empowered experience of that space.

It is possible to trace a similar trajectory for ‘threshold’ as has been explored for ‘landscape’. There are overlaps and intersections of these two concepts in the work of 

[37] Brief for a theory assignment in the KDA 421 Theory in Design unit at the School of Architecture, University of Tasmania, developed and written by Blythe.

disparate objects. In the Peppermint Bay project, the line works as a
formal device, as a path or line of movement and as a mimetic trace of
the topography. At the Tolman’s Hill House, the line is a path and also
what might be described as a ‘ley line’ connecting the interior space of
the house with the greater valley and the city. Other moves, such as the
idea of the ‘cradle’ (a formal ‘holding’ of the subject in the landscape), in
the Longley House, retreated to the background of subsequent projects
while new ones have continued to emerge.

However, even as the attempts to classify terroir designing in terms of
normative moves were being undertaken there was a concurrent
resistance to the idea that a set of design rules could adequately
describe the design process. Therefore, the classification process was
more accurately posited as a question: Is it possible/useful to classify
terroir architecture as a set of normative moves?

The normative instability observed in the design process lead to the
understanding that each project is a unique circumstance and that
architecture is bound to the unique constellation of each project rather
than separate from it. By virtue of this dependency it is, therefore,
irreducible in terms of a set of normative moves. So, while there was
evidence of a certain internal consistency in design approach brought
about by key lines of enquiry (landscape, threshold, the cosmopolitan)
identifiable across projects, this consistency was not normative. Rather,
the consistency was discovered to be one technique associated with
the ‘construction’ of a design-place that for each project is unique. The
idea of the design-place (described in Section 3 Design-Place) thus
replaced the search for a classification of normative moves.

The GeoCenter Møns Klint: words drawings models

The GeoCenter Møns Klint competition for a Denmark museum
celebrating the history of a nation was located in a dramatic landscape
setting on top of chalk cliffs overlooking the ocean. The project is
described on the terroir web site in the following terms (this text is an
edited version of my original texts prepared for the competition panels,
the Grimoire of Architecture Symposium, and the Homo Faber
Exhibition).  

In asking why people go to Møens Klint to look out over the sea,
collect fossils, we concluded that the answer lies in the complex
relations of body, landscape and culture that entices the subject.

39 Richard Blythe and Gerard Reinmuth, "...An Elegant System of
Marks... In the Work of Terroir," in The Grimoire of Architecture: A
Symposium on the Architectural Drawing and the Work of Marco
Frascari (Louis Laybourne Smith School of Architecture and Design,
University of South Australia: 2004), Richard Blythe, "Architecture
Models (Terroir)," in Homo Faber Modelling Ideas edited by Alison
Fairley, Andrea Mina and Peter Downton, (Museum of Melbourne:
RMIT, 2007).
Eckersberg's painting is enlightening in this respect - demonstrating that the answer is not necessarily the cliff itself since it remains hidden from view. Rather a subject, with telescope in hand, looks out from the cliff at something else. Two others are engrossed in close conversation looking neither at the cliff nor the view. Therefore this painting suggests that dialogue or discourse are essential - conversation inspired by the setting and informed by the elevated advantage of the cliff top where a naturally occurring giant platform harnesses a sense of scale and strength of the geological events that caused this formation.

terroir designing began with diagrammatic and text explorations of different contexts of the site informed by readings of the painting.

First explorations were concerned with movement (a factor of both current desire lines and anticipated manipulations of these to take into account the new building), and the geological history of the site through its formation and erosion, particularly in the period since the last Ice Age. Models were made of the site and of the pathways across it. Models of glacial movement were overlaid on these - open ended, speculative models that tried to understand the relation between the glacier as a moving body scouring the chalk surface. These were exploratory models designed to open up the possibilities of the project - architectural moves revealing spatial and formal opportunities.

These explorations set up the context or grounds for our architectural response. The building itself became an excavation of the chalk surface, a scratching away and revealing of the ground beneath in a manner that was evocative of the fossil-hunting that had been popular on the site. The main spaces of the building were, therefore, trench-like galleries that zigzagged between 'caves' on their inland end and 'windows' looking towards the sea. The length of each gallery responded in scale to the time period represented and therefore became a more frenetic spatial tic-tac in the contemporary zone.40

From a technique, or process point of view, this project captured key aspects of our practice. Designing happens as a frenetic activity with multiple authors doing different things and often working over the top of each other’s work (models, text, diagrams). At first, we tended to look for commonalities; elements that would smooth over the process. Gradually, we have come to understand the value of the differing positions and of the ‘argument’ trusting that the various tensions at play will eventually result in robust propositions that will inform the project while other positions fall away. By ‘inform’, I suggest that through this process, the project’s ‘design-place’ (a concept to which I will return in the next section) is established and a particular thread of the project’s ‘virtuality’ (also discussed later) is teased out. At the time this project was undertaken, neither the concept of design-place nor virtuality had been articulated.

In part, the structure of the office has facilitated the multiple authorship and over-writing approach. Although directors, we three have never lived and worked in the same city. This has meant that designing takes place through a combination of intensive face-to-face meetings and by digital exchange (by circular facsimile in the first years of the office and now by email). The digitising of text and data de-personalises the mark sufficiently to allow others to assume authorship and to overwrite drawings, text and images. The fact that there is still an unmarked original somewhere lets the second author ‘off the hook’, although frequently, it is the multi-authored digitised version that becomes the edition of greatest value rather than the original.

Thus a real shift is evidenced from the kinds of modernist practices described by Mark Wigley in Wellington in 2000, in which he describes the sketch as both single-authored and pure in the sense that it captures an idea prior to its subjection to the more mechanical aspects of architecture. In Wigley’s scenario, Modernism values the sketch as a kind of pinnacle moment of design and which establishes mastery. The greatest works are those that drift the least distance off-course. As Wigley pointed out, the problem with this understanding is that the architectural object can only then achieve a sort of compromised realisation of the architectural moment captured in the ‘pure’, unimpeded sketch. This tends to promote a sort of heroism in authorship. The over-working nature of terroir’s design process results in a different understanding of the affective role of the sketch, of the model (both physical and digital) and of text.

Wigley fuelled a certain apprehension within terroir at the time because his comments were ‘close to the bone’. terroir did value the

41 One of the outcomes of this thesis is the clarification of this process. This thesis was undertaken in parallel with Masters theses authored by Reinmuth and Balmforth. Their final exhibition presentation and thesis clearly describes this process at work in the Prague National Library Competition undertaken by the practice in August of 2006. A summary is provided later in this document.


43 For a more detailed exploration of the use of the model in our design processes, see: “On Models,” in terroir: cosmopolitan ground, edited by Gerard Reinmuth and Scott Balmforth (Sydney: DAB Documents, University of Technology Sydney, 2007).
sketch, particularly Reinmuth’s incisive ability to create a simple illustration from complex and often lengthy exchanges. These were in turn over-written by other partners of the authorship and then filed and referred back to as projects developed. It took some time to be confident that these diagrams served a different purpose to that described by Wigley.

Sketches (or diagrams) were valued within the terroir process primarily for their productive value. In Wigley’s description, there is a cynical understanding of the value of the sketch as a ‘proof’ of genius or ‘master’ status of the author. ‘Proof’ could, however, be understood in a different, systematic rather than formal way as identifying a set of project-specific conditions that govern future design moves for the project. This kind of proof is a productive tool in the unfolding of the project rather than as ‘proof of master status’ or genius of the one who made the marks.

Wigley’s paper inspired three papers all of which review the role of the sketch, the diagram and the model in the work of terroir. These include a review of Wigley’s paper published in Architectural Review (Australia) 2001,44 a paper presented at the ‘Grimoire of Architecture’ symposium lead by Marco Frascari in Adelaide in 2004,45 and an exhibition piece with associated text published as part of the ‘Homo Faber’ ARC grant project authored by Mark Burry, Peter Downton and Andrea Mina at RMIT and exhibited at the Museum of Melbourne, June 1 - July 2, 2006.46

44 Blythe, “The Architect’s Mythical Sketch.”
3 Design-Place

The ‘Grimoire of Architecture’

The ‘Grimoire of Architecture’ symposium, Adelaide (2004), was a watershed moment in beginning to unravel the nature of terroir designing. The night before the symposium began, I flew in from Launceston and Reinmuth flew in from Sydney. We had printed as many images as we could of models and diagrams... in short of those marks and notes that we could see had been significant in the design process of a number of key projects particularly the GeoCenter Møns Klint.

![Image](image.png)

Figure 19: GeoCenter Møns Klint diagram series.

We began by laying out these A4 prints around the hotel room, over tables and chairs and across the floor, and sticking them to the walls. The room was literally plastered in them. Then we began trying to sort them by identifying a series of key themes. These actions proved to be quite radical within the symposium in the sense that the symposium subject was the architectural drawing. For us, it was impossible to separate out what we drew from what we wrote, or made in models. The argument that I put forward then was that drawing for us was a drawing out, or drawing forth, through rapid, often digital exchanges, of what I would now describe as the ‘virtual potential’ of the project.

Frascari, on the other hand, spoke of traditional drawing properties such as recto verso and the sensual qualities of linseed oil and charcoal. The workshop session consisted of playing with these materials. The question Frascari was posing was, “What is lost when we draw on the liminally-thin screen of the computer that has no verso and none of the material, textual qualities of traditional drawing substances?” When I asked him if he was tending toward the Romantic, he produced the latest Toshiba tablet computer from his bag and replied, “No, I’m really fascinated with what happens to architecture when you change how you draw.” I went back to terroir and suggested that Balmforth and Reinmuth buy the Toshiba tablets (all three partners now work with tablet computers).

Frascari valued the slowness of process that leads to discovery; the quality of the feel of the charcoal on the surface, the smell of the linseed oil and the way it soaks into the page revealing the recto and verso simultaneously. Within that context, terroir’s emphasis on the speed of exchanges, the digitised, multi-authored sketch and the argument that a combination of the diagram, the crudely-made model and words are all part of drawing must have appeared odd.

In discussing creativity, van Schaik describes how mathematicians have found it difficult to shift from drawing with chalk on a blackboard to more contemporary means such as felt pen on a whiteboard. He claims that this indicates that there is something about the feel of the chalk on the blackboard surface, and the rolling of it between the fingers that is essential to the thinking process itself.\(^{48}\) In other words,

---

\(^{47}\) Line/path, ‘tracing’ movement through the site, ‘flow’ the scouring action of the glacier across the surface, ‘formations’, ‘penetrations’, ‘impressions’.

that ways of working are not independent of ways of thinking. In this sense, Frascari’s interest in the material quality of drawing is historically interesting but it also indicates why the proposition of separating out intrinsic activities is not useful for *terroir*. For *terroir*, the ‘chalk between the fingers’ represents the intersections and overlaps of various techniques: of line, of texts, and of models.

When we laid out the model, diagram and word images from the GeoCenter Møns Klint competition, we identified that our drawing began as a kind of testing, or questioning of the project. For example, we drew and re-drew the existing site in terms of lines of movement, points of entry and exit, cleared space in the forest. Then, there were more speculative drawings suggesting penetrations down into the chalk substrata of the site that were documentations of potential experiences rather than responses to the accommodation brief. The site had been formed partly from glacial action across its surface which implied an action of scraping away of the surface of the site. We imagined the effect of scraping off the current green forest layer to reveal the white chalk in the horizontal plane and to thereby draw a relation with the vertical cliff surface (and, as already mentioned, fossicking). These imaginings were turned into diagrams and then the diagrams made into simple card models as a way of converting the thinking into three dimensional objects.

Part of this drawing process was to ask questions of the paintings that had been provided as part of the competition brief. By employing a critical reading of these paintings, similar to the approach used with the Dombrovskis wilderness image, and combining these word evaluations with the speculative diagrams and models, we were able to establish a contextual ground for the project. At this stage, however, the role of words as a way of designing remained implicit.

There were two critical themes bound up in the ‘Grimoire’ work that, while not explicated at the time, had begun to emerge. It would take until the end of the PhD process, and collective reflection on many more projects to bring them to the surface. It was the first time that the productive value of words in designing (rather than as a summative or preacing activity) was identified. The ‘Grimoire’ symposium also opened up an important question about ethics of context as a design problem by identifying that *terroir*’s first design moves were about establishing contextual grounds. These are important themes for this thesis, and therefore, the GeoCenter Møns Klint has emerged as a significant project.

The words used in the GeoCenter Møns Klint project attempted to draw the diverse and multiple investigations (glacier, paintings, occupation, movement, and brief) into a single, manifesto-like statement. These manifesto-like statements have been developed for many projects over the course of the PhD. They are informed by theory and philosophy but are intended as design moves rather than as theoretical or philosophical text. The relationship between theory and design is in some ways a chicken-and-egg situation. It is also one of mutual dependence.

Often the activity of designing projects would open up gaps or inadequacies in key texts resulting in new theoretical speculations that, in turn, would lead to further reading, and a search for texts that supported or opened up the design work. This was a mutually productive process rather than a search for a theory upon which the designing would then be based, or that would ‘explain’ the designing. Designers search for new possibility rather than logical consistency. At the time of the GeoCenter Møns Klint project, key texts included: *The Poetics of Space* (Gaston Bachelard); “The Tell-the-Tale-Detail” (Marco Frascari); “Territory and Architecture” (Vittorio Gregotti); *Berlin Childhood around 1900* (Walter Benjamin); Heidegger and Norberg-Schulz (read through Jeff Malpas); Merleau-Ponty; *The Idea of a Town* (Joseph Rykwert); *Questions of Space* (Bernard Tschumi); “Of Gardens” (Sir Francis Bacon); The *Colonial Earth* (Tim Bonyhady); *Translations from Drawing to Building and Other Essays* (Robin Evans); Elizabeth Grosz; John Rajchman, and Landscape and Memory (Simon Schama). 49 The reading list represents a certain conflict at play in

---

trying to understand projects both in terms of their material presence and also from the perspective of the psychoanalytic or post-structuralist. One of the gaps identified at this point was the limitation of the idea of essence as represented in, for example, Norberg-Schulz' *Genius Loci*. Another gap opened up in GRC2 (May 2005) in terms of the role of theory and the purpose of theorising in design practice.

**Finding a voice – the Kaos Café Notes**

Leading up to GRC2, Reinmuth, Balmforth and I met at the Kaos Café in Hobart to discuss our research. At that meeting, I talked out a theoretical position for *terroir*. Reinmuth and Balmforth were both enthusiastic about this productive meeting. I then tried to capture what had been discussed in a paper: ‘Kaos Café Notes’. At around the same time and perhaps related to this particular incident, Reinmuth began making the observation that I was much better in “auto-pilot, off-the-cuff, and at the café” than when I tried to write the material down. I was aware of this proclivity from previous projects and I had changed my practice by speaking the papers’ content into a digital recorder rather than by writing. After the Kaos Café catalyst, I also began recording presentations finding that repeatedly playing back discussions proved productive.


Headings from the Kaos Café notes include ‘Tschumi’s Paradox’, ‘Benjamin’s Table’, and ‘Deleuze’s Multiplicity’. Van Schaik recommended re-situating these titles as ‘terroir’s Paradox’, etc. At GRC2, I attempted to explain *terroir* design projects in terms of the Kaos Café notes using the voices of these other textual authorities to explain, in a secondhand way, *terroir*’s work. It didn't go down very
well. This was difficult to understand since for me, gaining clarity of idea through a careful reading of these texts was essential for the design process. What I had failed to appreciate (probably because, from my perspective, it seemed entirely obvious and in some ways unremarkable) was that my talking out the projects themselves was a work in and of itself and was, in fact, where the greatest value lay. Although informed by these other texts, this ‘talking out of the project’ was not necessarily defined or indeed limited by them it was in fact a new work in itself. Therefore, a key shift in the PhD was one from a position of talking about designing through the texts of others to talking about designing through the textual surface of the design project back out into a world of ideas.

The breakthrough came from a question asked by Jonathan Hill at the end of GRC2, May 28, 2005. Hill asked: “Do you design?” From memory my answer was: “No.” Hill then made the suggestion that “you should see yourself as a designer but one who works in a slightly different way, one who designs with words.” Hill gave the example of Jean Nouvel presenting his thesis entirely in words. His observation was that the words were, in fact, a key part of the designing actuality but that I was not surfacing this, perhaps even obfuscating the situation by describing the work at a distance, and through the texts of others rather than dealing with what was going on in the work directly. I remember feeling quite awkward about the idea of being credited with designing, however, Balmforth and Reinmuth gave me the confidence to begin to think of what I was contributing in these terms.

Following GRC2, Reinmuth returned to the café analogy. Although he didn’t articulate it in exactly these terms, he was trying to explain that in café mode I had been working in this other way, to talk out through the textual surface of the project (which was how I worked within the design team, and this is evident to some extent, even in the GeoCenter Møns Klint text) but had regressed to a sort of pseudo-theoretical explanation when I attempted to formalise this in reflective written text. Inscriptions in my notebooks that GRC weekend and in the months that followed from June to October represent the most frenetic period of reflection serving to shape the remainder of the PhD.

Page 151 of the notebook dated May 30, reads: “If I’m a designer what is designed? terroir? Practice? Projects?” This question sat within a string of queries inspired by Tschumi’s aforementioned essay ‘Questions of Space’. In the panic that follows a negative critique, this felt like an effective technique to re-position my efforts. The questions flowed from a discussion with Sand Helsel (who had been at the presentation). On May 29, the day after the GRC presentation, Helsel suggested that the point was not to use the theory as a justification of the project, or as a post-justified ‘generator’, and to avoid the tendency to use theory as a means of extruding a compliant architecture. The questions read as follows.

**GRC2 crisis questions:**

29 May p149
If theory is implicit in designing what is the nature of the ‘pli’…?
If theory is implicit in designing should it also follow that this ‘pli’ remain hidden and not subject to scrutiny?
If so, does theory become the secret agent of designing?
What is at stake if the secret were (to be) exposed?

29 May pp150-151
If exposed does theory automatically assume the role of ‘extruder’?
What forms other than ‘extruder’ might the ‘pli’ take?
Is there agency in this plied state?
If there is agency, the power to act, is there not also the generation of something?
If something acts in design what is the nature of that action?
If there is the generation of something isn’t this then a valid ‘generator’?

If I’m a designer what is designed? terroir? Practice? Projects?
(expand)
If something is designed of which there is a designer what is the nature of that designing? (expand scaffold of elements)
Can the nature of designing be understood architecturally by giving it a spatiality or by describing its order in space?
Who is involved in designing?
30 May, pp152-153
If more than one person designs what is the nature of the communication between designers in designing?
If the ‘scaffold’ of designing could be understood as a theory then what is the nature of the relationship between theory and the thing that is designed? Implicit questions (see p 149), implication, what is implied?
How are the elements of a theory scaffold chosen from all the possible elements (ethics/evaluation)?
Of what is the scaffolding constructed?
If the scaffolding is constructed of diagrams what is the nature of those diagrams?
If a drawn diagram is made as a digital mark what is the nature of this information set?
Could all forms of diagrams be understood as information sets?
If the diagram can be understood as a data set how is it different from the drawn line? (Wigley et al)
Is the drawn-line data set summative of the other data sets?

31 May, 0:22am, pp154-155
Can the theory scaffolds be understood as design places in that they are spatial but also inscribed with values and therefore qualitative?
Do projects emerge with a kind of terroir of these design places? (rather than generator or extruder)
Is the point of these design places to create a ‘between’ condition that describes the opportunity of the project?
If there is a place of the theory is there also a place in which the elements of that theory are evaluated and distilled?
How are clients introduced to the design place?
Design Places
Design Things.

Of particular importance at this time was the question set that began to unravel the idea that what terroir designed extended beyond simply designing building objects in response to client briefs. The first thing that was being designed was terroir. That is, the very nature of our constitution as a group necessitated a proposition that design is constellational, emerging from groupings and dependencies as opposed to the modernist tradition of the hero-artistic-autonomous-agent. Such a proposition therefore demanded that this interdependency be defined, articulated or, as I was suggesting in asking these questions, designed. The practice, that is, the economic entity that employs people and provides the resources by which projects are designed, must also be designed to ensure that the means of producing the architecture was structured in a way that would facilitate our constellational approach. And, the way that the projects themselves are designed.

These issues, of designing the way design happens and of designing the object, have a particular significance in group design practices in which authorship is shared. In the case of singular authorship, these two issues tend to be conflated but this conflation obfuscates key characteristics of the design process. These ideas were also explored in my teaching practice, in which theory was taught, for example, through group design projects in which negotiation between designers was an essential strategy.

52 The understanding of our design practice as ‘constellational’ lead to future synergies with the philosopher Marcelo Stamm, from whom I adapted the term.
**terroir's contraption**

The ‘constellation proposition’ brought a new focus to the way in which we were designing projects that had surfaced partially in the ‘Grimoire’ symposium. In our ‘Grimoire’ paper, Reinmuth and I described how the ‘play’ models and diagrams, and the words, work around the space of the final designed object. That is to say, that when the designing began it was not focussed necessarily on the final object but rather on creating a kind of space within which the object might later take shape. This was likened to the frameworks used by the Italian Renaissance sculptor Canova when translating the plaster originals to the final marble objects carved by Canova’s assistants. To facilitate the process, pins were placed over the surface of the plaster original so that multiple measurements could be taken to confirm the surface of the marble facsimile. The framework could then be understood as a space within which the object takes shape according to this framework.

Canova’s contraption became a metaphor for terroir’s contraption; that is, the act of designing a space within which the project later takes form. The key difference was that in the terroir contraption, the design-place of the project, the object was, to a certain extent, always shifting as the key contextual information changed. This resulted in a very flexible and responsive system that allowed us to revise projects to respond to significant brief changes without a loss of design direction. For example, in the Hazards Hotel project on the East Coast of Tasmania, the brief shifted from one hundred-and-twenty rooms, to one hundred rooms and then to fifty rooms over a four year period, and the design was able to absorb these shifts.

The classification of normative moves was an approach that was continually subverted by the design process itself thereby demonstrating that designing is not a normative process. However, the attempt provided evidence of the counterpoint, conflict and even contradiction that was part of terroir’s designing. The evidencing of a non-normative approach created new ways of understanding and describing what was at stake in the design process and opened a window through which the proposition of the design-place was graspable. The proposition of the design-place raised new questions of how the architect selects constituent contexts; that is, how the architect decides to value one project context over another: topography over streetscape, material over volume, the universal over the particular; in other words, how to deal with the indeterminate nature of designing.
Figure 28: Hazards model, January 31, 2007.

Figure 29: Hazards model, March 28, 2007.
4 Ethics

Implicit in the observation that there is a ‘need to choose’ in the contextual construction of a project is recognition that in the absence of a canon it is necessary to design the manner in which designing will take place. That is to say in the absence of a guiding set of rules or norms (for example Modernism or Deconstruction), decisions must be made about how to value the various project contexts. In the examples given to date, those contexts include the local suburban and wider landscape; urban patterns, patterns of movement, and geological histories. In other terroir projects, contexts have included wildlife habitation; flora and fauna distribution, literary histories, urban histories, patterns and histories of use, representational histories, client personalities and preferences, planning requirements, financial drivers, and so on.

In each case, the design-place tends toward a particular grouping of contexts while others fall away resulting in a unique set. The mix and range of contexts changes from project to project and remains fairly specific to each project even when the starting point for terroir tends to be topographical. The particular choices made and the groupings that emerge provide a reflection on the values of the project that are held jointly by the stakeholders including; the architect, other consultants and interest groups, legislative authorities and the client. This contextual constitution of the ‘design-place’ is an ethical practice.

A second question, arising in this proposition of the design-place was whether or not landscape provided too narrow a lens, particularly for urban sites. The first comprehensive attempt to address this issue of how a landscape lens could be re-constituted in an urban context occurred when terroir undertook an invited competition for the Centre of Fine Arts (COFA), University of New South Wales, in which terroir made the final shortlist. The COFA brief identified a series of faculty relationships between staff, exhibition, art collection gallery, library and studio. terroir began in the usual way of exploring the topography of the site, movement patterns and potential movement patterns. Questions of landscape however, remained relatively minor compared to the potential of the relational issues of the various components of the COFA project.

The client brief proposed that this project was one characterised by intersections, “…the site where faculty, students and the general public intersect…,” a proposition reinforced by terroir’s observation and analysis of the existing condition. The new building was to be a place where production and display, private and public overlap and it therefore embraced the intersections of the Institution and the Public; students and scholars; historic uses and present requirements; people and place; landscape and buildings; art theory and practice.

---

Figure 30: COFA competition 2001, ‘Caduseus’ staff’ diagram.

The client brief proposed that this project was one characterised by intersections, “…the site where faculty, students and the general public intersect…,” a proposition reinforced by terroir’s observation and analysis of the existing condition. The new building was to be a place where production and display, private and public overlap and it therefore embraced the intersections of the Institution and the Public; students and scholars; historic uses and present requirements; people and place; landscape and buildings; art theory and practice.

---

53 Quote taken from the competition brief.
terroir’s final proposal was for a building to be inserted on the campus that would link all the other currently separated spaces in a kind of choric moment. The concept was discussed in terms of the Caduceus, Hermes’ staff (two snakes wrapped around a staff). Hermes was the messenger or herald of the gods and therefore played a role in passing between worlds. The geometry of three intertwining elements and the idea of transformation, or even transubstantiation through the making of art provided the conceptual basis for our design proposition.

One key development during this project was the shift to an interest in multiplicity but not in its particularised version. To put it simply, terroir wanted to ‘galvanise’ the three elements of the Caduceus into a single object, one in which three elements were identifiable and yet inseparable rather than having, for example, a glass tube, a timber tube and a concrete tube. This architectural move, first applied in the COFA project, re-appeared later in solving the Peppermint Bay roof which began as two distinct objects defining a functional division and then through design development morphed into a single ‘galvanised’ object.
A second key principle that emerged in this process and that allowed a conceptual freedom from a form of essentialism evident in the work of Norberg-Schulz and Gregotti, for example, was Nietzsche’s proposition of ‘Historia Abscondita’: “Every great human being exerts a retroactive force: for his sake all of history is placed in the balance again, and a thousand secrets of the past crawl out of their hiding places – into his sunshine. There is no way of telling what may yet become part of history. Perhaps past is still essentially undiscovered! So many retroactive forces are still needed.” Historia Abscondita is a liberating idea in the Australian context of the narrow interpretations of the Burra Charter by local council officers (usually unqualified in design) as a kind of mandate for the formal (or worse, elemental) facsimile as the only legitimate engagement with history and the vacuous appropriation of historical motifs that littered the 1980s and 1990s (formative years for the three terroir directors) prevalent, for example, in the work of Terry Farrell, Michael Graves, Ricardo Bofill, and in the Tasmanian context, Garry Forward.

One of the early tendencies in terroir was the desire to uncover the productive role of history in designing. Substituting the word ‘project’ for ‘great human being’ in Nietzsche’s quote opens up a world of possibility for understanding the various intersecting interests in a project as generative of a kind of choric ground from which something entirely new emerges gaining its independence from the present by means of a synthetic leap. Through Nietzsche then, the design urge (situated in the potential productive role of history) gained greater clarity in the production of the COFA project. Nietzsche’s concept is important because of its usefulness as an apparatus for unravelling what is already present as a design urge. In this sense, theory can be understood as a type of productive clarification that is dependent on the designing rather than as a precursor, or a priori condition of the design process. These ideas are developed further in the concept of the virtual condition of projects (discussed later) and align with Rosi Braidotti’s proposition for the positive affective agency of critical theory to invent futures that do not rely on creating a negative reading of the current condition in order to justify a new proposition. Rather, for Braidotti, the proposition comes from a positive agency. The virtual condition of terroir projects operates in a similar manner to Braidotti’s positivity by opening up possible futures independent of a negative rendering of the present.

---


55 Braidotti is careful to distinguish such an approach from what she sees as the negative positioning of critical theory whereby a current condition is set as a negative in order to be generative of some other future. She points out the inevitable dependency in such a scenario in that the future depends on the negative condition for its emergence and continued substantiation. Braidotti is working from a Deleuzian perspective. John Rajchman, also writing from a Deleuzian perspective has been helpful in developing the concept of the virtual condition of projects although his use of Peter Eisenman’s architecture to illustrate Deleuzian concepts is less than convincing highlighting a problematic positioning of theory/philosophy as a kind of explanation of architecture to which this thesis is opposed. Braidotti, “Affirmative Philosophy as a Resistance to the Present.” Rajchman, *The Deleuze Connections*. 
affective agency and terroir's interest in context, a potentially parallax criticality emerges.

The use of mappings, histories, client comments and values, and other readings to construct the space within which designing happens, (in other words the construction of the design-place of the project), is implicit in both the COFA and GeoCenter Møns Klint projects. It was not possible, however, to uncover the ethical issues at play in designing the design-place until the implicit was explicated through the critical reflection that took place both through the GRC process and the ‘Grimoire’ symposium. The articulation of the design-place idea also enabled an expansion beyond landscape in the sense that it revealed that our approach was not fundamentally limited to landscape but rather our landscape enquiry had opened up a mode of operating through the design-place that could then be widened to include also the urban and cosmopolitan. This is recognised in the introduction of the term ‘ground’ to the terroir lexicon for example in the title terroir: cosmopolitan ground.

A certain serendipity enabled this important transition from landscape to cosmopolitan ground when, for a moment, seemingly unrelated relationships conjoined an architecture enquiry with a philosophical one. I met philosopher Marcelo Stamm at a leadership training program at the University of Tasmania. Our shared scepticism in the subject matter resulted in a longer conversation that revealed an overlap in questions of the design-place and constellationary theory as they relate to a philosophy of creativity. This snowballed into a proposition for a symposium session with added contributions from Reinmuth and philosopher Jeff Malpas. The symposium, ‘Cosmopolitanism and Place: the Designs of Resistance’ (October 21-22, 2005) hosted by the Centre for Social Theory and Design, University of Technology, Sydney was organised by Malpas and art critic and philosopher Andrew Benjamin as part of a larger Australian Research Council grant dealing with issues of the cosmopolitan. The symposium session encouraged terroir to re-think design in terms of the cosmopolitan. This symposium was the catalyst for our book terroir: Cosmopolitan Ground to which Stamm and Malpas contributed essays, and for which Andrew Benjamin wrote an excellent introduction.

56 Scott Balmforth and Gerard Reinmuth, (Eds.), terroir: Cosmopolitan Ground (Sydney: DAB Documents, 2007).

Notes from a discussion between Stamm and myself at the University of Tasmania on October 11, 2005 are recorded in Notebook No. 2. The purpose of the discussion was to tease out the content of the symposium proposed in an abstract written on August 18.

Figure 35: Notebook No. 2, pp 10-11.

The notes identify a series of creativity/design concepts that underpinned a conversation that continued for two years during the preparation of terroir: Cosmopolitan Ground. These included constellations; creativity as collaboration (not individual genius); relational dynamics; ethical dimensions of responding to a given circumstance; diagnostics and prognostics; virtual potential; the synthetic; the indeterminate as a reliable real, and the limiting problem of the totalising tendencies of Modernism in contrast to the productive condition of the indeterminate. The many intersections and overlaps within these topics included, for example, Leon van Schaik’s

57 Notebook No. 2, pp 8-15. Although the conversations began several months earlier, these were the first written notes.

58 Notebook No. 1, pp 167-168.
A terroir of terroir - a brief history of design places

Richard Blythe RMIT 2008
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retrospective clarity has been possible through enacting the “cocktail straw moment” and drilling back down through the layers of the PhD process. Theory has again helped in that recent reading of Slavoj Žižek (in particular, the concept of the ‘parallax view’) has provided a theoretical framework that coincides with the observations and experiences of the design research that is the subject of this thesis.\footnote{Žižek, The Parallax View.}

This is another example of the serendipitous nature of designing in that at the time of writing up the thesis (the “cocktail straw moment”), terroir partners were appointed creative directors for the Australian Institute of Architects National conference, and in that capacity, were entertaining the idea of engaging Žižek in a conversation about architecture. In a typically terroir coincidence, Blythe and Reinmuth re-discovered separate personal histories within the work of Žižek and this coincidence was enough to confirm Žižek as a person of interest for the purposes of the Conference. I’ll return to Žižek in the section ‘Tickling Toys’.

**The question of context**

The idea of the contraption brought the question of contexts to the surface. This had been a conversation within terroir for some time in which there was an awareness of the difficulty of what might be termed ‘contextual authenticity’ or the ‘contextually real’. The example used to explain this is an image of Mario Botta’s Round House, Ticino, Switzerland (1980-1982). In architecture publications and on the architect’s own web site, the house is represented within the context of the valley. It can be understood as geometrically responding to the scale of the valley and of bringing the occupant into a visual/spatial relation with it: “The intention was to avoid any comparison and/or contrast with the surrounding buildings, but to search instead for a spatial relationship with the distant landscape and horizon. By using a cylindrical volume I wanted (sic) to avoid elevations that would necessarily have to be compared to the facades of the existing houses around it.”\footnote{http://www.botta.ch/Page/Architettura/Pr%201980_049_CasaRotonda/Img_01.jpg, retrieved July 8, 2008.}

When Reinmuth visited the house, he took an image that shows the house in its other suburban context (the one Botta chose not to illustrate). The comparative images, (object in the valley/object in suburbia), were useful in understanding that while we were interested in notions of multiplicity and in working from multiple contexts in creating the design space of the project terroir, like Botta, we were not placing equal value on all contexts. Rather, there was a process of selection - one of determining the ‘contextually real’ or at least deciding which contexts allowed the greatest possibility, or the widest scope for the design-place of a project.

The Tolman’s Hill House is located on a site overlooking the city of Hobart and the Derwent River 2.4km “as the crow flies” and 260m below. The terroir design discussion for this house revolved around the relationship of the journey from the city up the hill to the site and (re)-presentation of the occupants to the valley and city through an experience of the house. The architectural delight happens at the moment when the valley appears before the occupants as they enter the main space of the house, and the route, or journey, from city to house is re-presented to the occupants in its complete dimension. Up until that point, the journey is experienced as serial fragments.

The outside of the Tolman’s Hill House is simple in a confronting way and inspired a discussion of the ‘blunt object’ in the GRC process. The ‘blunt’ conversation held several layers. It dealt with the simple and direct detailing of the exterior. For example, van Schaik noted that the cladding of the Tolman’s Hill House was unceremoniously cut off to the ground line as if it wasn’t detailed at all and he contrasted this with the lush interiors of terroir buildings. The ‘blunt’ also carried an idea of the veil, or the resistance to engagement metaphorically described by terroir as the ‘Stealth Bomber’ quality of the exteriors – a sort of immaterial, scaleless surface. Van Schaik has referred to this quality in describing the Cambridge House as having been made out of almost nothing at all.

---

64 GRC4, June 2006, audio recording of panel discussion following all three terroir presentations 47:30.
65 GRC4, June 2006, audio recording of panel discussion following all three terroir presentations 27:00.
Van Schaik described the Tolman’s Hill House as “perhaps the ugliest house I have ever seen” (before going on to discuss its “new beauty”). The house makes sense only when both the interior and exterior have been experienced and is, in this sense, similar to the Peppermint Bay project. This moment, that is dependant on the difference between the interior and the exterior in terroir’s work, lead to a discussion of the surface or inner/outer relationship.

Figure 40: Cambridge ‘Stealth’ House (2005), the immaterial house.

The Tolman’s Hill House was situated in a new suburb of ill-conceived housing that does not respond to the valley context. In the case of both the Tolman’s Hill and Cambridge projects, terroir dismissed suburbia as a context that was not necessarily ‘real’ to the project. Therefore, while terroir is interested in bringing multiple contexts together in the design process, it is not taking a relativist position; or not taking a position in which all contexts would be understood to be equally important or equally real for the project.

Interiors and the Cosmopolitan

The Peppermint Bay project provides a useful case study in demonstrating the various shifts discussed so far and in opening up the final set of transitions of the PhD. Peppermint Bay is valuable because it was a project completed in the first stage of the PhD process (traditional history method) and was very much designed within a landscape framework. It became one of the primary objects of reflection in the early phases of the second critical-practice stage of the PhD. Leading up to GRC4 (June 2006), terroir was involved in a new project for the Wolong Valley, China. Peppermint Bay was used in that project as a vehicle for explaining our design approach to the Chinese. The difficulty of presenting through translators necessitated simple explanations of the process, intent and outcomes reinforced with images that represented them in the context of the Wolong Valley. This however, did not prove to be a one-way relationship, (of Peppermint Bay informing the Wolong project), but rather the Wolong project opened up new ways of seeing Peppermint Bay, and therefore new ways of acting in future projects. The Wolong project will be discussed in the section ‘Design/Theory/Pattern’. A new way of seeing an old project provided a view through which the question of the cosmopolitan began to crystallise and find material explanation in the work of terroir.

Figure 41: Peppermint Bay 2003 (Brett Boardman).

---

The multiple conversations through which the design-place of the Peppermint Bay project was constructed included: paths; the surface (or inner and outer); landscape; architectural precedent; the indeterminate line; village context; and of course, the many practical matters relating to function. The building houses a commercial kitchen and three dining spaces. The first of these, the Fisherman’s Bar, is a casual dining space. The second provides dining space for an *a la carte* restaurant. The third space is a function room. Each of the three dining spaces has a particular relationship with the picturesque landscape of the D’Entrecasteaux Channel. The three spaces can be opened up to form a single large function space and are divided from the kitchen by an internal zigzag path/ramp that runs through the building connecting the road at entry level with the slightly lower ‘village green’ that extends to the end of the peninsular on which the building is sited.
The first dining space, the bar, is approximately thirty metres from the rocky shore of Peppermint Bay (from which the project takes its name). The shore is close enough for the detail in the rock formations to be seen from the building and for the sound of the gentle lapping of waves to be heard – the intimate. From within the second space projects, the viewer has an experience of being projected out across some twenty kilometres of waterway dividing Bruny Island from Tasmania, a body of water caught between folding hills – the classical. The third space embraces an old English oak: tree and building interior spatially inscribed in each other – the empathetic.

From the beginning, this project was understood as garden rather than building. The different spatial qualities of the three dining rooms reflect investigations into the structuring of landscape gardens including Francis Bacon’s essay “Of Gardens” (lawn, pleasure garden, wilderness); through Edmund Burke’s treatise “A Philosophical Enquiry into the Sublime and Beautiful” and our own experiences of the political constitution of contemporary wilderness in the Tasmanian dams debate. There is no direct ‘causal’ relationship between these landscape investigations and what we designed but the idea of distinct adjacent landscape experiences within the one ‘garden’ combined with an intense interest in movement was nonetheless formative and a key factor in determining the design-place of the project.

At Peppermint Bay, the entry to the first room is at the same level as the front entry. The other two rooms are set at a lower level and are accessed by a central ramp. The ceiling height in the first room is thereby kept lower while the next two rooms have a volume that is unexpected. The three rooms are entered by passing through a timber ‘wall’ that is two metres thick. The timber wall opens up in a series of poche spaces that include the entries to the main rooms and a cellar. These poche spaces have low, 2100mm ceilings that compress the space prior to its release into the vaulting ceilings of the second and third room in much the same way as the poche entry space of Adolf Loos’ Villa Müller, Prague (1928-1930) opens into the main room.

---

The play between subject and landscape is one with which terroir is familiar through architecture precedent in the work of Tasmanian architect Michael Viney demonstrating the power of the small architectural object in a vast landscape. Viney drew on Nigel Pennick’s thesis of geometric relations and his own observations to achieve this. He used the Corbusian notion of promenade in conjunction with a particular orientation of floor slabs and walls, and the careful placement of openings to achieve architecturally what he described as “soaring.” Viney’s notion of soaring was inspired by the way Greek temples are placed on hillsides and by contemporary Japanese-inspired interests in podium structures. Viney observed that even in a ruinous state, a temple platform in the landscape created a palpable spatial experience of projection out into the space beyond and simultaneous contraction of the vast space of the valley into a compact architectural one. This was achieved through careful orientation in a process akin to creating ley lines or geometric relations between the building and its landscape. Viney’s soaring concept was discussed widely during the design of a number of projects including the Tranmere and Longley Houses (both from 2000). The second dining room in the Peppermint Bay project can be understood in these terms.

---


71 Michael Viney, “Architecture and Landscape”, lecture given as part of the visiting speakers series, Tasmanian State Institute of Technology, School of Architecture, Planning and Landscape Architecture, Mount Nelson Campus, 2005.

72 Perhaps the most vivid recollection I have from my undergraduate studies is of this set of ideas that Viney discussed and illustrated in a lecture at the Tasmanian State Institute of Technology, 1985.

73 Watkins, *The Old Straight Track*. 
At the ‘Grimoire of Architecture’ symposium, Peter Kohane gave a paper describing a drawing made by Louis Kahn explaining the quality of the room. Kohane’s paper struck a chord, particularly with Reinmuth, as an elaboration on the idea of empathy and the way it manifests in simple mimesis and inflection.
These qualities were also explored by architect Esmond Dorney who produced a series of lightweight steel structures in Tasmania in the 1950s-1970s that were rediscovered and appreciated by the local architecture community in the 1980s-1990s. Dorney had worked with the Burley Griffins in Melbourne prior to World War II. Dorney's own Park Beach House (1957), Park Beach Hobart, was, like most houses he designed, an expressive lightweight steel structure, assembled in a manner akin to the modular systems of Bailey Bridges, an approach to construction he experienced firsthand during WWII. The mimetic roof forms of Dorney's houses echo the patterns of the scalloped bays of the Derwent River and the folded silhouette of mountains and hills that contain it, seen, for example in his 'butterfly' house Churchill Avenue, Sandy Bay, Tasmania. It could be stated, therefore, that his architecture was concerned with more than questions of function and construction.

An affinity with the Burley Griffins' architectural thinking, and in particular, their fascination with the Australian landscape is evident in this mimesis. It is the mimetic quality of these dramatic steel and glass houses that separates Dorney's work from the structural expressiveness of the Melbourne school typified by the Peter McIntyre house built on the banks of the Yarra River that was concerned with the athletic properties of suspension and cantilever. Although essentially simple, Dorney's mimetic approach, in which the greater landscape affects, to some extent, the object, is germane to terroir's understanding of site as an extended field of affective possibility.

---


The third dining space at Peppermint Bay was thought of in terms of mimetic exchange between room, subject and landscape and works as a fulcrum in the spatial arrangement of the building. The room faces an oak tree. The ceiling of the room rises up to embrace the canopy which is trimmed to the height of the head of the folding glass wall between tree and room. The vaulting ceilings and the warbling, horizontal glazing lines mimic the ridge and fold lines of Tasmanian hills; the dark colour of the exterior is designed to disappear, a shadow in the landscape with a surprise inside. Peppermint Bay, therefore, seemed to be the culmination of a series of landscape investigations. However, it also proved to be productive of further interests and concerns as terroir architecture moved into a new phase. This productive opening appeared as Peppermint Bay was re-thought in terms of new projects.
Design/Theory/Pattern

In May 2006, terroir was invited to join a consortium of tourism, planning and engineering consultants to develop a master plan for the Wolong Valley in China (later devastated by the 2008 earthquake of which Wolong Township was the epicentre). The brief called for a plan that would realise the development of what was essentially a traditional Tibetan and Qiang agricultural valley into a tourism centre with visitations of 1.6 million per year. At the first site visit, a number of middle-management government representatives discussed the faux Tibetan villages constructed in neighbouring provinces to cater for tourism demand. This section of the complex client group was interested in what could be done to create developments that catered for tourism but avoided a kind of Disneyesque romanticisation and fetishisation of the historic. They were particularly interested in Peppermint Bay for this reason. The vernacular buildings and infrastructure of the Wolong Valley had developed over centuries and were structured to the scale of pedestrian movement and limited mechanisation. To cater for the vast increase in scale required for mass tourism, faux villages in neighbouring provinces were created in which over-scaled vernacular forms were applied to new uses of commerce and tourism.

Figure 51: The successful breeding of Panda Bears in captivity in the Wolong Valley is driving an exponential increase in tourism.

Over a three-day period, photographs were taken and observations made of the Wolong Valley, and its various patterns. These were documented in images. A similar image set was developed retrospectively for Peppermint Bay. The design-place and virtual concepts were explained through a simple image of a tiger in the grass as a way of communicating the important role of pattern in our understanding of places. The concept was then extended to a building (Peppermint Bay) and as a proposition for the Wolong Valley.

This explanation demonstrated how Peppermint Bay is a-historical in the sense that it is neither vernacular or historicist, but is fundamentally the ‘child’ of the multiple contexts of the project in that it is a virtual extension of them – it is both of its place but also brings a surplus, something of its own. Therefore, a critical condition triangulated between past, present and future begins to emerge in terroir’s work. It is a criticality that oscillates between Nietzsche’s Historia Abscondita, Braidotti’s positive affective agency and the contextual surface of the project.

---

77 This was due to the successful breeding of the Giant Panda in captivity. The Panda is endemic to the area and there is a long history of co-existence in the valley. Old and sick Pandas come down out of the mountains to sit on the edges of local farms to be fed. The sight of cuddly baby Panda’s riding plastic rocking horses and playing on swings is irresistible to tourists (and was to me).
The image of the tiger in the grass demonstrates our human capacity to see and recognise pattern. It explains pattern recognition as integral to ‘meaning-making’ or making sense of the world. The examples of patterns relevant to the two projects (Peppermint Bay and Wolong) included vineyards whose rows of vines provide information about the season, the soil condition, orientation, the dimensions of agricultural machinery, and so on. In other words, when we see a vineyard we ‘see’ this information even if we are not fully cognisant of it. Standing stones provide a very specific connection between the shadow cast by the sun with a particular point on the surface of the earth at a particular moment, a solar strand binding us with the firmament. Celestial patterns provide a certain surety about the permanency of the cosmos and we see in their constellations recognisable figures that become the props for mythologies that bind us cosmically. Gravestones arranged in a particular orientation under the umbrella of a great tree provide a window upon histories and ceremonies acted out over generations in a small rural community. The diurnal patterns of light and dark metre our existence and the changing seasons work as a kind of minor measure between the birthdays and anniversaries that gauge a life. But none of these is as loaded as the capacity to recognise the tiger in the grass, a moment that is fundamentally meaningful, or at least it was in a time when the tiger was less likely to be located in a zoo.

The Wolong re-development could, therefore, be understood in terms of potential familial patterns. There are two key components to this proposition: what would be built would be radically new but familial; and that this familiarity would need to be achieved by synthetic leap rather than by facsimile or simple extension in order to create new built environments of sufficient scale to cater for the proposed radical change in population and use. Further, these would also contain a surplus, something additional, the product of the synthetic moment.

To present this argument, patterns in the Wolong Valley were documented. These included patterns of trade; agriculture, geology, vernacular construction, hospitality, festival, landform and the mythological construction of the valley as a place. ‘Wolong’ (Wo Long) means ‘to sleep’, or ‘lie’. It can also mean ‘to manifest’ (wo), and ‘dragon’ (long). The local story concerns a magical dragon that came to the valley bearing gifts, but on finding it already perfect, he lay down. Coincidences in the patterns were noted, for example, in Qian villages where extraordinary white wall markings reflect white quartz lines running through the shale stone of the mountains. These can be seen all over the valley.

Figure 53: White quartz markings in the grey shale stone of the Wolong Valley next to white wall markings of a Qiang village.

---

78 Both interpretation and the dragon myth came from personal conversations with a local woman, Sophie, who worked for the government body that managed the Wolong Nature Park, and my interpreter.
In order to concretise these Wolong Valley observations and to express them in terms of an architectural proposition, Peppermint Bay was re-described directly in relation to the patterns implicit in its design-place. These included descriptions of the seasonally changing stacks of timber apple crates along the nearby roadside; roadside shops selling local produce – simple sheds set in tarmac parking lots; and the silhouette of local hillsides. These ‘patterns’ were paired with familial images of the finished building. This was important in opening up two questions by ‘forcing’ a ‘re-seeing’ of the Peppermint Bay design process in material terms; that is, according to its patterns. An exploration of these questions unlocked one of the key issues identified in GRC2 serving to open a view of how the use of language to talk out the design-place of the project operates as a design activity, and in finding a voice to describe this.
Up until this point, the research projects had been largely talked about through theoretical positions. However, this proved misrepresentative of the actual process in one significant respect. Theory was not in itself productive of design outcomes; in other words, design was not some kind of ‘proof’ of theory. Rather, undertaken as a kind of critical
practice, designing has theoretical implications, and simultaneously, acts as a critical foil to theory. In the first phase of the PhD, the design aspect of my practice, a critical history of landscapes was entirely hidden. There was no explicit evidence of designing even though there seemed to be some form of productive yet ‘unspoken’ relationship between designing (for example, in the GeoCenter Mens Klint project) and the PhD process. In the early stages of the second phase, there was an attempt to address this gap and to reach the critical-practice through the lens of other people’s theory (an application of history research methods being applied inappropriately in design). However, due to the difficulty of translation, the Wolong project demanded a different approach in which the Peppermint Bay project and propositions for Wolong were talked out directly. Re-describing Peppermint Bay in this direct way demonstrated the potential of working from within the project, rather than through the lens of other theoretical positions as a critical practice; ‘critical’ in the sense that from within existing conditions new, unprecedented relations are proposed that bring a surplus. Wolong was a watershed moment in which the ethical dimensions of designing surfaced in the work of terroir. The slight shift in focus to patterns also opened up new ways of understanding how the line worked in terroir’s designing a shift from simple instrumental vector (ley line and path) to ‘desire lines of the imagination’ engaging complex and multiple perceptual patterns. This shift becomes more evident in the concluding projects.

Private/Public

By 2002 approximately, it appeared that there were different architectures at work within terroir, evident in the differences in the Masonic Club, and Longley and Tranmere Houses. These differences could be loosely understood as shifts in focus between the projects. The Masonic Club was focussed on an interest in a narrative construction of the experiential quality captured in the title “Puzzle-Box,” the first journal article published on the practice.  

79 Li Shiquao, GRC4 audio recording of the panel discussion, 39:50.
The internal fit-out of this Victorian building was developed through a discussion of the nature of Victorian architecture and a recollection of the joys of childhood hotel stays; particularly, the ‘puzzle-box’ like quality of discovering the room. In a way, this could be understood as a precursor to later works in which the idea of the ‘toy’ plays an important role. For the Longley House, the key concern was the proposition of the dual threshold as both physiological and psychological, which in some sense might be understood as an early precursor to the idea of parallax or indeterminacy. The Tranmere House was primarily concerned with placing the subject in relation to its valley landscape and was the first evidence of the ‘blunt’ object and a play between interior and exterior that holds the architectural moment.

At the time of recognising these architectural differences, the three directors were concerned that the differences indicated a sort of inconsistency, one that could be expressed as a question: “Are the apparent differences in terroir buildings evidence of an inconsistency?” 81 This question was formulated early in the PhD candidacy (presented at GRC2), however, it was understood at the time as rhetorical rather than a question that required addressing in the next works. It was a meta-question that provided a point of reflection for projects that followed.

The first evidence of an internal consistency in what otherwise appears as visually divergent works came while producing the book terroir: Cosmopolitan Ground. Jeff Malpas observed that while terroir described the Tolman’s Hill House and the Liverpool Crescent House as operating on quite different principles, according to ‘line’ and the ‘cube’ respectively, the ‘line’ was very much at work in both. At the culminating point of this thesis, it is possible to see that in works such as the Commonwealth Place Kiosks, Prague Library Competition and Tasmanian Museum and Art Gallery (TMAG) there is a more complex coalescence of what appeared in earlier works as divergent interests. This will be described in more detail in the concluding sections.

During the design process for the Cataract Gorge project for the City of Launceston, a tension surfaced between the universal and the particular and lead to propositions for the material substantiation of irreconcilable difference. terroir was commissioned as part of a team to develop an interpretation plan for the Cataract Gorge Park. As part of that process, a series of stakeholder meetings was held in which people shared their experiences of the place. The assumption was that in a contemporary Western culture, knowledge is freely available to all and is therefore shareable. The underlying presumption of the workshop was that encouraging stakeholders to share their experiences and knowledge of the place would provide rich material for the interpretation project that would allow the design team to create an inclusive solution. One of those invited to share was an Aboriginal elder. When I worked with her on a previous project, I had asked what it was like being a Tasmanian Aboriginal. She said the best way to answer that was to explain that when she was a child she was gifted at

81 There was, of course, a second order question raised as to whether or not an inconsistency was necessarily negative.
school in the area of history and had won a scholarship for Aboriginal children to attend school on the mainland (she was from King Island so the ‘mainland’ was Tasmania not mainland Australia). The first thing she learnt was that the Tasmanian Aborigines died out with Trugannini in 1876. “That’s exactly what it is like being a Tasmanian Aboriginal,” she said, ending with a cackling laugh. From this exchange, I knew her to be a woman keen to share her culture and values.

A stir went through the Cataract Gorge workshop when people noticed that she was crying. When she was asked why she responded by saying that she found the stories about this place compelling and she had so much she wanted to share but as an elder she was not at liberty to share sacred knowledge with the uninitiated. This was a case of a sacred culture caught in a Western value system. There was no real design outcome from this experience. There was, however, an unrealised proposition that to acknowledge this dilemma in some way, a secret would need to be made palpable by means of a built intervention in this landscape. The experience motivated me to run a design studio on the idea of irreconcilable difference, as part of the Speculation Studio series discussed earlier, to explore how parallax conditions can be dealt with in design. Thus, the possibility emerged of an ethically parallax project, one that increases engagement with the other but allows the parallax its own space; in other words, that does not reduce the universal to a globalised condition of equal values and sameness but allows space for each in their different constitutions.

Peppermint Bay was the venue for my cousin Yasmin Naqvi’s wedding on the December 30, 2006. Taking place in what have previously been described as the second and third rooms, the wedding brought together a diverse collection of people. At the time, Yasmin was completing a PhD in international law in The Hague. Half her family is Australian, the other half are Muslim Indian. The two sides of the family have known each other for many decades, visiting each other in Australia and India over the years, and the wedding was an opportunity to catch up. At the wedding, the Australians drank a great deal, the more traditional Muslims drank no alcohol and there was no agreement at all as to whether Tendulkar or Ponting was the better batsman.

Making the wedding slightly more complicated was the fact that Yasmin was marrying her long time boyfriend Joel, who came from a Jewish family. The ceremony included the traditional Muslim-Indian custom of the Rajajaga and the Jewish traditions of the Chuppah and Sheva

![Figure 60: Cataract Gorge observation platform model (2004).](image)

---

82 Slavoj Žižek’s concepts of ‘parallax view’ and the ‘tickling object’ become important in the final stages of this thesis.  
83 I am grateful to Jeff Kipnis for prompting this question in a discursion at Ohio State University, Ohio, USA, July 31, 2008.  
84 The veiled newlyweds sit face-to-face under a cloth at a mirrored table. In traditional weddings, this is the first time the bride and groom sees each other.  
85 The traditional marriage canopy under which the bride circles the groom seven times.
Brachos.  

While in this particular wedding the ceremonies were vestiges of cultural practices (in the sense that while important to the individuals, they were selective symbolic actions rather than operating actions of a belief system), some Indian family members at the wedding were married according to these traditional rites and customs. A number were married by arrangement and some had met their partner for the first time during the Rajajaga ceremony. This particular wedding however sat somewhere between Indian, Muslim, Australian and Jewish with an international twist. Following the formalities twin brothers Tao and Sam, originally from Marseilles, gave an athletic display of rap-dancing. Fourteen days later, these people were once again dispersed around the globe.

Yasmin's wedding, while an extraordinary event, is not necessarily unusual in our modern condition in the way that it conflated distance and cultural boundary. If the wedding could be understood as a kind of cosmopolitan scene, then the general question, “What is ground in a cosmopolitan condition?” could be understood through the more specific question of, “What was ground at the moment of that wedding in that place?” It was this question of the multicultural condition that gave rise to Descartes’ universal doubt: “Who am I in such a context?”

As the wedding progressed, I fantasised about the impossibility of making a drawing that would map out ground as it occurred for each of the people at the wedding – a global tangle of spatial intelligences intersecting in that room held as it is in a valley between two islands. The wedding guests were ‘at home’ in the room to the extent that their grounds intersected at the interstices of their various communal identities. This ground (the space between) might be understood as public in the Kantian sense, as the place of the exercise of reason in a trans-national universal way. When this sense of the public is contrasted with Kant’s idea of the private as the communal-institutional order of one’s particular identification (that is, the private is communal not individual), it is possible to assert that the truly universal is radically singular, operating in the interstices of communal systems.

This apparent reversal of logic, that the private is in fact communal and that the public can only be accessed through individual action (acts of reason) in a trans-national universal way at the interstices of communal identity, provides a way of thinking about how architecture can operate in such a trans-national, trans-cultural, trans-identical cosmopolitan condition, and how architecture can respond in a time of cultural uncertainty. Culture is uncertain in the sense that in our modern, globally interconnected condition, the very idea of culture understood as a stable, shared condition is fundamentally questionable (if not entirely redundant). Culture for those that are internet-connected and able to take advantage of jet travel is a radically transformed condition. For each person within this condition, culture is individually constructed according to constellations of contact lists, Facebook friends, You Tube links, Flickr albums, Twitter and Skype contacts, and special interest networks. What your neighbour does in these conditions can often be simply a coincidence of geography and mean very little in terms of your own cultural context. Within this kind of condition, culture must be understood as constellational and personal: as groupings of intersecting and overlapping subjective and personal constellations. Culture then, cannot be understood as a stable value set in designing. Rather, for each project, a particular grouping of cultural constellations provides a specific condition that, while it might intersect and overlap with many adjacent cultural conditions, is nonetheless unique.

In attempting to describe how architecture can respond to such a condition, Ignasi de Solà-Morales claimed that: “The most sensitive architecture of the present moment is thus no longer the expression of a communal project that transmits the values of rationality, progress, and collective emancipation to the urban landscape, but is instead merely the modest presence of the particular discourses that publicly expose what should only be regarded as private experience.”

The problem with the term ‘private’ here is that it confuses the Kantian distinction between private and public since Kant understood the ‘private’ as being constituted in the communal. Rather, terroir projects have attempted to create grounds of intense personal experience (and I am reading Solà-Morales’ ‘private’ as meaning ‘personal’) of the subjective moment and that by virtue of their subjectivity allow access to the interstitial, universal public.

---

86 The Seven Blessings of marriage concluding with the groom breaking a glass with his foot to signify the destruction of the Jerusalem temple.


Therefore, the proposition for Wolong was to create architectures of subjective experience (driven by pattern) that would allow for interstices of a traditional agricultural society and contemporary tourism. The idea of the virtual condition of projects discussed earlier is essential here in identifying how the interstitial is bound to the original condition in that it emerges synthetically from it while at the same time, its synthetic emergence brings a surplus. The proposition was that the virtual condition of existing patterns when taken in to the design-place of the project would lead to new patterns that were both familiar (bound to the original in familial ways) and entirely new (surplus in the sense that children are new family members) and capable of accommodating the demands of tourism. To be interstitial then, is to be compoundly bound rather than simply, in a gap or void. It is from within this interstitial position that it is possible to realise an indeterminate condition of the three critical approaches of this thesis - that is, of historia abscondita, positive affective agency and the contextual surface of the project. It is the resultant parallax condition that makes possible the material manifestation of aspects of the virtual condition of projects.

---

89 At GRC June 4, 2006, and in response to the reflections on Peppermint Bay post-Wolong, Zeynep Mennan suggested the combination of two key themes – the cosmopolitan and ethical – by asking the question, “What is the architect’s right to select from a cosmopolitan point of view?” Mennan suggested that this question could be explored further through Derrida, “The Right to Philosophy from a Cosmopolitan Point of View.” This challenge was taken up in the section ‘The architect’s right to select from a cosmopolitan point of view’ in Richard Blythe, "Designing Ground," in terroir: Cosmopolitan Ground, ed. Scott Balmforth and Gerard Reinmuth (Sydney: DAB Documents, 2007), pp 33-36 and that argument has substantially informed this thesis.
5 Tickling Toys: or surface twists

The absence of substantial communal systems requires architecture to engage the subject by means of personal experience, rather than symbolically. In this experience, the difference between the subject and the object (the building) can be described in the difference between two verbs: to subject oneself and to object. Describing the difference in this way establishes that the object is not a mute and passive thing in the subject's active perceiving, but rather, that the object acts, as for example in the object cause of desire. Therefore, the architectural moment can be understood as the moment in which object (the building) acts on the subject, or expressed in Žižekian terms, the object 'tickles' the subject.

Tickling is a useful way of shifting the thinking from the process (the design-place) back to the object experience of the architecture without departing from the key thesis. The tickling, in as far as it can be understood as a kind of playfulness, relies on indeterminacy in the same way that toys sustain indeterminacy between reality and make-believe. This indeterminacy is critical for two reasons: it allows for continual acts of rediscovery through repeated experience (unlike a punch line to a joke, architecture must be capable of accommodating repeat experience); and the possibility of engagement with otherness is increased through the slippages of an indeterminate condition that allows for the toy-like ability to create a non-threatening make-believe, the playing of as-yet-unfamiliar roles, that becomes a precursor to real ones.

The indeterminate relation of exterior and interior emerged early on in terroir work and is, for example, evident in the Tolman's Hill House (discussed earlier), Liverpool Crescent House, and the Commonwealth Place Kiosks. In order to describe this emerging surface playfulness, terroir gathered together key image and architecture references that were repeated throughout the GRC process including: the Stealth Bomber; Utzon's Bagsværd church, and the drawing of the snake that swallowed an elephant from *The Little Prince*. With each re-description and each new project there was a growing awareness of 'surface play', the latest manifestation of which is to investigate implications of the tickling object concept by reviewing past projects and designing new ones.

---

91 Žižek's proposition of the 'ticklish subject' is met with the question, "What tickles the ticklish subject?" to which he replies, "the tickling object." Ibid. p 17.
92 The philosophical principle of wonder has been useful in determining this position. See, for example, Philip Fisher, *Wonder, the Rainbow, and the Aesthetics of Rare Experiences* (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1998).
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Figure 62: Bagsværd Church exterior, (left) Jørn Utzon (1976). Bagsværd Church interior, Jørn Utzon (1976).

Figure 63: Drawings from The Little Prince by Antoine de Saint-Exupery – "Is it a hat?" "No, it is a snake that swallowed an elephant."

Figure 64: Liverpool Crescent House exterior and interior (2005) (Ray Joyce).

94 flickr.com/photos/pg/140755502/
95 http://www.archinect.com/schoolblog/blog.php?id=C0_410_39
There are two ‘twists’ at play in the Commonwealth Place Kiosks project. In addition to the surface twist (‘stealth bomber’ exterior, ‘wonderful’ interior), there is also a geometrical one. The project consists of two small kiosks facing each other across the Parliament-War Memorial Axis in Canberra. The gap between the Kiosks results in

---

Fisher, Wonder, the Rainbow, and the Aesthetics of Rare Experiences.
a minor radial shift from the axis that originates at the Capitol Hill centre point of the Griffin’s geometry. The building is set out on this slightly skewed line giving it an uncanny edge.

At this point in the PhD process, the point of reflection, it is therefore possible to apply a ‘tickling-object-lens’ to past projects as a way of thinking forward to new ones and potentially opening up new ground (described in the GRC process as a Janus characteristic of designing).

At the endpoint of this thesis, it becomes possible then to re-think terroir architecture in terms of objects that tickle their subjects through, for example, a play between the outer surface and the inner space, or in the inversion of interiors that ‘make sense’ of the object’s relation to the exterior. The tickling is also evident in the desire to create objects new to their contexts that nonetheless retain a familial resemblance. In this instance, it is the partially rhetorical question, “Do I recognise this thing?” that acknowledges partial recognition and partial strangeness and that is, therefore, the source of the tickling.

Three Competitions: Prague, Hobart, Stockholm

This surface interest is also evident in three competitions (Prague National Archive, Stockholm Library, and Hobart Waterfront Competitions), that collectively provide another watershed moment in the development of the practice. The competitions were deliberately chosen as opportunities, local and international, to produce works that responded in a reflective way to the GRC process. While the Prague competition was the most complete of these, all three projects usefully surface aspects of terroir practices.

The Prague Competition design process was central to Balmforth and Reinmuth’s Master’s Exhibition, October 2007, in which they illustrated how terroir goes about designing. The presentation captured key elements of an email string between Balmforth, Reinmuth, Sarah Benton, Matthew Skirving and Blythe. The email string clearly illustrated how the design-place of the project was created by bringing together multiple, contextual conversations. These included: Prague Castle highlighting the tucks and folds of the topography and the relationship of Letná Plane to the valley; the Velvet Revolution; the material quality of velvet; the Black Theatre of Prague; the literature of Kafka and Kundera; cockroach eggs; precedent studies of archives; an exploration of the nature of archives; studies of the public pathways around Prague; Prague café cultures; and Cubist architectures.

Of particular significance to Balmforth and Reinmuth’s theses was the observation that words and writing play a role in the design process and by which the project direction is ‘set’ at a key moment. That ‘setting’ happens through the production of a pithy, manifesto-like statement that, working from within the design-place, brings a particular direction for the project usually through metaphor. This is then used as a kind of gauge for design development. Balmforth and Reinmuth described it in the following way on a digital yellow sticky note pasted over Blythe’s email shown in context of the email string:

> Asked for a clarifying statement as a means of ‘final confirmation’ in regard to the project direction, Richard produces a manifesto as taut as the architectural discussion.

> Despite the fact that no building yet exists and will only be developed from this point in, this text will ensure (the design

---

97 See, for example, GRC4, June 2006. Reinmuth and Balmforth presentation discussion (also covered aspects of Blythe’s previous presentation), 52:45min mark.

direction of the project) until the end of the process and will appear on the first competition panel in a slightly edited form.\textsuperscript{99}

The email read as follows:

From: Richard Blythe blythe@utas.edu.au
Date: 17 August 2006 9:10:06 AM
To: “Gerard Reinmuth” reinmuth@terroir.com.au
Cc: "Sarah Benton" <benton@terroir.com.au>, "Scott Balmforth" <balmforth@terroir.com.au>, "Matthew Skirving" skirving@terroir.com.au
Subject: Re: prague ideas

Archives contain secrets, histories yet to be challenged and represented. New contexts surprising and even horrific. The idea of the archive is not situated in the preservation of this material however but in the moment of its opening up of it revealing of the bringing of new light to things that have lain still for so long, protected, like eggs, cockroach eggs rather than doves eggs. Eggs that contain the potential horror of the metamorphosis of history as much as they contain its hope. These are the secrets of the archive tucked under the corner of the velvet blanket of the park. The moment of the archive arrives in their cracking open. Prague is a city of dark tucks and folds, the folds of valleys that protect a castle, dark histories overlaying creativity, and like the blackness of the Black Theatre of Prague it is these shadows, this blackness that intensifies the appearances of this city. The archive: a cluster of cockroach eggs in a velvet fold cracking open in the lightness of the moment.

\textsuperscript{99} From Balmforth and Reinmuth, GRC presentation June 2007.
This observation of the way in which words worked as a kind of ‘setting’ manifesto emerged at the previous GRC5 in October of 2006. At the end of the presentations and discussion, Balmforth observed that the “swizzle stick moment” (a reference to the culminating phase of van Schaik’s inverted cocktail glass diagram of the PhD process) for this PhD may well be found in mapping the relationship of key texts to projects: from GeoCenter Møns Klint – wilderness-centred - to the Prague and Stockholm competitions that were project-centred demonstrating a shift in both an understanding of the process and in design practice.\textsuperscript{100}

\textsuperscript{100} Notebook 2, p148.
The competition for an extension to the Gunnar Asplund-designed library in Stockholm operated in a similar manner. The terroir entry looked first to the architectural problem of how to make an extension to such an important building. terroir began the design process by trying to understand the existing building, to decipher the meaning of its alignments and misalignments within the city and to describe its spatial logic. The original rectilinear base is misaligned in the city grid. As a design move on Asplund’s behalf this is a significant decision: to decide to be un-aligned with the city.

Instead, Asplund created an on-axis relation between the centre of the library drum and the observatory that sits on the hill next to the library. In this sense, Asplund had created a relation between two spatial conditions: the externalising space of the observatory that telescopes the observer into the infinite space of the cosmos, and the internalising space of literature through which the reader occupies the infinite textual space of the human imagination. If this ideational couplet could be understood then, as one of the key contexts of the project, the question for us was how should an addition be made? terroir proposed a third ideational type that could be added to the couplet.

The spatial model for both the Stockholm observatory and library is also complementary in the sense that the observatory takes the observer inside and then projects them upwards through the telescope. In the library, the ceiling is a large flat dome. The reader enters the library drum moving upwards and with eyes drawn into the space of the dome. While the interior of the drum is illuminated with the light and shadow of the sky, it is nonetheless remote from its city, which cannot be seen from the interior space.

There was an opportunity then to create both a third ideational type and a different spatial condition. An underground rail line passed under the site. terroir proposed that this rail line could be the object of focus in a new subterranean city space - a space in which a reader on a subway train might glimpse a reader in a subterranean library café. terroir wanted to use the logic seen in Asplund’s project, but to create contrasting alignments. In other words, to make an extension that was of the same logical set but one based on clear differences (both ideational and spatial) in order that the clarity of the original be sustained in a new configuration. terroir therefore proposed to bring people in and down, and to bring them face-to-face with something of this city, with its telluric aspects, a porthole into the underground tunnel network of the city. The concept was described on the competition panel in the following way:

Asplund’s library is of a particular, classical or at least Platonic geometry that brings emphasis to the slight (but never the less significant) shift in alignment of this building with the city. This difference of line is germane to establishing the axial relation between the dome of the library and the observatory sited on top of the original ridge that divided the city.

Conceptually then this building sits as spatially distinct from the city, the architectural moment of the project is made manifest between two spatial possibilities: the externalizing spatial expanse of the heavens experienced through the observatory (a kind of Unus Mundus or mythological space where heaven touches earth) on the one hand, and the internalizing spatial expanse of human thought textualized in the pages of the artefacts held under the constructed heaven of the library dome on the other.

The trajectory of the observatory is upward, eyes drawn to the heavens, and externalizing. The trajectory of the library is also upward, eyes drawn to the space of the dome, interior and internalizing in the sense that the text opens up worlds within the subject.

This project then, begins in this spatial and conceptual couplet: reader and text - observer and heavens. The construction of the proposed extension must be understood therefore as the construction or constructing of an extended idea as much as it is a matter of adding building material or programme.

---

101 Blythe text as printed on competition panels.
The way in which the 'manifesto' is used to steer a project through design development is evident in the following email:

**From:** Richard Blythe <blythe@utas.edu.au>
**Date:** 2 October 2006 10:05:17 AM
**To:** "Sophie Bence" <bence@terroir.com.au>  
Cc: "'Scott Balmforth'" <balmforth@terroir.com.au>, "'Justin Hanlon'" <hanlon@terroir.com.au>, "'Richard Blythe'" <blythe@terroir.com.au>, "'Anthony Clarke'" <clarke@terroir.com.au>,  
"'Gerard Reinmuth'" <reinmuth@terroir.com.au>,  
"'Cassandra kiss'" <kiss@terroir.com.au>

**Subject:** Re: Stockholm

if you think of the basic diagram as an inversion of the looking upward of the original dome into an alternative heaven (alternative to the actual sky above Stockholm) so that the new building looks downward into the underground spaces of the city then I don't think the current section goes far enough...it remains ambiguous as to whether it is up or down...why not literally break holes in the subway tunnel so you see the train flash past...look deeper into the ground...seems gentle and conservative at the moment.

This is an example of the way in which the conceptual framework of the design process guides the designing.

In the Hobart Waterfront Competition, the emergence of a concept that would later be developed as a key component of the Tasmanian Museum and Art Gallery Master Plan (TMAG) can be seen in the following email exchange that took place during the design process:

**From:** Richard Blythe [mailto:blythe@utas.edu.au]
**Sent:** Tuesday, 31 October 2006 4:06 PM
**To:** Sarah Benton  
Cc: Gerard Reinmuth; Richard Blythe; Robert Beson; scott balmforth

**Subject:** Re: HOBART WATERFRONT

one quick observation  
the triangulation question is interesting in terms of what is the third element: mountain, river, ?  
not convinced that it is the hobart (sic) rivulet but this got me thinking about the city's disconnect from the river...actually the city centre sits up over the ridge and in a valley (Hobart Rivulet Valley) out of sight of the river, another tuck and fold like Prague, and the city operates largely in these trenches that run in a similar direction to the Derwent River so the city, other than at Sullivan's (sic) cove itself (sic) doesn't sit on the river's edge...maybe they are doing the wrong thing trying to change the city into a waterfront city?  
that valley is only one of two key valley's (indicated in your diagrams) which bifurcate into several more beyond the city edge  
I'm wondering if this terrain can't be thought of as the third element and also (given current concerns for water) as watersheds. Can we extend the idea of 'water front city' up the valleys to establish key water sites that might be about civics (as in where people meet) and technics (as in how the city manages water supply).
The key conceptual shift here, made possible by seeing this familiar city in terms of the less familiar Prague, was to re-imagine the city as an interior, caught in a valley rather than fronting the river. This concept was never realised in the Hobart Waterfront Competition submission but became a key starting point for the TMAG project. The way in which the Hobart topography is re-read as ‘tucks and folds’ post-Prague is further illustration of how projects and concepts bounce off and inform each other. It is an excellent example of the way in which former projects can be catalytic in later projects.

At around the time of GRC2, Balmforth observed that quite often the ‘manifesto’ statement developed in one project will take some time to resonate within the design work of the office but will ‘pop back out’ in a later project. The TMAG master plan text, taken from the original proposal reads as follows:

Hobart, historically at least, is not a city on the water, rather it is a city clipped on to the back of a ridge line around the corner from the water. The corner is Dunn Place.

Rather than ‘wall’ and ‘floor’ the model of the city on the waterfront should be one of a hook that links the waterfront and the city centre through the Dunn Place site. Elizabeth and Argyle Streets originally terminated at Macquarie Street along the ridge line reinforcing the idea that these streets were secondary connections between the city and the water.

The emphasis on how the city centre connects then to the water should not be along these streets but rather should be along Collins and Macquarie Street to Dunn Place and then around into the harbour.

This was the original route of goods and people into the city centre that huddled on the sunny, sheltered side of the ridge around the corner from the harbour. It is also the way the city is represented in early maps and images.

102 ‘Floor’ and ‘wall’ are used in the Sullivan’s Cove urban guidelines to describe the spatial containment of the precinct.
The TMAG site then is the terminating point of the Macquarie Street ridge dividing the city from the water. The flow line of the Hobart Rivulet, that is still very evident in the fabric of the city, provides the link-line between cove and city along the contour.  

The initial ‘hunch’ that Hobart was more hook-like than waterfront arose from seeing a familiar city anew through the lens of the Prague Competition, described in the terroir submission as a city of ‘tucks and folds’. These initial observations made during the Hobart Waterfront Competition were confirmed during the initial stages of the TMAG project through a series of mappings that used a similar approach to the work done on the city of Launceston in the first phase of the PhD.

The use of the ‘line’ in the TMAG project is multivalent: historical tracing; rivulet flow-line; line of movementgateway to the city; and spatial diagram of the relation of the city to the cove. There is then, a significant qualitative difference in the use of the line in this project compared with the comparatively simple use of the line as a formal device in the Canberra Library, and the vectorial lay line of the Tolman’s Hill House. In both the TMAG and Commonwealth Place Kiosks projects the difference between multiple lines (of orientation) is exploited as a design move demonstrating a further evolutionary moment in the design practice of terroir.

---

Figure 73: 1806 map showing Hobart Town situated in the valley not on the waterfront. Source: Tasmanian Museum and Art Gallery

Figure 74: Hobart Town from Mt Nelson 1844, showing the development of the town in the valley. Source: Tasmanian Museum and Art Gallery.

TMAG is also a good example of the way in which the virtual potential of a project is unravelled from its historical contexts in the discovery of a project’s surplus condition. Ignasi de Solà-Morales suggested that in a post-Nietzschean world, the problem of history, if history is understood as a steady progression of increasing levels and sophistication, is that we are then faced with a “temporal tonnage” and he rightfully asks, “How can we deal with this architecturally?”

In addressing Morales’ question, Nietzsche’s concept of *Historia Abscondita*, discussed above, in which there is an organic overlap between past and future in the production of the present frees the design process from this limiting weight. What *terroir* does, understood in terms of the virtual condition of projects as discussed above, is to make selective use of history in the production of a surplus condition. In this sense, *terroir* is aligned with Rosi Braidotti’s proposition of a criticality founded on positive affective agency. Braidotti looks to ways to invent possible futures that are not dependant on the present thus avoiding Solà-Morales’ ‘temporal tonnage’. She sets her position against critical theory that makes use of the negative to establish its authority. Braidotti places the subject at the intersection of multiple forces, the choric moment in which chaos is not chaotic but rather the virtual (creative) moment. It is possible then to operate in this triangulation between the contextual present, *Historia Abscondita*, and positive affective agency.

The philosophy of positivity is about being empowered to act more; to open up to the multiple, and can be contrasted with a negative dimming down of possibility. These concepts are useful in understanding design as a form of criticality that operates on a principle of positive affective agency to invent or open up new futures building on intuitive urge. The contrasting positions of opening up and dimming down (of both possibility and encounter with the other) provide clues to a possible ethics of design within the design-place of a project in the sense that ‘increasing’ and ‘dimming down’ could be seen as ways of ascribing positive and negative value.

The TMAG project developed as a topographic/historic reading of the landscape through the lens of another project that provided a ‘tickling’ moment in terms of re-seeing a familiar waterfront city in an unfamiliar way (as an interior). This tickling ‘twist’ was brought about by a careful reading of complex interrelated patterns. The TMAG project can therefore be understood as a kind of culminating moment bringing together the various strands of this PhD in a single project. The opening statements from the JPW/terroir submission begin by sketching out the thesis of patterns:

```
CONTEXT
The patterns of a place are what make places meaningful to communities and legible to visitors.
```

104 Showing the termination of streets (running vertically) at the Macquarie Street ridge and the way in which the TMAG site (large space at which Macquarie Street meets the causeway projecting out into Sullivan’s Cove) acts as a hinge point and gateway to the city.


106 Braidotti, “Affirmative Philosophy as a Resistance to the Present.”
These patterns are continually made: a road here; a building there; so places are emergent, they cannot be fixed by a single time or a particular pattern, rather they must be understood as dynamic and evolving, as composites, plurals, made up of times and patterns.

The JPW/terroir submission then picks up on the issue of history identifying the importance of new action and proposing instead to deal with the ‘temporal tonnage’ as a virtual possibility explained with a familial DNA metaphor:

While history can endow a place with an inheritance, the ongoing quality of a place depends on the quality of the decisions made today, decisions about those myriad and ongoing interventions: how the road is detailed, how the building is determined.

Cities contain multiple patterns that also grow and vary over time. Within the city each project, such as the TMAG Master Plan, is unique in the sense that for any individual project certain patterns of a place will take precedence.

A key task for the design team is to identify those particular and significant patterns.

Once a significant pattern has been identified its “hiSTORY” becomes a source for understanding its trajectory and its trajectory provides ways of understanding how it can be unfolded in the future.

An historical mapping of preceding patterns provides an effective methodology for identifying trends and characteristics, for sketching out a ground for future propositions. This is not to suggest the simple extension of historical patterns but of a synthesis of the key patterns of a place out of which propositions can be made that will bear a familial (rather than reflective) resemblance to the past.

We need to understand the DNA of the site and the project in order to develop a proposition that will be of this place.

It is from within this DNA, the familial, or the sort of uncanny recognition of familiarity within something completely new in a city that a second strand to the ‘tickling twist’ for this project is established. Therefore, the city is re-read as internal to a valley not open to the water and new buildings are strangely familiar:

This familial approach will mean that our propositions are unique, while they will be instantly recognizable as being of the same family they will have no precedent and yet they will ‘belong’ to this project. We are aiming to use the architecture and archaeology to provide new ways of seeing the greater city, of understanding its order and pattern and a new legibility for the TMAG within its city and within its site.
intersections and overlaps between these patterns to generate opportunistic moments that would bring a relational confluence of the TMAG collections, the history of the site and of the city, and the greater landscape to the experiential surface.

The growing emphasis in these studies and the future direction of the research will be focussed on the areas of the tickling object and of the surplus generated through the virtuality of the project at the moment of synthesis. The idea of the surplus first surfaced in conversations with Stamm but the conversation with Žižek has unearthed new ways of linking this back through van Schaik’s observation of the toy-like qualities of terroir’s architecture and thereby illustrating the co-dependence of concepts with each other and concepts and projects in designing. The concepts of the tickling object and surplus have already infiltrated this text post the production of the projects discussed but as with the explorations of landscape, threshold, patterns and the virtual, these concepts will continue to evolve during the design process of new projects, and through ongoing reflections on previous ones.

Figure 77: JPW/terroir Master Plan model.

This conceptual framing of the project was prepared as a kind of ‘manifesto’ statement during the early strategic design process and, like many of the other manifestos, found its way into the presentation of the project as a kind of ‘making sense’ of JPW/terroir’s approach. The use of the text in the final submission document was evidence of the way in which this approach had been embraced by another architectural practice (JPW) during the collaborative design process.
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Asplund’s library is of a particular, classical or at least Platonic geometry that brings emphasis to the slight (but never the less significant) shift in alignment of this building with the city. This difference of line is germane to establishing the axial relation between the dome of the library and the observatory sited on top of the original ridge that divided the city.

Conceptually then this building sits as spatially distinct from the city, the architectural moment of the project is made manifest between two spatial possibilities: the externalizing spatial expanse of the heavens experienced through the observatory (a kind of Unus Mundus or mythological space where heaven touches earth) on the one hand, and the internalizing spatial expanse of human thought textualized in the pages of the artifacts held under the constructed heaven of the library dome on the other.

The trajectory of the observatory is upward, eyes drawn to the heavens, and externalizing. The trajectory of the library is also upward, eyes drawn to the space of the dome, interior and internalizing in the sense that the text opens up worlds within the subject.

This project then, begins in this spatial and conceptual couplet: reader and text - observer and heavens. The construction of the proposed extension must be understood therefore as the construction or constructing of an extended idea as much as it is a matter of adding building material or programme.

Inherited geometry: the primary elements and subtle compositional shifts in Asplund’s library influence the formative order and aesthetic of this proposal.

Extending place; the axial alignment from the Observatory through Asplund’s library manifests a trajectory to a mythical order, beyond the immediate place. The Stockholm observatory has a similar longer-content axially aligned relation to the city that manifests a connection to the distant natural landscape of May park beyond the city, itself part of the Stockholm’s Stockholm Ridge - once a dominant marker through the Stockholm landscape. We propose a ravine, a deep cut, a telluric space that looks down into the ground, uncovering an underworld of the city, a slot cut in the side of the train tunnel so traveler and reader meet eye to eye in this most sublime space of the contemporary terror threatened city – the underground.

We propose a ravine, a deep cut, a telluric space that looks down into the ground, uncovering an underworld of the city, a slot cut in the side of the train tunnel so traveler and reader meet eye to eye in this most sublime space of the contemporary terror threatened city – the underground.

Harald Sohlberg;
The painting is indeterminate however, since the melancholy that it inspires consists of the presence of an “other” internal world, one out there world, the inscrutable mind of the viewer that is revealed. The painting is indeterminate since our gaze is made out of irreducible parts of seen and unseen worlds.

Harald Sohlberg; The painting is indeterminate however, since the melancholy that it inspires consists of the presence of an “other” internal world, one out there world, the inscrutable mind of the viewer that is revealed. The painting is indeterminate since our gaze is made out of irreducible parts of seen and unseen worlds.

In contrast to this dynamic, the sense of this architectural situation, marks the tension between the textual space of the reader and the spatiality of the viewer. The viewer is much like the man of 1797’s part.
Inverting program; The Depository and Media Management facilities are accommodated in a single, new element over the existing Public Library (Asplund’s Library and Annexes) with direct access from remodeled existing lifts. This efficiently solves the vertical and horizontal circulation of book storage and transport in a refurbishment of existing premises without significant disruption. Further, the existing, highly valued buildings are available for maximum public use, free of onerous storage and services.

Contemporary Arrival; Asplund’s Library entry is essential in the ideational and spatial experience - a single ascent through darkness to the inner light of the drum. Stockholm Library needs a complimentary entry sequence, in terms of both experience and idea. To engage with the contemporary city, the Library must open itself to the city. Multiple arrival opportunities – from park, train station, shopping centre or street – are gathered within a vibrant subterranean space which is also highly visible from the passing train and thus “announced” and anticipated within the larger railway system throughout the city. Movement in Asplund’s Library is in and up. The new movement is in and down inviting exploration of Stockholm’s mystical underworld.

If architecture is to be understood as spatial and relational then this proposal draws relations between three spatial figures – the textual inner space of Asplund’s dome, the cosmic externalizing gaze of the observatory telescope, and the sublime space of the contemporary underground – a triptych that extends Asplund’s Library as both spatial idea and material object. This is a temporal response in the sense that Asplund’s library, constructed in the previous millennium, is re-grounded in its current, cosmopolitan city. By establishing a conceptual relationship between three architectural figures, the original artifact is re-valued, re-instated, and re-placed without significant material alteration.