

Graduation Plan

Master of Science Architecture, Urbanism & Building Sciences



Graduation Plan: All tracks

Submit your Graduation Plan to the Board of Examiners (Examencommissie-BK@tudelft.nl), Mentors and Delegate of the Board of Examiners one week before P2 at the latest.

The graduation plan consists of at least the following data/segments:

Personal information	
Name	Dominik Stoschek
Student number	5234379

Studio		
Name / Theme	Explore Lab 34	
Main mentor	Prof.dr. Georg Vrachliotis	Architecture
Second mentor	Ir. Hubert van der Meel	Building technology
Argumentation of choice of the studio	Explore Lab is the only studio where you can research your very own, personal choice of topic which can't be implemented into the predefined research frameworks of the other studios. My very strong personal fascination of the European Union and its interesting but also controversial built manifestations led to the decision to pursue that topic in Explore Lab. The prospect of carry out one's own research approach that exactly matches personal skills and interests has confirmed this decision.	

Graduation project	
Title of the graduation project	Dissensusland - A mobile parliament of disunity nourishing productive synergies of dissent
Goal	
Location:	Quai du Southampton, Le Havre, France
The posed problem,	At the EU-Parliament, one of the most powerful legislative institutions in Europe, deliberation and decision-making processes are stuck in an ever-turning hamster wheel designed to reach unanimous compromises. The architecture of what I call consensusland provides spaces exclusively designed for the purpose of reaching compromises and not offering room where discussions and conflicts can be discussed open-endedly. What is supposed to be a building for exchange and deliberation rather nourishes an atmosphere of complete consensus. Challenging ideas as a result of productive conflicts can't emerge in these spaces, leading automatically to a decrease in interaction. No more interaction means stasis.

research questions and	To what extent are spaces of dissent and consent spatially and iconographically reflected in the European Unions's parliamentary architecture?
design assignment in which these result.	Creating a counterpart to the existing architecture of consent of the EU-parliament which challenges its current architectural constitution and presents a different approach to decision-making processes. This building will therefore not operate on the supranational level of the EU but will be embedded on a local level aiming to involve a broad public into discussion and brainstorming processes. To be able to quickly adapt to ongoing debates and to create an overarching, connecting network, this space of dissent will be of temporary and site-independent nature, allowing to accumulate different perspectives and points of discussions from various sites. This structure is about recording and presenting the prevailing potential for dissent on a certain topic, in this case the post-Brexit debate, making moods, opinion ranges, prejudices and emotional conflicts visible and tangible in order to eventually let them confront and possibly culminate in challenging solutions and ideas

[This should be formulated in such a way that the graduation project can answer these questions.
The definition of the problem has to be significant to a clearly defined area of research and design.]

Process

Method description

Research process:

To research about an architectural grammar of dissent in the EU’s parliamentary architecture, I will execute an iconographic examination of publicly available visual content from Social Media networks which are then linked to an architectural examination of their spatial constitution. This process will be divided into three main stages: Systematically collecting and mapping visual content (quantitative part), analyzing the architectural constitution of both buildings on the base of the decision-making process of the EU parliament, interpreting the relation of the spatial constitution and its iconographic aspects according to predefined examination criteria (qualitative part) together with visualizing the results. From these findings, I will draw guidelines helping me to implement spaces of dissent in the design project.

Design Process:

Together with an analysis of various case studies, which have a participatory and open-ended approach implemented, such as Cedric Price’s Fun Palace, these guidelines will form the main framework for the design. During the process, the different stages of production of dissent (accumulating, visualizing, confronting) will

first need to be systematically formulated and arranged in order to come up with a process that allows for the creation of dissent. After that, these processes have to be converted into actual spatial arrangements and sequences of various installations and facilities. Therefore, the main focus of the design is the inherent process of dissent. Eventually these sequences have to be brought together in one overarching building structure that serves not only as a connecting element for what's happening inside but also as an attractive representative and symbolic structure towards the outside. To adapt quickly to ongoing debates and conflicts, the structure will be of temporary and site-independent nature, which will be a guiding design parameter, especially for the choice of the structural system.

Literature and general practical preference

Research:

Hein, C. (2004) *The capital of Europe: Architecture and urban planning for the European Union. (Perspectives on the twentieth century)*. Westport, Connecticut: Praeger.

Mourier, P.-F. (1999) *Le Parlement Européen à Strasbourg: = The European Parliament in Strasbourg = Das Europäische Parlament in Straßburg*. Besançon: Ed. de l'Imprimeur.

Société Espace Léopold (2008) *Espace Léopold - The European Parliament*.

Narrative:

Mouffe, C. (2013) *Agonistics: Thinking the world politically*. London: Verso.

European Commission (2014) *The mind and body of Europe: A new narrative*. Brussels.

Miessen, M. (2011) *The nightmare of participation: Crossbench praxis as a mode of criticality*. Berlin: Sternberg Pr.

Rancière, J. and Corcoran, S. (eds.) (2013) *Dissensus: On politics and aesthetics*. London: Bloomsbury.

Derrida, J. (1992) *The other heading: Reflections on today's Europe. (Studies in Continental thought)*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Bernholz, L., Landemore, H. and Reich, R. (eds.) (2020) *Digital technology and democratic theory*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Diez, G. and Heisenberg, E. (2020) *Power to the people: Wie wir mit Technologie die Demokratie neu erfinden*. Berlin: Hanser Berlin.

Landemore, H. (2020) *Open democracy: Reinventing popular rule for the twenty-first century*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Design:

Sennet, R. (1998) *The Spaces of Democracy: 1998 Raoul Wallenberg Lecture*: University of Michigan.

Pohl, D. (2022) 'Cedric Price's Pop-Up Parliament: A Role Model for Media Architecture and Data Politics'.

Reflection

1. What is the relation between your graduation (project) topic, the studio topic (if applicable), your master track (A,U,BT,LA,MBE), and your master programme (MSc AUBS)?

During my architecture bachelors in Germany, the notion of politics in Architecture has rarely been noticeable. It felt like this profession wants to free itself from another constraint. In the architecture master here at TU Delft, I learned that architecture cannot be perceived and practiced without taking into account all the (political) entanglements our society projects onto architecture. So, while I have become more and more interested in EU-politics, my understanding of architecture has also become more politicised in the sense that I have always tried to look at all perspectives and understand all sides in order to grasp the complexity that now lies in our politicised built environment. Caught in this dilemma, I began to see architecture not as a solution, but as a possibility that perhaps does not solve a problem but at least changes the way it is looked at. The master track helped to sharpen that look and allowed to test and further refine it within the framework of the graduation studio Explore Lab.

2. What is the relevance of your graduation work in the larger social, professional and scientific framework?

My graduation topic researches the highly ambiguous and multifaceted field of the European Union which is already per definition a complex construct. In order to create a relevant project in this field, I decided to create a narrative that confronts the existing structures and tries not only to question them critically but to think radically differently. If the ultimate goal of the EU is unity, I say that it seems more logical to celebrate our diversity and disunity. Thus, the project takes up current debates on the identity and self-understanding of the EU and offers an alternative approach to idea- and decision-making on a societal level. It offers a possibility of how the EU could represent itself and attract more people to engage in the European project.