Christopher Clarkson
4850106

Reflection:

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

The graduation project addresses the architectural field by problematising two fundamental issues relevant to the practice, namely: the surface, and the measure. I believe the surface to be an ontological starting point for our conception of space itself, and therefore a crucial element which deserves far more attention than we commonly give it in architectural practice. The measure is commonly derived from surface to surface distances, and relies on a belief that things remain the same over time. Once we acknowledge that the surface is constantly shifting and changing, we must accept that any measurement we take is an approximation, and is necessarily imprecise. As such it underpins a distinction between the drawing of the Architect, versus the built material edifice. These problems are also of utmost importance regarding the idea of border and territory, as well as the 'New Silk Road' which relies on safe and reliable navigation of cargo along slippery waters of unfathomable depths. In our consumer-capitalist times, the ability to reliably and quickly, and safely deliver goods across the globe's waters is essential for many economies. This is all achieved by entering a negotiation of coordinate systems and depth measures in contrast to the ever-changing behaviour of the water's surface.

2. How did your research influence your design/recommendations and how did the design/recommendations influence your research?

Through analogue experimentation leading up to the design proposal, a number of things became evident that fascinated me, the first of which was the idea of the frame as an analogy to the surface when composing an image. Secondly, the error, or accident when engaging with something like a type-writer, or darkroom print, became an essential thematic for the research thesis, and later also the design which addresses and embraces mismeasure itself and introduces the qualitative measure as a counter argument. In trying to determine a site, the cartesian grid of the coordinate system fascinated me as a part of not only the boat's navigation on the water, but also of a kind of global measure which has shifted over the years and so the research has informed also an understanding of the work's context.

3. How do you assess the value of your way of working (your approach, your used methods, used methodology)?

The value of my method lies in the capacity to see and embrace the chance encounters with the material world, rather than to doggedly pursue some abstract perfection which in my opinion does not really exist. It is in the marginal error, and imprecision of the world that it gains its aesthetic value, and allows for unanticipated use function. Photography I believe an excellent tool for site analysis, due to its subjective reading, and fundamentally due to its framing abilities – 'What gets put in, what gets left out?' Becomes the essential question that informs observation and later also the design procedure itself. The method requires a consistent ability to evaluate what the intention is, and what the outcome generates that was unforeseen, and a willingness to follow that.

4. How do you assess the academic and societal value, scope and implication of your graduation project, including ethical aspects?

The project's academic value is in its problematisation of the surface and the measure – I believe it also introduces new means to engage with academia itself, by using the arts to address the slippage of meaning, and the fact that no paper will capture any one truth, nor will it be perfectly understood by any one person. Just as the centimetre is an abstract yet precise measure between two surfaces that can never truly explain or capture the space that is generated, nor can an academic paper which addresses the phenomenon directly explain or reduce such a disjunction to a logical conclusion that can then be forgotten.

5. How do you assess the value of the transferability of your project results?

The project is at its outset designed with a conception of sitelessness – engaging with the relation between abstract systems of measure and real conditions, the project implies a changed understanding of the measure itself, so fundamental that it is relevant to the entire globe. Until architecture is not measured, and not conceived of surfaces that enclose volumes and generate space, this project's implications are highly transferable, if only as a way of thinking, to any architectural project.

6. In what way(s) is the project a critique on current architectural practice and education?

The project is loaded with irony and subversion of the systems it critiques. For example, programmatically, the structures make literal the abstract coordinate points of the pacific ocean – it is impossible to have the structure float exactly at this point and so they are necessarily in the 'wrong place.' Furthermore, by using coordinates from multiple maps, the same coordinate begins to appear in multiple positions as a disruptive instrument of navigation that begins to misdirect.

The drawings subvert the very notion of the section, plan etc. by introducing the idea of the frame, filled with paradoxical information that challenges what you think you're looking at. It also introduces the contradiction of CAD as a precision tool, used to trace the hand-sketched design proposals, rendering them at times unbuildable, yet highly precise.

Engaging with the fact that the project is *not real* and rather an exercise in education, existing purely on paper or the screen, the requirements requested by the university to qualify me as an 'architect' are also challenged by questioning the idea of the architectural drawing, the cross section being always perpendicular, or the notion that a model is a scale representation, when in fact it is a 1:1 object in reality- in this case presented as a helmet and experiential device that offers tacit knowledge rather than representational, or metaphoric information about an imaginary work.

7. In a world that is governed by systems of measure that are largely enabling systems (global trade, economy, sustenance of nations etc.), why challenge or disrupt them?

In a world that is highly controlled and rigid in its political, economic, and temporal measures, there is little to no escape from a system that positions you somewhere, at a particular time, for a particular purpose. As a result, we also have effectively lost the ability to get lost, and to generate myths of things we think we saw but can never quite confirm (monsters at sea, or phantom islands). A lot of the loss of these things is due to our incessant mapping and fixation on the positioning of any one thing in relation to other things – a kind of fetishisation of precision and efficiency.

In response to this, it is one option to make stories, construct new myths, but they cannot function properly within the cultural framework that we currently operate in. The measure kills them as 'just stories' or make-belief, and they are not granted the weight of a potential truth. The second option, what this project attempts to do, is to embrace the specific cultural phenomenon we currently experience of the measure, and question if this itself is not in fact mythical and imaginary, much like the monsters in the sea of the Carta Marina of 1527. Indeed the coordinate line of 5 degrees north is not tangible or even observable, but at the same time (fantastically) it cannot be denied. As a result, the project seeks not to refute the system of measure that we have, but more to point out that these cardinal points are as bizarre, absurd, and indeed, mythological as the loch ness monster itself. By manifesting them physically, the strangeness of our contemporary myth of measure

is realised and celebrated – one is once again able to get lost, so long as you consider the GPS coordinate location for what it truly is, a fabrication.