



Delft University of Technology

The Roles of the Architect Toward a Theory of Practice

Avermaete, Tom; Teerds, Hans

Publication date
2016

Document Version
Final published version

Published in
On the Role of the Architect

Citation (APA)

Avermaete, T., & Teerds, H. (2016). The Roles of the Architect: Toward a Theory of Practice. In S. Frausto (Ed.), *On the Role of the Architect: Lexicon No 1* (pp. 7-11). The Berlage Center for Advanced Studies in Architectural and Urban Design, Faculty of Architecture and the Build Environment, Delft University of Technology.

Important note

To cite this publication, please use the final published version (if applicable).
Please check the document version above.


Copyright

Other than for strictly personal use, it is not permitted to download, forward or distribute the text or part of it, without the consent of the author(s) and/or copyright holder(s), unless the work is under an open content license such as Creative Commons.

Takedown policy

Please contact us and provide details if you believe this document breaches copyrights.
We will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

Lexicon N°1
On the Role of the Architect



Lexicon N°1

The Berlage

*Forty-two keywords
cross-referenced into
ten critical positions
in an attempt to articulate
a theory of practice in
relation to the changing
role of the architect.*

Edited by

Salomon Frausto

With an introduction by

Tom Avermaete and
Hans Teerds

With a supplement by

Jean-Louis Cohen

This book is published by
The Berlage Center for Advanced
Studies in Architecture and
Urban Design

Faculty of Architecture and
the Built Environment
Delft University of Technology

© 2016 The Berlage Center
for Advanced Studies
in Architecture and Urban
Design and Delft University of
Technology

All rights reserved. No part
of this book may be used
or reproduced in any manner
without written permission
from the publishers, except in
context of reviews.

Printed and bound in Belgium
by Graphius Group

First edition 500 copies

ISBN 978-94-6186-651-6

*Lexicon N°1: On the Role
of the Architect* is the first in
a series of publications ex-
ploring keywords relevant to
contemporary architecture
discourse. It is accompanied
by a supplement entitled
*After-words, or the Encyclo-
pedia Temptation* by Jean-
Louis Cohen.

Copy editor

Rachel J. Engler

Design

Joris Kritis

Special thanks to

Gerrie van der Beek, Annemieke
Berger, Jean-Louis Cohen, Hugo
Corbett, Klaske Havik, Amber
Leeuwenburgh, Mick Morssink,
and Thomas Weaver.

Editor's note

The succeeding pages are the
result of a seminar taught at the
Berlage in the autumn of 2015
by Tom Avermaete, Professor
of Architecture, and Hans Teerds
of the TU Delft's Chair of
Methods and Analysis. Students
sought new insights on the
relationship of architecture to
society by identifying forty-two
keywords based on recent
perspectives on how architects
practice today. Accompanying
this nomenclature are ten critical
positions on the changing role
of the architect.

—SEF

Contents

- 7 The Roles of the Architect:
Toward a Theory of Practice
*Tom Avermaete and
Hans Teerds*

Keywords

14	Accommodation	56	Ethics
16	Action	58	Expertise
18	Advocacy	60	Formal
20	Agency	62	Grassroots
22	Appropriation	64	Indeterminacy
24	Architect	66	Intervention
26	Artist	68	Intuition
28	Authorship	70	Mutual Knowledge
30	Client	72	Negotiation
32	Commodification	74	Plan
34	Community	76	Profession
36	Concept	78	Program
38	Construction	80	Public
40	Context	82	Scenario
42	Cooperation	84	Self-organization
44	Cross-disciplinary	86	Stakeholder
46	Discipline	88	Strategy
48	Do-it-yourself	90	Tactic
50	Empowering	92	Tools
52	Engineer	94	Vernacular
54	Entrepreneurship	96	Work

- 99 Critical Positions

The Roles of the Architect: Toward a Theory of Practice

Tom Avermaete and
Hans Teerds

Changing Perspectives

To claim that today's professional field of architecture is characterized by rapid transformation is to state the obvious. New techniques of communication and modeling—like 3D printing, CNC milling, modeling software, and gaming tactics, among other things—extensively affect the architect's work. Building industries are, too, impacted by these changes and themselves experience the emergence of new materials and products. Urban and architectural projects are being redefined as complete business cases: including design, financing, construction, marketing, and maintenance during the first decades of use.

Commissioners take alternative positions and roles in the building process, as do contractors. Not only do new bonds develop between developers and users, inhabitants and local governments, engineers and designers but also formerly silent parties take initiatives in the urban landscape or take the responsibility to develop projects.

Instead of being commissioned by the state or the market, urban projects are increasingly initiated as co-productive and collaborative ventures involving complex groups composed of private and public actors and, notably, citizens. Finally, there has been a noticeable shift in thinking about architecture's relation to resources. Influenced by recent reflections on circular and purpose economies, a new understanding of how architecture engages with common urban resources has developed, an understanding that redefines architecture's relation to material, spatial, natural, and social resources. All of these changes have significantly affected the architect's role within the professional field and beyond. These are changes that have consequences on the small scale of individual building project as well as on the large scale of cities, infrastructure, and landscape.

These changes not only affect the role of the architect but also surely challenge any understanding of architecture at large. What happens when contractors surpass independent architects and start to act as designers? What do architects have to offer in participative projects of local agency, when inhabitants are likely to plan, organize, develop, and design their dwelling environments themselves? Is architecture

merely the design of buildings and places, and thus opposed to both the bricolage-like state of many of the bottom-up projects and the glitz and glamour presented in the developer's renderings?

Although today's changes seem to challenge the field extensively, it would be a misconception to regard this state as a new condition. The profession of the architect has never been "stable," but has rather been characterized by a continuous transformation of its conditions and characteristics. Modernism and its aftermath have shown how easily a socially engaged understanding of architectural design can lose its depth and turn into an aesthetic idiom, meanwhile drastically altering the role of the architect. Against this background, the field is continuously urged to rethink its own premises, urged not to lose depth and too to keep a clear perspective on its relevance, aims, and tools within contemporary society. Rethinking the logos and praxis of the architect is and has been foundational to the discipline of architecture.

Sensus Communis, Forma Communis

We feel that the urge to continuously reflect upon the very profession of the architect begins with the acknowledgment that the field of architecture bears a

specific responsibility in society. The meaning of architecture, as such, has always surpassed the sheer technical design of buildings and spaces; indeed, even in its most technical appearance the responsibility of architecture reaches further than the occurrence of the single detail or building. Architecture deals with space and it delineates its boundaries. As the French thinker Henri Lefebvre has taught us, this delineation of space is not exclusive or particular to architects: all people appropriate, demarcate, and engage with space.¹ There is no such a thing as the authority of the architect in space. However, in the planning of spaces, and their very appearance, the architect not only draws the lines and limits of space but also deals with "the world and the people in it."² This is the very substance of architecture: intervening in the world and taking into account its people.

The term "world" is used here in Hannah Arendt's specific sense; per Arendt, all the interventions that turn the earth—that is, the globe, our biological

1 Henri Lefebvre, *The Production of Space* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1991), 300.

2 Hannah Arendt, "Karl Jaspers, *A Laudatio*," in Hannah Arendt, *Men in Dark Times* (San Diego/New York/London: Harcourt Brace & Company, 1995 [1968]), 79.

sphere, and nature—into a habitual environment for the human being.³ Without these interventions one might state that culture, and life on earth more generally, is not possible. These interventions mainly consist of *things*: houses, cities, infrastructures, tables, spoons, artworks, but also institutions that regulate the human community. The world delivers human life its foundational ground and delivers society its very durability. The world is there before we appear on earth and it still is there when we leave.⁴ According to Arendt, the world is therefore by definition a *common* world, shared with fellow human beings, in fact shared even with our predecessors and with future inhabitants.⁵ The treatment of this world, as we might imagine, affects all human beings. The world therefore by definition is of public interest and an object of political life. It requires a *sensus communis*. This is precisely the political dimension of architecture: as one of the human being's main instruments to intervene in the world, as a *forma communis*, it is definitionally a public issue.

3 Hannah Arendt, *The Human Condition* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1994 [1958]), 2.

4 Ibid., 52–53.

5 Ibid., 137.

This perspective immediately situates all architectural intervention—ranging from small, bottom-up initiatives in neighborhoods to vast, top-down infrastructural projects for territories, and from the first commissioning initiatives to long-term exploitation—under the high tension of a political perspective. Space is political, and intervening in space thus necessarily implies a political position. This urge to take a position is obviously not a prerogative of the architect but, as a professional intervening in space, the architect is constantly challenged to articulate his or her position.

Architects today are challenged to be proactive, to take initiative, to interact, to develop, and to respond. They are challenged to rethink spaces and imagine possibilities, to act politically and to enable the public to question spatial developments. They are, we might state, challenged to take a public role, share their knowledge of space, their imagination of possible futures, and their intuition to grasp and affect a specific site or condition.

A Community of Practice

It is clearly not only the architect who is involved in the organization and design of space. This is a task that equally a matter of inhabitants themselves, as well as

of politicians. Contractors are involved, as are local communities, committees of perseverance, and so on. Space is, simply put, a common concern. However, since architects historically have been dealing with space, with the imagination of possible futures, with initiatives of change, with interventions in the world—and the design of all of these things—they can perhaps be described as experts of spatial design. Since it is specifically this expertise that is called into question today, the field needs to understand what it actually has to offer. Architecture might be understood as the art and act of spatial design, today too often understood as the art and act of the figure of the architect.

Architecture is, like other art forms, a “social practice,” a term described by the philosopher Alasdair MacIntyre. In his use of these words, MacIntyre means that the participant in a social practice is not a stand-alone figure. “By a ‘practice,’” he writes: I am going to mean any coherent and complex form of socially established cooperative human activity through which goods internal to that form of activity are realized in the course of trying to achieve those standards of excellence which are appropriate to, and partially definitive of, that form of activity, with the result that human power to

achieve excellence, and human conceptions of the end of goods involved, are systematically extended.⁶

The established “practice” thus means that there is already both a long-developed know-how as well as certain approaches that contribute to the shared knowledge of that specific activity.

Even if these achievements from the past are challenged by the individual participant or by the entrance of other players within the field, it is a certain set of knowledge that is challenged, transformed, and appropriated. This is also the very reason that MacIntyre does not call it simply “practice,” but rather emphasizes the social character of these activities. Participating in a social practice means inserting oneself in a practice that already exists, a practice that has a history and a tradition, even if this tradition is constantly and acutely challenged by new forms of communication, methods of working, and tools of production. In other words, to participate in architecture means to deal with an established body of knowledge and to confront *and* relate to preexisting ideas about craftsmanship and perspectives upon good and bad practices and better and worse performances.

6 Alasdair MacIntyre, *After Virtue* (Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 2010), 187.

In all of this, social practices depend upon a certain community of practice that contributes to a cumulative body of knowledge.

A Theory of Practice

It is therefore that, when the field is challenged and needs to rethink its premises and approaches and reflect upon the roles that each individual architect can take, we should not look at theoretical perspectives from other fields, but rather “harvest” from the practices within the architectural field itself. Cumulative knowledge originates in everyday practices, practices in which architects develop their approaches and take specific positions on the basis of their shared knowledge. It is in these approaches and positions that architecture’s specific contribution to the world appears.

The architect’s practice is increasingly linked to the actions of multiple actors and emphasis is increasingly placed on the coproductive nature of the architectural enterprise. The urban territory and the knowledge and skills of citizens are understood as immanent sources to be unlocked, activated, and managed by the architectural project. Questions that arise from this new definition of the architectural project need further exploration. Are the impulses we detect in these projects the prefiguration of a broader new interpretation of the architectural

project? Can we in the future regard the architect’s intervention as the unlocking and management of important communal sources of skill and knowledge? And how does this relate to the body of collective knowledge and practices that is part of the discipline of architecture itself?

This lexicon—conceived and constructed—is an attempt to articulate such a “theory of practice” that is not composed on the basis of an ideal image of reality but rather theorizes from the very soil of reality itself, accepting and validating the many contingencies, ambiguities, and contradictions of everyday practice. The terms presented here are not meant to replace other forms of knowledge within the field of architecture. Rather, as Pierre Bourdieu writes more generally of a “theory of practice,” they are intended to challenge the prevalence of “objectified” and meta-theoretical knowledge in the field of architecture.⁷ As notions that begin to outline a theory of practice, the entries in this lexicon contribute to the continuous accumulation of shared and gained knowledge focused on the role of the architect.

7 Pierre Bourdieu, *Outline of a Theory of Practice* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1977), 3.