
11519

ARCHITECTURAL DESIGN: ACTIVISM STUDIO

SEMESTER: Spring 2010
CREDIT POINTS: 12pts
PRE-REQUISITIES: Enrolment in M.Arch
SUBJECT MODE(S): 6 contact hours per week in 2 x 3hour studio sessions
SUBJECT COORD: Adrian Lahoud
SUBJECT OFFERED BY: Master of Architecture

Teaching Staff

LECTURER

Gerard Reinmuth
Phone: 02 92792226, email: reinmuth@terroir.com.au
Office: Suite 802, L8, 32 York Street

ASSISTING

Tamara Donnellan
Phone: 02 92792226, email: donnellan@terroir.com.au
Office: Suite 802, L8, 32 York Street

Subject Description

Refer to Subject Outline document available on UTS Online.

Subject Objectives

These are noted on the Subject Outline document available on UTS Online and are repeated below for your information:

By the end of this subject the students would be able to achieve the following:

1. Undertake primary and/or secondary research in architectural activism and apply this research to initiating a specific set of targeted activities.
2. Formulate and perform an expanded role for architects through project-based speculations and other activities.
3. Understand the specificity of creative process in relationship to research undertakings and methodologies.
4. Use the design process itself as a research tool for understanding and refining the design ambitions and research questions towards writing a brief.
5. Demonstrate expertise in the distinct sub-discipline of socially-responsive architecture and an ability to transfer that expertise creatively and appropriately in resolved design proposals.
6. Articulate and to put into practice through architectural design proposals a defensible position vis-à-vis contemporary urban design and architecture.
7. Present complete and relevant findings of a professional quality in a public setting such as open juries, exhibition and/or published work.

Assessment tasks

Assessment	Weighting	Description	Related Subject Objectives	Additional Comments
Assessment 1A		Research Phase	1,2	Group Work Due 6 th August
Assessment 1B		Research Phase	2,3	Group Work Due 10 th August
Assessment 1C	30 (A/B/C)	Research Phase	3,4	Individual Work Due 20 th August
Assessment 2	40	Project Development	2,3,4,5,6	Individual Work Due 21 st September
Assessment 3	30	Exposition	4, 5,6,7	Individual Work Due 17 th November

The Contextual Surface and the Tickling Object¹

¹Recall the great projects of public buildings in the Soviet Union of the 30s, which put on the top of a flat multi-story office building a gigantic statue of the idealized New Man or a couple: in the span of a couple of years, the tendency to flatten more and more the office building (the actual working place for the living people) became clearly discernible, so that it changed more and more into a mere pedestal for the larger-than-life statue. Does this external, material feature of architectural design not render visible the "truth" of the Stalinist ideology in which actual, living people are reduced to instruments, sacrificed as the pedestal for the specter of the future New Man, an ideological monster which crushes under his feet actual living men?

The paradox is that were anyone in the Soviet Union of the 30s to say openly that the vision of the Socialist New Man was an ideological monster squashing actual people, they would have been immediately arrested - it was, however, allowed, encouraged even, to make this point via architectural design²

INTRODUCTION

Architecture in our globalised world

Zizek's quote is a beautiful meditation on the potential of architecture to make explicit ideas that cannot be accessed via other methods. However, the idea of a cohesive culture upon which Zizek's example has been based has become uncertain - in the sense that in our globally interconnected reality, the very idea of culture as a stable, shared condition is fundamentally questionable³. Culture - for those that are internet-connected and able to take advantage of jet travel - is a radically transformed condition and can now be individually constructed according to constellations of Facebook friends, Skype contacts and Twitter followers⁴. What your neighbour does in these conditions can often be simply a coincidence of geography and may mean very little in terms of your own cultural context.⁵

Given this, culture might now be understood as constellational and personal. However, it then follows that culture 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 none the less unique⁶. These conditions provoke serious questions of architecture.⁷

The Specificity of the Architectural Project and the Tickling Object

We contest that the constellational and variable nature of communal systems today requires architecture to engage us by means of personal experience, rather than in symbolic terms as illustrated by Zizek's example. In this context, the difference between the subject (the person) and the object (the building) can be described in the difference between two verbs: to subject oneself and to object.⁸ Describing the difference in this way establishes that the object (the building) is not a mute and passive actor - rather, the object acts. If we understand the architectural moment as that in which object (the building) acts on the subject (the occupant), we can say, in Žižekian terms, that the object tickles the subject.⁹

¹ For further detail on these concepts see Blythe, R. (2009). *A Terroir of terroir (or, a brief history of design-places)*. Architecture and Design. Melbourne, RMIT. Doctor of Philosophy.

² Žižek, Parallax Conference Paper, Melbourne, 2009

³ We first starting addressing these issues directly as a result of the Cosmopolitanism and Place conference held at UTS in 2005.

⁴ TERROIR's first book is called *Cosmopolitan Ground* in direct response to these issues. These concepts are addressed in many of the texts.

⁵ Blythe, R. (2009). *A Terroir of terroir (or, a brief history of design-places)*. Architecture and Design. Melbourne, RMIT. Doctor of Philosophy, pg 53

⁶ The architecture conference *Parallax*, directed by TERROIR in 2009, was structured specifically to address these issues.

⁷ Blythe, R. (2009). *A Terroir of terroir (or, a brief history of design-places)*. Architecture and Design. Melbourne, RMIT. Doctor of Philosophy, pg 55

⁸ Žižek, *The Parallax View*, p 17.

⁹ 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.

The architectural question then is how to do the tickling? How can architecture burst into our experiencing of the world other than as a simple material engagement?¹⁰

Our view is that this tickling occurs in three ways. Firstly, there is the direct experience of the object (phenomenological). Secondly, there is the way that this direct experience is registered in psychological terms. These two effects are of course related and interdependent. Finally, there is the way in which these experiences of the building might have a political effect. The result is a dynamic sociospatial model in which the personal, the social, and the political operate in constellational ways and in which the physical and material world is complicit.

¹⁰ Much of this thinking has been developed in conversation with Marcello Stamm, leading to the idea of the inner-outer as both a design space and physical space via which we may achieve architecture that works in this way.

THE CONTEXTUAL SURFACE

Transcendence vs Immanence

Despite the complexities of working in our contemporary condition, architects often choose only to answer a simplified version of the questions a problem might pose, lacking as they do a means to address this complexity. Further, in contemporary architecture culture, we often see projects reduced to a banal, single image "concept" such as a wave, piece of coral, mountain, or cloud. Simplified diagramming practices currently dominating architectural discourse reinforce the idea that architecture can emerge from simple, logical steps, while the increased use of digital design tools has also exacerbated the tendency to deploy a unified organizational system across a whole project. In the case of the digital projects, formal complexity often conceals conceptual simplicity.

Underpinning this situation is the idea of transcendence - that a form or force, often bought to the project by the architect, has an inherent usefulness or even moral rightness regardless of that project's conditions. This studio will counter this idea of transcendence with that of immanence - that is the idea that the process of a project's production is contained within the project itself¹¹. We will suggest how a project might be approached so that it develops an internal consistency and thus a system for decision-making which evolves continually in response to the circumstances in play¹². In short, we are going to explore the idea of designing as an ethical endeavour¹³.

The Contextual Surface

The tool we use in order to generate this internal consistency for each project is what we call the *contextual surface*. In TERROIR, this is often referred to as a machine (in Deleuze's terms, an abstract machine) which is constructed anew for each project and which provides a mechanism for making the various prioritizations and negotiations particular to it and where the project itself is understood as a constellation of coincident interests (developer, end user, public). Each new project results in a contextual surface unique to it, such that attempts to discern enduring ethical foundations across projects are thwarted by the very fact that each project challenges our own positions and to some extent re-forges how we see the world.¹⁴

The method we use in order to test the veracity of the conceptual surface is design. That is, all speculations and propositions should be put to work in the design process. Thus, while there is a high value placed on argument in this studio, it is an argument that occurs only with and around material (models, drawings etc) generated as part of the argument and which is done with the intent of informing the architectural project which is the subject of the studio¹⁵.

¹¹ This idea of transcendence versus imminence came to us through a commentary from Adrian Lahoud, Senior Lecturer at the University of Technology Sydney (UTS), in response to this and other similar papers.

¹² Balmforth, Scott and Reinmuth, Gerard, editors. *TERROIR: Cosmopolitan Ground*. UTS, Sydney. 2007. This book provides perhaps the best insight into this approach via the form of representation of each project in the context of its own contextual surface.

¹³ Blythe, R. (2009). *A Terroir of terroir (or, a brief history of design-places)*. *Architecture and Design*. Melbourne, RMIT. Doctor of Philosophy.

¹⁴ Blythe, R. (2009). *A Terroir of terroir (or, a brief history of design-places)*. *Architecture and Design*. Melbourne, RMIT. Doctor of Philosophy. Discussed initially as "design place", the idea of the contextual surface has been further developed by TERROIR through a series of projects and studios.

¹⁵ In addition to using this working method in the office, TERROIR also explores these ideas further via teaching. The most significant of these to date is the masterclass "The Inner-Outer and the Tickling Object" held in April 2010 at Arkitektskolen Aarhus, Denmark. These ideas will be further explored at an International Studio held at that school in late 2010 and this masterclass.

STUDIO PHILOSOPHY

We may note one peculiar feature of philosophy. If someone asks the question what is mathematics, we can give him a dictionary definition, let us say the science of number, for the sake of argument. As far as it goes this is an uncontroversial statement... Definitions may be given in this way of any field where a body of definite knowledge exists. But philosophy cannot be so defined. Any definition is controversial and already embodies a philosophic attitude. The only way to find out what philosophy is, is to do philosophy. Bertrand Russell, *The Wisdom of the West*

This is not a practice-led studio in the sense that it is often understood, where students are taught a series of techniques common to (in this case) TERROIR and are assessed on their ability to work within this frame. Rather, all of us – tutors and students – will be united in an enquiry around a specific design problem in the design studio. Assessment will be based on the veracity of each proposition and the ability of this proposition to engage with this group of peers who have all explored the same problem and understand its particular difficulties. It is important to understand that we are not in search of an “answer”. Rather, the best we can hope for is the ability to pose better questions. It is the veracity of the proposition itself which is the measure.

In this sense, the studio has in itself a basis in philosophy. This is not to suggest that the studio will require extensive research in philosophy as a field of knowledge nor will we pretend to build special expertise in this field – rather philosophy can be defined in its purest sense as contested ground, an open enquiry or an open project. This studio, as in any philosophical enquiry, will unfold as a result of investigation of questions about the project itself.

Ethics and Selection

In understanding design as an ethical endeavour, we mean a process which examines the many contexts at play in a situation and our attempts to organize these contexts into in an “ethical set” or a system of rules which are adopted in order to deliver a project. The particular questions we address in a project are not posed at the outset but emerge during the exploration of multiple contexts and in response to what is discovered. These discoveries form a set which becomes the contextual surface.

The method via which the project is then developed is commonly called “normative ethics” or prescriptive ethics. Underlying this creation of the ethical set is the question, why should this building exist, or what issues should this building respond to? These questions are answered as a consequence of an examination of the problem at hand and in the context of the fleeting, transient, contingent, qualified approximations about the project that we contribute. Rather than being absolute and particular to a project at a point in time, they are a particular view at a particular point in time – a sort of definite reference point but which cannot be carried somewhere else. We argue that it is this temporal specificity that gives value over an extended period and where our project is fundamentally different to the modernist project.

The process of establishing a contextual surface is ethical in the sense of there being a dependant relationship between this surface and the object being designed. Secondly, the problem of selection in designing is an ethical one in that it reveals the human and subjective nature of designing, thus showing us in a non-theological way something of human nature. A third ethical strand deals with the way in which both the process of designing and the designed object might be understood to increase modes of relation and to find new value in the multiple other.

THE PROJECT

The project is the design of the 1.7km long boundary condition at Villawood Detention Centre.

Within this boundary, you need to:

1. Accommodate 3 detention types (see below) and a security fence condition; while responding to
2. 3 contexts (suburban, industrial, landscape)

There is currently a real masterplanning and redevelopment project underway at Villawood which involves a comprehensive upgrade, including the three accommodation types to be included in our boundary condition. We will refer to this work as part of the familiarization phase of this studio but it will have no bearing on your work beyond this initial study.



BRIEF: Accommodation types to be contained within the wall

Your 1.7km long boundary is to include three accommodation types which accord with the classification of detainees at Villawood Detention Centre. These types are outlined below.

The descriptions of the three types are compiled from information and reports prepared by the Department of Immigration and Citizenship (including the Department's website <http://www.immi.gov.au/managing-australias-borders/detention/> and specifically Submission 1 Villawood Immigration Facility Redevelopment Statement of Evidence to the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Public Works, August 2009)..

HRA (including HCOS): High Risk Accommodation (and High Care and Observation Suites)

What?

High security accommodation for at least 24 high security risk detainees, as well as a minimum of a further 6 detainees requiring high care and observation, including kitchenette, laundry and recreation facilities.

Who?

HRA - People determined to be of high risk to the community assessed on a case by case basis – usually single males, people who have been released from time in a correction facility and therefore sent to VIDC on character grounds awaiting removal from Australia upon cancellation of their visa.

HCOS - clients whose risk rate is high, but who are having torture and trauma problems, required to be monitored

Security?

High security including active risk management of clients

GFA: General Flexible Accommodation

What?

Flexible use accommodation for a minimum of 60 detainees (including bedrooms, bathrooms, local living rooms and outdoor recreation areas) to provide flexibility:

- to allow for changes in numbers and risk profiles of people in detention;
- to separate conflicting groups of people in detention;
- to respond quickly to changes in numbers of people in detention;
- to separate short and longer term residents;
- to moderate the security levels to make alternative use of any of the areas;
- to maintain separation between incompatible demographic groups; and
- to cope with surge capacity situations that may occur from referrals from other IDCs or unforeseen fluctuations in compliance activity.

Who?

The VIDC provides accommodation for a wide range of people who require different levels of supervision and management, including visa overstayers, visa cancellations and entry refusals. GFA would accommodate both high risk detainees as well as low-risk detainees during surge events.

Security?

This accommodation needs to be re-configurable to enable different categories of people in detention (male, female, etc) to be accommodated separately and safely, and the ability to add security layers as necessary.

IRH: Immigration Residential Housing

What?

A flexible detention arrangement to enable people in immigration detention to live in family-style accommodation in a community setting, while still formally being detained. This is a more domestic environment which permits a greater degree of autonomy. They are able to cook their own food and undertake regular trips to other locations for shopping and recreation under the supervision of the Detention Service Provider.

The Sydney IRH (established in 2006) is located adjacent to the Villawood Immigration Detention Centre, and comprises single storey dwellings capable of accommodating different family compositions. There are four duplex houses (eight units) each consisting of three bedrooms, two bathrooms, kitchen and two living/dining areas. Each duplex is fully self-contained to enable independent living. The backyards of the houses are integrated as a single large landscaped area. The layout of the duplexes maximises the amount of privacy for people in immigration residential housing. Each duplex is fully self-contained to enable independent living. Small outdoor areas adjacent to each house allow a level of privacy without interfering with security. One home is configured to accommodate people with disabilities.

An additional building is provided for communal use and also for administration purposes. Provision is made for people to access the recreation and educational facilities of the surrounding areas.

Who?

People who are detained are eligible to voluntarily participate in immigration residential housing (IRH) depending on:

- places being available
- health and character checks
- an assessment verifying the detainee is not likely to abscond
- any operational issues particular to the person in immigration detention or affecting the smooth management of the IRH.

IRH is mainly for short-term stays of low-risk groups including families/children eg refused entry upon air arrival, pending broader community placement.

Sydney Immigration Residential Housing has an operating capacity of eight family groupings, or 24 individuals with the ability to expand by a further 24.

Security?

Security is modern and unobtrusive and the facility is surrounded by a typical suburban fence. Less intrusive security measures than IDCs.

The "Fence":

General security measures:

- Site boundary secured by monitored perimeter building elements, walls and fences with designated controlled entry/exit points;
- Effective illumination levels and positioning of internal, perimeter and external lighting;
- Careful placement of landscaping to allow clear lines of sight;
- Segregation of clients according to risk profile;
- Use of tamper resistant materials, fixtures, hardware and fittings throughout the centre;
- Restricted and monitored building entrances, including electronic access control systems with key override;
- Installation of electronic security including duress alarms, intruder detection alarms, closed circuit television (CCTV), paging and intercommunications systems; and
- Contraband detection systems.

Security approach:

- to ensure the safety and security of both personnel and clients, without creating the restrictive feel of a correctional environment.
- use the positioning of the buildings themselves to be managing aspects of the security so that the need for fencing all over the place is less of a requirement, to have the new construction, by its very construction, forming part of the security for the whole precinct.
- Innovative containment measures to avoid the present correctional-style of containment which is inappropriate in a facility designed for administrative detention and is not punitive in nature.
- Security at the existing facility is a mixture of chainmesh and palisade fencing, razor wire, electronic detection and deterrence, and the presence of security personnel. The existing security apparatus does not meet the standard of modern surveillance and protective equipment now available and is neither efficient nor cost effective. This results in higher human resource expenditure to achieve the required levels of security and movement throughout the facility.

ASSIGNMENT 1, 30% of semester

Assignment 1 is in 3 parts.

ASSIGNMENT 1 (PART A)

Group Research: Starting the contextual surface

Students will be asked to divide into groups of 3 who will each approach the problem according to one realm of enquiry. These separate modes of enquiry will be resolved at the start of semester but may include:

1. Physical Site Issues: Climate and environmental issues, landscape form, built form
2. An analysis of the current urban context
3. Site history and development, including role of Villawood as a portal for refugees and its effect on the surrounding suburbs;
4. Australia's current Refugee Policy, Villawood occupants
5. International Comparisons and Precedents for Detention Centre accommodation

Each group will then be asked to present the arguments/ambitions for the project from within the perspective of these limited forms of investigation. The format for the report will be as follows:

- An A3 report in the Indesign template provided containing text and images of models created
- Box-board or timber models which are not representative but projective in nature

ASSIGNMENT 1 (PART B)

Group Research: Disciplinary Knowledge and Precedent

Students will be asked to divide into *different* groups of 3 to assignment 1a, to enable a level of cross-over and cross-fertilisation of ideas. In this group, students will be asked to study exemplary precedents which may form part of the contextual surface for the developing project. The give groups of precedents are as follows:

1. Urban Types (Royal Crescent, Bath and the Copenhagen Perimeter block)
2. Ralph Erskine, Byker Wall
3. Joern Utzon (Kingo Houses and Fredensborg Houses)
4. Steven Holl (Fukuoka Housing, Japan and MIT Student Housing)
5. BIG, 8 house, The Mountain, Kløvermarken park

In each case, students are to study the precedent and give a presentation on it, addressing the social and/or cultural ambitions of the project and how these ambitions are manifest in the overall planning, detailed arrangement and formal expression. Presentation should be in an A3 document according to the Indesign format provided, and containing the following:

- Plans and sections of the projects at varying scales of 1:5000, 1:1000, 1:200 and 1:50;
- Commentary on the drawings and how they reveal key decisions integral to the project
- Models in box-board or plywood which make propositions about how the key lessons from these precedents might be deployed on the project site.

ASSIGNMENT 1 (PART C)

Individual Research: Building the contextual surface

Students will then be asked to extend this initial research individually. Via the use of a design research method – that is, exploring the problem via formal and spatial explorations that simultaneously ask questions of the material provided and which are projective in nature. This work should be presented in drawings and models which do two things:

- Utilize knowledge from the first 2 parts of the assignment;
- Introduces new information, references or precedents in response to your own perspective on the material collected to date.

ASSIGNMENT 2, 40% of semester

Assignment 2 requires development of the initial research exercises in a substantive way such that assignment 3 (exposition) is possible. The program for this assignment will be as follows:

Tuesday, August 24 Initial development of your initial propositions from assignment 1C

Tuesday, August 31 Continued development

Tuesday, September 7 and Friday, September 10

Students will be divided into two groups on these days for separate crits via Skype with Gerard and with Tamara on the studio. These crits involve no assessment but should be treated as significant and focused sessions where key questions can be addressed. For these sessions, students will need to email PDF files, in the provided Indesign format, to Gerard before the critique. These PDF files should contain:

- 1C work
- Current drawings of the scheme
- Images of current models

Tuesday, September 14 Pre-presentation quality material

Tuesday, September 21 CRIT*

*For the Crit, students need to present information which demonstrates that course objectives have been met, as follows. All material should be presented on vertically formatted A1 sheets, with a minimum of one sheet for each of the 5 dot points below (models are additional to the sheets):

- *Text and diagrams which demonstrate* how your project is evidence of the formulation of an expanded role for architects through a project-based speculation;
- *Text and diagrams which demonstrate that you have understood* the specificity of creative process in relationship to research undertakings and methodologies;
- *Text and diagrams which demonstrate how you have used the design process itself* as a research tool for understanding and refining the design ambitions and research questions towards writing a brief;
- *Drawings and models which demonstrate expertise* in the distinct sub-discipline of socially-responsive architecture and an ability to transfer that expertise creatively and appropriately in resolved design proposals;
- *Drawings and models* which articulate and to put into practice through architectural design proposals a defensible position vis-à-vis contemporary urban design and architecture.

ASSIGNMENT 3, 30% of semester

Assignment 3 sees the exposition of the project.

For this assignment the resolution of the project itself becomes the focus and the decisions made become ever-more specific as the requirements of program distribution, organization, material and finishes selections and detailing are considered. In each case, the decisions made should be explainable in the context of the contextual surface and/or the adjustment of this contextual surface as these tasks tested it further and led to new questions and propositions.

This is the final development of the project, leading to completion and the final presentation. The final presentation materials should include the contextual surface as a clearly defined part of the material. All material should be presented on vertically formatted A1 sheets (models and the contextual surface representation are additional to the sheets) and respond to the course objectives as follows:

- *Text and diagrams which demonstrate how you have used the design process itself as a research tool for understanding and refining the design ambitions and research questions towards writing a brief;*
- *Drawings and models which demonstrate expertise in the distinct sub-discipline of socially-responsive architecture and an ability to transfer that expertise creatively and appropriately in resolved design proposals;*
- *Drawings and models which articulate and to put into practice through architectural design proposals a defensible position vis-à-vis contemporary urban design and architecture;*
- *The above, with the associated critique, constitutes a presentation of your findings of a professional quality in a public setting such as open juries, exhibition and/or published work.*

Program

See below a week-by-week outline of the subject including teaching roster.

Week	Session 1	Tasks	Session 2	Tasks	Teaching
1	Tues July 20	Introduction Lect: Project Intro Lect: Context. Surface	Fri July 23	Lect: R Goodwin Ass 1A/1B Sunday 25 th - SITE	GR/TD
2	Tues July 27	Lect: A Benjamin Ass 1A/1B	Fri July 30	Ass A1/1B	GR/TD
3	Tues Aug 3	Ass 1A/1B	Fri Aug 6	CRIT 1, Ass 1A	GR/TD
4	Tues Aug 10	CRIT 2, Ass 1B	Fri Aug 13	1C	GR/TD
5	Tues Aug 17	CRIT 3 Ass 1C	Fri Aug 20	Assignment 1-2 transition	GR/TD
6	Tues Aug 24	Ass 2	Fri Aug 27	NO CLASS	TD
7	Tues Aug 31	Ass 2	Fri Sept 3	NO CLASS	TD
8	Tues Sept 7	CRIT 4a	Fri Sept 10	CRIT 4b	TD (GR skype)
9	Tues Sept 14	Ass 2	Fri Sept 17	NO CLASS	TD
10	Tues Sept 21	CRIT 5 Ass 2	Fri Sept 24	Assignment 2-3 transition	TD (GR skype)
	Tues Sept 28	BREAK	Fri Oct 1	BREAK	
	Tues Oct 5	BREAK	Fri Oct 8	BREAK	
	Tues Oct 12	BREAK	Fri Oct 15	BREAK	
11	Tues Oct 19	Ass 3	Fri Oct 22	Ass 3	TD
12	Tues Oct 26	CRIT 6a	Fri Oct 29	CRIT 6b	TD (GR skype)
13	Tues Nov 2	Ass 3	Fri Nov 5	Ass 3	GR
14	Tues Nov 9	Ass 3	Fri Nov 12	Ass 3	GR
15	Wed Nov 17	FINAL CRIT			GR/TD

Key

	Tutorial
	Interim Crit
	Formal Crit for Assessment
	No Class/Break

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Benjamin, Andrew. *Refugees, Cosmopolitanism and the Place of Citizenship.* USyd, 2002.

This key text works through fundamental issues such as boundaries and the place of citizenship.

Blythe, Richard. *RMIT PhD Thesis,* RMIT, (Melbourne), 2007.

This thesis gives key insights into the role of place, placement and spatial strategies in the work of TERROIR.

de Sola-Morales, Ignasi. *Differences - Topographies of Contemporary Architecture,*

MIT Press (Barcelona), 1995.

A book which includes a chapter on "weak architecture." and the role of judgement as opposed to processes in architectural design.

Fisher, Philip. *Wonder, The Rainbow and the Aesthetics of Rare Experiences,* Harvard

University Press, 2003.

A reflection on the concept of wonder and the power of this experience for visitors and viewers of contemporary art and architecture.

Moneo, Rafael. *Theoretical Anxieties and Design Strategy,* The MIT Press (Cambridge,

MA), 2005.

A brilliant survey of Moneo's contemporaries and their work.

Reinmuth, Gerard and Balmforth, Scott (Ed). *Statens Naturhistoriske Museum: Contextual Surface,*

TERROIR (Sydney), 2009.

A Contextual Surface created by TERROIR.

Reinmuth, Gerard and Balmforth, Scott (Ed). *Prague Library: Contextual Surface,* TERROIR (Sydney), 2006.

A Contextual Surface created by TERROIR.

Reinmuth, Gerard and Balmforth, Scott (Ed). *Cosmopolitan Ground,* DAB Documents,

(Sydney), 2007.

The first monograph on TERROIR.

Reinmuth, Gerard and Balmforth, Scott. *RMIT Masters Thesis,* RMIT,

(Melbourne), 2007.

PhD and Masters Research by TERROIR.

van Schaik, Leon. *Spatial Intelligence: New Futures for Architecture,* AD Primers, London,, 2009.

A key work on understanding architectural intelligence.

Zaera-Polo, Alejandro. *The Politics of the Envelope: A political critique of materialism.* Volume 17,

Rotterdam, 2008

A key text from the last few years which discusses the role of the architectural surface in political terms.

Zizek, Slavoj. *Parallax Conference Paper,* Melbourne, 2009.

A conference paper from Slavoj Zizek for TERROIR's conference, Parallax, held in Melbourne in 2009.