



In a time when depletion of reason is seemingly becoming a normality and a fundamental disruption of the ecosystem forecasts its proximity through abnormal climatic occurrences, the first and foremost question that comes to mind is about foundation, not only of architecture, but of society and life as a whole. The 'fundamentals' that we have been taught by our teachers, by history, and by how we have been conducting our profession as architects, are these foundations adequate? How should we learn from there, from this incredibly rich and abundant substance built up by the many cultures of this planet? How should we understand it, how should we re-read it? Which values will have to be abandoned or entirely replaced?

With our ALICE year one program we put emphasis on two notions that we esteem to be fundamental to architecture. The first is its processual nature. Architecture does not belong to a world conceived as a series of well-defined problems where architecture would form the objects to bring about solutions to those problems. Rather, architecture is always entangled in questions directly linked to our existence and therefore emergent in nature. As gestures and inventions, architecture has both cultural and technical meaning; these aspects of architecture cannot be separated as they are of one and the same nature. The things that we invent and produce to act upon the space that we live in are extensions of our body. They are in constant transformation, situated in relation to us as living individuals and societal beings, and in relation to the environment that is itself a living organism. Being alive,

we are in a perpetual state of *becoming*, as is our environment and our society. Architecture is therefore both an expression and concretization of this aspect of *becoming* that we share with all humans.

The second aspect that we stress is architecture's collective nature. Architecture is never made alone, it is a means of communicating in society and with the environment. This collective nature and the languages that pertain to architecting play a fundamental role in how we conceive of architecture itself and its role as an exteriorization of our bodies into the world (*ref.* Bernard Stiegler). Gestures – the making and the significations that emerge through these processes – form a cultural and technical language that we craft together. We make architecture together. Making is as intrinsically linked to thinking as is the will of the soul that lets a gesture take place. In our program we emphasize on the collective nature of architecture in making projects as individuals, as small groups and as one large group of people. To emphasize the importance of the collective act we have hypothesized and succeeded to think, design and build one single project with 250 people, all authors and co-authors. The most important aspect in the ALICE series of *Houses* is not their final form but rather the explorative process by the contributors and the capacity of an articulated *mise-en-espace* to support a search for new forms of living together. As such, HOUSES/GARDENS becomes a powerful research tool.

The terms that we have introduced in our first-year program as a journey into architecture are crafted around

a simple idea: they are intended to first help constitute a conception of the world, then to engage with it, and finally to help situate ourselves in it, both as an individual and collectively. The first phase MEASURES can be seen as an expanded idea of correlation and infinite proportion. We then conceive and project PLANES to act upon the world, to correlate ourselves in space and with the environment and people around us, building up supports to situate us gravitationally, and to localize articulated openness and separation. With ROOMS we are creating interiors and considering thresholds and transitions of individual or entirely collective nature. The term HOUSE then is about the organism, about the principles and structures that build up and hold together the above notions.

The present, second iteration of *Becoming* continues the investigations that we have led throughout the previous two cycles, *Visible Worlds and Inside*, and the first iteration of becoming. The first cycle, *Visible Worlds*, focused on the relation that we build up to the world in its appearances and through collective making – how we, as we act on space, communicate spatially. Projects were conceived in a collective matrix space – not as individual objects but as collective artefacts with hundreds of individual qualities. These inventions were emphasized in model space. In the second cycle, *Inside*, we have laid focus on constructing. Being inside of the processes that act upon space, our existential position is by logic one of immersion. Immersion is emphasized as a condition of being-in: in making, and quite literally, in constructing the architectures that we have

conceived and designed. As importantly, we have pushed immersion as being-in space, as a phenomenological architecture so to speak. We have accentuated *insiderness* as a collective phenomenon, both in working in large groups, and in leaving the sheltered academic environment and constructing full-scale projects in public places, and as public places, accessible to all. Each of the HOUSES is forum, a place for exchange. To mount these exchanges of ideas, gestures and built space by many souls, to scaffold these communications, we have elaborated and investigated the concept of *protostructure* – itself concretized as a physical support and supporting concretizations of the ideas of a larger collective. The first iteration of *Becoming Léman* saw this very protostructure becoming fragmented and dissipated into multiple sites across a landscape.

Yet the question of how we situate these architectures persists. Have we perhaps still been focusing too much on architecture as building?

We will now continue to learn how to relate architectures to the ground. How to situate ideas and spatial constructs, not only in society, but also in relation to life in general, to our resources on this planet, and very literally how to root architecture, how we let it live, how we let it *become*. With GARDENS, we will investigate through sounding the waters and sounding the grounds the relations that architecture will have as extensions of ourselves in this marvellous and fragile planetary garden (*ref.* Gilles Clément) that is the biosphere. We hope to simultaneously write architecture and its relation to the ground. We will elaborate,

test and investigate the potential of *protofigure* and *protofiguration* as ways, concepts and ideas on how we inscribe habitat into the land. We hope and believe that such an architecture can shift values. Architectures are not problem-solvers but rather have the potential to relocate values – from profit in a capital fixed economy to an ecology and economy of space and of contribution.

It is in the spirit of an urgency that we propose to work first on values other than efficiency, profitability, or longstanding knowledge of architectural types and languages: in initiating architecture as a thinking and making of space that is aimed at an intrinsic principle of contribution and CARE, based on both individual and collective desire. It is the experience of this very possibility that we would like to share with communities of people in most diverse environments – Houses/Gardens as habitats, imagined, conceived, thought, drawn and built by, and with many. These future spaces that emerge between many souls in constant deliberation will be expressions and contributions of desire, beyond the object, and beyond efficiency.

It is here that such architectures may embark on other routes. They may emerge not as rigidly ordinated and easily legible objects, ready to be consumed as eloquent speech or used as functional machines in view of a purpose. Spaces may rather take on a strange form and resemble organisms like whole cities, with their many imperfections and often less obviously ruled development. They may become constructs embodying collective histories of deliberation rather than of the architectural canon. They may, at times, sound like

symphonies – louder reverberations in the streets followed by quieter whispers in the night.

Grounds, plants, structures, rhythms, details, materials may all evolve by themselves into new forms in the interplay with many and in continual, ongoing deliberation. It is the open field of potential that draws out new collective ideas, to be brought into material life through open operations, intrinsically coordinated. We must think of new canvases and new tools, to unlearn and relearn architecture. Values will shift and form may be very different, and perhaps at times reoccurring from another moment of our histories. Projects and resulting spaces will be material articulations of liminalities – potentials articulated by material and temporal processes – *Becoming* future inscribed in values of contribution.

Such an architecture is again immersive: it is aimed at an ecology of space. As an immersive architecture it must be phenomenological: it evolves the experiential comprehension of the places and the space that we live in. It becomes where we meet other people and our environment. To survive, it must be economical beyond capitalism: it must give us values to live a better life.

Architecture is a political practice. The way we evolve space reconfigures matter, places, people, biological life. To act upon space is a collective responsibility. We must therefore, first and foremost, put into question the values that exercise control in these actions. Who or what governs life and us? What are the values that truly matter?