PAPRIKA! x 100

WHAT WORKS? It's nimble, it's fun, it's a little bit bitchy. • the physical broadsheet is brilliant • It's so frequent, it's not precious, it gives an idea of the life of the school over time • the relationship it builds between the graphic design program and the architecture school • when it doesn't take itself too seriously, and instead allows the reader to find an accessible and often disquieting moment of realization. • Its frequency • WHAT DOESN'T? Don't shy away from politics! • Weak ideas go too often untested, unanswered, unchallenged. When was the last time the paper printed a rebuttal? When was the last it printed the words, 'I disagree'? And for that matter, strong ideas are often left by the wayside: when was the last time the paper printed the words, 'I agree'? • I'd be curious to know more about the goings on of each class year... like what the hell is going on up on 6 these days? WHAT'S NEXT? Fictional narratives could be very enjoyable. • Below-the-surface stories: what does it mean to be a student at Yale? Financially, socially? • And the biggest of them all: What is in, what is out? What is cool? What is post-modernism? • Why does the poop smell leak from midtown west into Penn Station after everyone takes their morning dump? •

It's not *Paprika!*'s birthday. 100 issues is big, but we're a bit hesitant to celebrate (or, maybe we celebrated enough at last year's "*Paprika!* turns 5!" party). And so, instead of cake, we're passing out a slice of reflection: looking back to look forward.

We would like to take this issue as an opportunity to evaluate and celebrate *Paprika!*'s output as a publication since its creation in 2014. As a steady voice since, *Paprika!* has been a place for everything from theoretical analysis to school-specific reporting and cultural commentary, all of which are collecting dust in physical archives, and/or taking up space on server farms. With this sizable repository of writing at our fingertips, what do we do with it? In an effort to re-engage with these relics, we asked our contributors to somehow respond to a past piece of writing from Paprika!'s archive—arguments against, commentaries on, and wholehearted endorsements were all welcome.

As the tenth group of Coordinating Editors, we wanted to learn how we can make things better, hear more voices, and reach deeper into our own community while also extending our reach beyond it. So, in conjunction with this article specific dialogue, we surveyed *Paprika!*'s readership in search of more granular and direct feedback. We see these parallel explorations as complementary to one another: the former zoomed in, the latter zoomed out. This is not meant to mark the end of this dialogue, rather to suggest that its pipeline is always open.

Biggest thanks to all who came before us, and whoever might come after. Here's to the next however many.

Angela Lufkin, Adam Thibodeaux, Sarah Weiss and Max Wirsing

CREDITS

Paprika! x 100
Volume 05 Issue 12
January 30, 2020

COORDINATING/ISSUE EDITORS:
Angela Lufkin
Adam Thibodeaux
Sarah Weiss
Max Wirsing

GRAPHIC DESIGNERS:
Herdimas Anggara
Betty Wang

PUBLISHERS:
Audrey Tseng Fischer
Morgan Kerber
Liwei Wang

WEB EDITOR:
Seth Thompson

January 13

"We need to have a kitchen advisory board."—Scott Simpson, M.Arch I 2021

"Absolutely."—Phil Bernstein, probably

January 20

A variety of strange substances are left to off-gas in the spray booth, and the back alley dumpsters suddenly become a popular spot for model documentation.

January 24

In Renaissance and Modern II, Kurt Forester torments Peter Eisenman with a slideshow of early 20th-century expressionism, highlighting a familiar, phallic tower by Mendelsohn. "This is a side of you I've never seen before," Peter responds.

Also of note: Peter's observation that "buildings aren't meant to have wings." His stance on silkworms is unclear.

BECOMING FULCRUM

Nicolas Kemper, M. Arch I 2016

Should the living follow rules written by the dead?

In May of 2014, Anne Householder, Jack Bian, Madelynn Ringo, John Wan and I went on a day trip up to see Kahn's Exeter Library and make some drawings. On the way back, we were pounded by a summer thunderstorm south of Hartford so intense that I-91 became a river.

We were in a reflective mood, discussing how we wanted our time in graduate school to amount to something more than survival. We committed to organize a publication. John Wan named it almost immediately, right there in the car: *Paprika!*

We published the first issue that September. Within a year, Andrew Sternad and I were the first Coordinating Editors, Dov Feinmesser its first Publisher, and *Paprika!* was publishing weekly.

Less than a month after *Paprika!* received its name in a Connecticut thunderstorm, a student publication at the Architectural Association in London, *Fulcrum*, threw down an existential gauntlet. I am not sure if we knew of *Fulcrum* when we started *Paprika!*, but we should have. Also run by students, also a single sheet weekly, *Fulcrum* was much of what *Paprika!* aspired to be. It could pair the writing of students with some of the most accomplished voices in the field; it could speak with urgency and authority about its community and its politics; and it had a wide following beyond the school. Its last issue claimed that it was the most-read student architecture publication in the world.

On June 27, 2014, a mere eight days before *Paprika!* announced itself and made its first call for submissions, Jack Self, *Fulcrum*'s co-founder and editor, published its 100th issue and pulled the plug.

"Our reasoning is neither jealousy nor some arrogant fear of plagiarism," its last editorial said, "but simply the fact that what follows *Fulcrum* must be propositional, of its time, and wholly original."

Now that we have arrived at *Paprika* x100, is it time to follow suit? My co-founders and I have long since graduated. From the students' perspective, we are effectively dead. Should they, the living, still follow rules—set in writing, set by work, set by precedent—written by the dead?

That is for the living to say.

I would only offer that, personally, I set less store by the origins of rules than by their consequences.

The key rules of *Paprika!* should be more often publicly discussed. The most important ones are written in its constitutional document, the Baton, to wit: The Coordinating Editors and Publisher shall be chosen by open election. The publication is to remain financially and organizationally independent of the school. The Coordinating Editors and Publisher must approve all expenditures. Meetings and calls for submissions are to be open. Everyone who has made a substantial contribution to the publication shall become part of the Collective. The On-Campus Collective, the students, can impeach the Coordinating Editors. Most importantly, the On-Campus Collective can amend the Baton.

We co-founders gave up all control of *Paprika!* before we graduated, when, in December of 2015, Maggie Tsang and Tess McNamara were elected the Coordinating Editors, and Caroline Acheatel their Publisher. In choosing to embrace those roles, take up the rules of the Baton, and assemble a team of writers, editors, and designers, they effectively re-founded *Paprika!*, because rules have only as much power as the living give them. Their successors, Ethan Fischer and Dimitri Brand, re-founded *Paprika!* again, and so on, up to and including this spring's Coordinating Editors, Angela, Adam, Max and Sarah, their Publishers Audrey, Morgan and Liwei, and the dozens of editors, writers, and designers with whom they will collaborate.

Rules are tools, possibly the most powerful tools we have, as they allow for concerted and coordinated action. Rather than ask who wrote them, or whether they are original, I would pose simply: do they work? Are they useful? Do they oppress, or do they empower?

Today *Paprika!* offers a place to learn to edit and to write. It secures press passes to the Chicago Biennial and the Venice Biennale for its writers. It puts their work in front of a readership far beyond the walls of its school. It secures perspectives and answers from some of architecture's most promising practitioners. It has provided a firm platform to advocate reforms as small as the establishment of a lunch hour (check), and as large as the establishment of a department of Urban Design (not yet). It provides a forum to propose and challenge ideas. Through the Collective, it offers the support and perspective of a network whose members now number 185. Most importantly, *Paprika!* tells a story—about school, about ideals, about the potentials and pitfalls of architecture—and by telling the story, shapes the story, and changes the story.

In that last issue of *Fulcrum*, the editorial made a compelling exhortation: "Use the long-term as a subversive strategy. Develop ten-year plans. Develop fifty-year plans. Learn to transform and trade in the possibility of tomorrow today, just like the financial elite to whom we are beholden."

Paprika! got here by executing a five-year plan. What will it accomplish over the next hundred?

Is *Paprika!* "wholly original"? No. We did not invent the newspaper, democracy, by-laws, or InDesign.

Does it work? Is it useful? Does it oppress, or empower? Ask the living.

STAYING PISSED

Deo Deiparine, M.Arch I 2020 in response to "Architecture and the Politics of Pissed" by Mark Foster Gage in Bulletin 2-B: "We Won't Build Your Wall"

In a bulletin released on February 6, 2017, two weeks after the inauguration of Donald Trump to the presidency, Mark Foster Gage writes a micro manifesto entitled 'Architecture and the Politics of Pissed.'[1] The bulletin features a square-formatted image of the York Street face of Rudolph Hall.[2] Very plainly and neatly in block-text type, the words 'WE WON'T BUILD YOUR WALL' spans across the three bays of glazing on the fourth floor. Silhouettes of a student's glowing desk lamp, propped up books, and stacks of unidentifiable material suggest the ghosted presence of an architect-to-be, residually active in their studies yet notably absent from the frame.

The current cohort of students, the class of 2020, will be re-entering the workforce during an election year, one which must feel momentous given the calamity of the past four years. The M.Arch I class in particular, of which I am a part, applied with hopes to enter the ivory tower immediately after the shock of 2016. We then bided the second half of the decade within the enclave of the institution—for exactly long enough now to reckon again with the angst of American electoral politics. During our stint here we've constantly heard the familiar refrain, 'the school is really changing,' a sentiment remarking on the curricular directives devised and executed by Deborah Berke as dean.

I doubt I speak alone in wondering if my time here has equipped me well enough to be back out there. Not only in the sense of professional practice, but as to how practice can 'inspire shifts along the fundamental fault lines of culture,' as Gage provokes. After 2016, the general mood for most of us, rightly observed by Gage, was to be pissed, to feel galvanized, to take seriously that something must be done.

Within the school's recent curation of guest lectures, seminars, and studio briefs emerge conspicuous thematic groupings, many pointing toward the viability of 'alternative practice' or alternative criteria for success in architecture. The tropes Gage claims architects are tiring of: "clever diagrams, metaphors of buildings looking like animals, pretty Pollyanna pastel backgrounds" are no closer to disappearing but appear increasingly alongside examples of architecture that finds ways of building outside the logic of the market,[3] architecture that makes a case for overcoming the carbon paradigm,[4] or architecture that draws upon new role models (or old ones seen with new eyes). While these practioners and theorists have promoted their ideas since well before 2016, their critical mass here and now implies a call to engage. In contrast to the growing cynicism widely felt within the discipline over architecture's capacity for social engagement,[6] these pedagogical shifts have stressed resourcefulness as a means of rehabilitating architecture's relevance. As we take our elite pedigrees to the job markets, how will this learned resourcefulness add up to the changes we claim we want to see? Apart from the handful of alternative practices and daring offices doing the work we dream of, what leverage do we have to rehabilitate the firms we'll work for—the widget producers, more shaped by than shaping the forces governing the world? Beyond the briefs we're given while in the institution, how will we fight?

[1] Mark Gage, "ARCHITECTURE AND THE POLITICS OF PISSED (a micro manifesto)." Paprika! 2-B, We Won't Build Your Wall, February 6, 2017.
[2] From Instagram account @clairelouisehaugh
[3] Last semester's Canales, Cruz/Forman, and Kéré advanced studios all unapologetically embraced the act of building while also refuting the inevitability of the market.
[4] Elisa Iturbe's seminar, 'the City and Carbon Modernity' and Esther da Costa Meyer's seminar on the Anthropocene both recontextualize architectural history and theory in the face of the existential threats of climate change.

Tianyu Guan & Guillermo Acosta Navarrete

Congrats *Paprika!*
Here's your slice!

In celebration of the centenary issue of *Paprika!*, everyone is invited to a pizza celebration. To join the party, follow the steps on this slice.

Step 1

Draw a slice of *Paprika!* pizza.

FULCRUM x100

Interview by Angela Lufkin, M. Arch I 2021, with Jack Self, creator of Fulcrum.

Jack Self is an architect in London, director of REAL and editor-in-chief of Real Review. *He graduated from the Architectural Association in 2014, where he started the student publication* Fulcrum.

Angela Lufkin: What motivated you and your co-founders to start *Fulcrum* at the AA in 2011?

Jack Self: *Fulcrum* was founded as a vehicle to explore the zeitgeist, and with some hope of trying to shape it. I first became interested in capturing the spirit of our times shortly after 9/11. The mood in society shifted so rapidly; I had never experienced such mass hysteria or paranoia capable of permeating every aspect of the public and private spheres. The period following 9/11, the so-called War on Terror, was the first paradigm of my adult life. This ended in 2008, when the Global Financial Crisis cut short the ecstatic hedonism of the boom years and exposed the extent to which neoliberalism had radically reshaped wealth in society.

Between 2008 and the end of 2010, there was a kind of paradigmatic pause—a kind of slack water between two tides. The twentieth century was now definitely over, but the new century had not yet taken shape. There was a general hope for profound and systemic change to our economic and social models (perhaps best symbolised by Obama's first campaign in 2008).

Naively, I truly believed we were on the brink of pruning back the excesses of capitalism. But by around October 2010, it had become clear to me that we were entering a new paradigm—and not the one I had expected. *Fulcrum*—which literally means a pivot or turning point—emerged out of a realisation that the change I had hoped for was not imminent. In this sense, *Fulcrum* was founded out of frustration and anger. Issue two came out the week Mubarak was toppled in Egypt and the Arab Spring really kicked off.

Over the next two years, every week *Fulcrum* tried to reflect and precipitate the changing attitudes in society towards wealth, gender, class, race and other structural social inequalities. For example, we became very involved with the Occupy movement and the anti-austerity marches.

How did the identity of the graphic design play into the conception of the publication and its content?

Graphic design is the discipline of visual communication. You can express an idea through words or an image or a building—but graphic design is the most powerful means for mainstream or popular communication. As a publication, *Fulcrum* tried to precipitate a tipping point in architectural culture. Graphically, we tried to communicate that idea through the format: two authors writing on the same topic every week, which shows that there is never an absolute or universal truth on any subject. All perspectives are relative. Eventually we worked out how to present this relativism through a graphic fulcrum—a thick line drawn down the middle of the page, a pivot around which the two arguments revolved.

What influence do you feel *Fulcrum* had on the student body of the AA? More broadly, what role do you believe student journalism plays in the academic environment of an architecture school?

It is not for me to assess the influence of *Fulcrum*. But I can say that it was much more widely read outside the AA than within: we used a neglected Risograph to print 500 copies each week, at a school that then numbered 700 students. Most copies ended up in the trash. I reckon on our readership being about 300. Yet the scanned PDFs were downloaded 5,000 times each week. As is often the case, it was only when *Fulcrum* ended that the school body reacted. Before *Fulcrum* there hadn't been a student publication for twenty years. After it, there was an explosion—about half a dozen, two of which are still running. So I am proud that if nothing else we contributed to a renewed interest in writing. Though probably *Fulcrum* is just a reflection of the trend, rather than a driver of it...

More generally, student journalism is extremely important. Architects rarely write well, and the discipline suffers from a lack of rigour. So a healthy culture of writing is central to producing better thinkers and better architects. It is also even more crucial now than last decade, because the common forums for debate and discussion are in decline. Student journalism forces people who don't agree with each other, and might have little in common, to acknowledge and engage the relative strengths of their positions. What scares me the most is a rise in silence: a generalised reticence to contribute, a hesitance to express an opinion at all...

What motivated your decision to end the publication at its 100th issue?

I graduated, so I killed the publication. *Fulcrum* was never an institutional publication—it was a constant struggle to get it recognised and supported by the AA. So the idea of passing it on to someone else was anathema; every generation of students must create their own means of expression.

What are you up to now?

Today I am finalising a new issue of *Real Review*, a quarterly contemporary culture magazine dedicated to "what it means to live today"—I founded this in 2016, and in many ways it is the continuation of *Fulcrum*.

Do you have any advice for *Paprika!* as we continue into the unknown?

Reflect deeply on why you write, and why you edit. What is your social agenda, your driving mission? Your readers are giving you the most precious and valuable thing they have: their time. A publication must not abuse that gift, but rather ask how it can improve the lives of its readers.

WHAT STORIES STOOD OUT? Stories that you would tell to a close group of friends at the bar. • I really enjoyed the interview with Luke Bulman because it clearly presented a way that "architectural thinking" can be applied outside the traditional edges of the architectural discipline. • Everything in that health issue with the map. • I forgot • Perspectives from current students on architecture teaching and studio practice: journal/diary entries, opinion polls, etc. The student survey from the "Shitty Architecture Men" issue comes to mind. It's gonna be a useful archive for architectural historians in the future! • I like stories that have a personal narrative, in addition to an informative aspect. Adam Feldman's and Thomas Mahon's pieces accomplish such things. • I thought the whole fantasy issue was amazing. • the interview with Elisa Iturbe was very good, as was the Mark Foster Gage interview. I think the interviewers always conduct really solid interviews and ask questions that good responses BUZZWORDS phenomena • Green • Dialectic • I've never understood why it's called a curtain wall • interstitial space • Sou Fujimoto • Materiality. It's not a real thing • Post- • Not a buzzword, but I hate upside down text • post-digital • Pedagogy •

ON FICTION AND PHANTASY

Shelby Wright, M. Arch I 2021 in response to Vol. 4, Issue 13: "Phantasy" & Vol 3, Issue 15: "Fiction"

Over the years, several issues of *Paprika!* have asked readers to dive into the depths of their imagination and contemplate a different reality. Sometimes these thought exercises have been subtle divergences from the everyday, and other times, they have pushed the boundary fully into the unknown. While the folds on imagination and playfulness seem to stand in contrast to the seriousness of folds relating to social justice, environmental concerns or pedagogical issues; the importance of these folds shouldn't be overlooked. While architecture must respond to the sometimes harsh reality in which we live and attempt to mitigate the problems we face, it still stands with one foot in the imagination. Without the capability to imagine, how could architecture even begin to tackle the problems of reality?

In an interview in "Phantasy" (Vol. 4 Issue 13), Mark Foster Gage talks about the value of imagination and architecture as a tool used to conceptualize potential futures. He says, "Architecture history is a history of anomalies—anomalies that show us an alternative path." It's the job of architecture to speculate on a potential future reality and provide a path to get there. You have to convince Dorothy that the Emerald City and a wish-granting wizard are at the end of the Yellow Brick Road in order to start her on that journey. In a personal dictum which could easily be the mission statement of architects collectively, Gage says, "I've never been interested in the world as it is—I've always been interested in the world as it could be." While fantasy and reality are seen in opposition, this interview touches on how critical they are for one another.

Michael Glassman's story "Down the Rabbit Hole" in "Fiction" (Vol. 3 Issue 15) asks the reader to imagine an impossible work of architecture: a rabbit hole. The space-warping oddities at play call up visions of *House of Leaves* and destabilize what is and isn't reality. Like most good stories, this one holds up a mirror to the real world as an act of revealing. When the narrator is asked about the purpose of having a library in the project, it provokes the response, "[...] the library was the crux of the project, the place where word and deed collided."

This seems to illustrate the divide between engineers, contractors and developers; and architects, artists and thinkers. The purpose of something doesn't need to be quantifiable to have worth. Architecture is the act of adding abstract value to building. In the "Phantasy" interview, Gage says that he seeks out spaces which are not the "predictable outcome of what architecture can be." What's great about "Down the Rabbit Hole" is that this structural fantasy comes out of the boring trappings of office life: scheduling, surveying, and ribbon cutting. It challenges the notion of a system producing "predictable outcomes."

Fiction can also be a productive way to engage with the past. "Ritual Vessels and Their Myths" by Olisa Agulue (also in "Fiction") brings historical and archaeological research into the field of imagination as well. The article discusses two artifacts from the northern Congo in a very matter-of-fact style and the belief by scholars that these two vessels are ritualistic in nature. Speculations are made about how these vessels were used in ceremonies, but these speculations are brought into question at the end of the article, because the rituals no longer exist and we have no knowledge of them. While the objects can be admired as things in themselves, and while it might be fairly easy to assume ways they could have been used based on their forms, it is nearly impossible to know what these objects meant symbolically and culturally to their original owners. Here, fiction is a residue which fills in the gaps of knowledge. It is this speculative meaning which gives historical objects importance.

Our understanding of reality is deeply entangled with fantasy; the two support and balance one another. In a field such as architecture, this entanglement is vital and *Paprika!* has encouraged such a relationship through speculative thought and imaginative propositions. It has been a space for experimentation, a space for activism, and a space for imagination. Written language, like architecture, is one of the many mediators between the worlds of fiction and reality, and another tool at our disposal. As we celebrate the 100th issue of *Paprika!*, we should look at the past not just as the reality from which it came, but for the future it envisioned, and then begin to imagine one of our own.

January 16

The surprise appearance of live silkworms on the sixth floor raise questions about the ongoing impact of the revised first-semester curriculum.

January 21

Bernard Tschumi starts following @yale-paprika on Instagram. Paprika!'s Coordinating Editor team briefly considers supplementing On the Ground's gossip with more theoretical musings, and then reconsiders after recognizing that if the readership wanted more theory they would have gone to Princeton.

January 22

New instagram contender @deskcrit astutely illustrates the struggle of first year: "when it's 9 mf AM and you in structjres [sic] but you still have 24 inches of your 100" biome drawing to fill"

January 23

Tatiana Bilbao and Walter Hood's advanced studios face off in an all-out, gloves-off competition for the semester's largest site model. On a related note: anyone looking for a 30-foot-long coffee table at the end of the semester, please contact Andrew Benner.

THE DEATH OF ARCHITECTURE

Abby Sandler, M. Arch I 2022 in response to "Editor's Note," by Lani Barry & Jeffrey Liu in Vol. 3, Issue 03: "Post-Ironic"

I was running in circles about how to title this piece, and quite honestly, how to write it. Should it be funny? Should it even try? By "it" I mean me, of course. Will fumbling jokes detract from my point, the gravity of the problem I am here to address? Probably. My Hanukkah safari was fantastic by the way, thank you for asking.

I've decided on an approach now: pure and utter sincerity. We'll see how this goes. I'm here to confront a serious problem in "our" field, as writing this for *Paprika!* assumes an audience of aspiring and established architects, historians, critics, what have you, granting me the permission to use the royal "we." I'm here reporting live from the echo chamber of architectural thought, and no one is laughing. This is the problem: the absence of humor in this very. Serious. Field. (Practice?)

I debated circling this piece back to the intentions of post-modernism. I turned to Lani Barry and Jeffrey Liu's piece edited in 2017, which cried out for a post-ironic approach to architecture, a practice that would allow the designer to be both visionary and self-critical, mitigating the self-seriousness imbued in all things architecture. I think they had a good point, but I also think there is a way to approach this matter without over-intellectualizing it.

"We" like to think that architecture affects Everyone, its scope being part of what makes it incredibly serious. Decisions we make directly touch the daily experiences of those who inhabit the spaces we help create. (I think? We hope? We prefer to believe?) Therefore, architecture can have no sense of humor...? I just don't understand. I asked some people what they thought of this, simply out of curiosity: why architecture can't be funny. Dearest Kevin Steffes said, "because if it's funny, then it can't be taken seriously, or it's just too expensive to be funny. The joke becomes too expensive." This was an idea I loved, a joke that was too expensive to be funny. Kind of like... The Vessel!

Don't be mistaken, though. I am not asking for architecture to be a series of jokes with coded punchlines. When I ask for architecture to have a sense of humor, I am also not asking the buildings to make me laugh, or the architects for that matter, for that would be the real nightmare. It's something more along the lines of Michael Meredith's plea for a manifesto titled "Absurd Realism!" in which he writes, "Architecture's self-serious tragedy has been written and rewritten ad nauseam. I'd prefer something else, something I can relate to. You know what I mean."[1]

To me, this is it. In fact, it's almost too on the nose, because I could have just submitted that quote instead of this article, and it probably would have been more effective. But no, I will see this through to the end!

Humor can be used to escape the vacuum of architectural discourse—any discourse even. Humor allows us to reach larger audiences, and provides a platform for honest self-awareness and criticism. Why shouldn't we be allowed to joke about this thing we all obviously take so seriously? Are we scared that if we joke about it we will be accused of not taking it seriously? That to me is more delusional than thinking architecture has the power to save the world.

Architecture can be the most serious thing if we want it to be, but in the end it's perpetuated, perceived, and experienced by humans. We as humans rely on humor, specifically satire and more self-critical forms of humor, because it allows us to, at the very least, take things that may have high stakes less seriously if even for just a few minutes. You know what helps us hear and understand things we wouldn't otherwise want to engage with? Humor. It cuts through emotion, "silencing at once our pity and affection," as Henri Bergson put it. It appeals to some deeper desire with ourselves to see reality in a different light, at the very least through a different lens for a very short amount of time. Sure, it can be a coping mechanism, but it can also be an extremely powerful tool.

Architecture does itself a disservice by not having a sense of humor, and more importantly, it reinforces the impenetrability of the field from those who believe they exist outside of it. Aren't we tired of singing at a pitch so low only architects can hear? Therefore, my cry for humor is to be served with a needle, to burst our bubble. So, please, architecture, I beg you, lighten up once in a while.

(to be continued...)

[1] (Log No. 22, The Absurd (Spring/Summer 2011), pp.69-73)

AN ARGUMENT AGAINST THE ___

Michael Gasper
M. Arch I 2020

Remember Mad-Libs? This is one of those.

1 ___ (Descriptive Adjective) 2 ___ (Verb ending in -ing) 3 ___ (Vessel) 4 ___ (Basic Brand Name)
5 ___ (Beverage) 6 ___ (Deluxe Beverage) 7 ___ (Number) 12 ___ (A piece of inflated jargon) 8 ___ (Noun)
9 ___ (Emotion) 10 ___ (Noun) 11 ___ (Occupational field) 16 ___ (Philosopher) 13 ___ (Adjective)
14 ___ (Adjective that is the foil to #1) 15 ___ (That obnoxious girl from Elementary School) 19 ___ (Adjective) 17 ___ (Design Movement) 18 ___ (Feeling state) 21 ___ (Another feeling state) 22 ___ (Name of a periodical)
20 ___ (Adjective) 25 ___ (Adjective) 26 ___ (Verb) 27 ___ (Noun) 23 ___ (Verb)
24 ___ (Adjective) 30 ___ (Niche Group) 31 ___ (Adjective) 28 ___ (Period of time)
29 ___ (Verb) 34 ___ (Verb) 35 ___ (Adverb) 32 ___ (Adjective)
33 ___ (Noun) 37 ___ (Alternate spelling of #5) 36 ___ (Adjective)

I'm not sure I'm the right person to be __2__ on the __1__ as it's not really my __3__ of (__1__ __4__) __5__. I'm more of a __6__ person. I'm more interested in the __7__ than the __1__. For me, the __1__ is just __8__—nothing special (by definition), but it does its job of preventing __9__ when I get home. One can, of course, make claims that there is actually __10__ in the __1__—as has been done in architecture __11__ times a century since __12__—but if the everyday is __13__, it would no longer truly be __1__. It's a contradiction in terms. And so this argument becomes a redefinition of the term "__1__" rather than an argument about __15__. Today the term "__1__" in __15__ is also confused with "__16__" or a type of minimal effort. __17__ is a style and I'm not particularly interested in style arguments.

I just wrote about this as a response to Michael __18__ in the most recent issue of __19__[1] on minimal design effort and "__20__" as a position. I believe the pursuit of the __1__ in __15__ is a form of political __21__. As if you're doing work that supports the __22__ of __1__ life, as it exists today (and every day), you are offering nothing to __23__ it. That means your __24__ efforts are politically __25__. You can either design for the __1__ in which you __26__, and solve its problems to keep it running __27__, or you can design for the __28__ you want to __29__—which explains my involvement with __30__ philosophy. I am invested in a project of speculation about __31__, and more __32__ social realities—as I'm not satisfied with the current __33__. If today's reality is the reality you think we should __34__ in—then, by all means, design for its propagation through producing its __1__ __15__. Of course, I think we can do better than today's __1__—architecturally, politically, culturally and __35__. Now back to my cup of very __36__ __5__. My special- __37__, as it were...

[1] (__19__ 39, Winter 2017: Observations on Architecture and the Contemporary City.)

Original text: "An Argument Against the Everyday," written by Mark Foster Gage for Issue 3-04, "Everyday".

Step 3: Cut off your slice and bring it to Minerva. Find instructions there for next steps.

Step 2

Here is my:

☐ wish

☐ gift

☐ rejected article:

BORDER IN TRANSITION

Rukshan Vathupola, M. Arch I 2020 in response to Tijuana/San Diego by Alejandro Duran, M.Arch '19 in Vol. 3, Issue 06: "Horizon".

In recent history, the development of the nation state has led modern borders to manifest and strengthen themselves through heightened social divisions between and within communities. These rend our common humanity along lines of race and religion, class and global identity to establish ideal cultural boundaries that soon metastasize into contentious geo-political realities. However, from those rigid classifications and the hard lines that have split the American continent between the US and Mexico on paper, a more fluid image of that common border begins to emerge. From the shifting forces of nature governing the tides of the Rio Grande and the blooming biodiversity that navigates its shores to the flow of those individuals who have walked between the lines, the border joining these two nations begins to appear as neither absolute nor stationary—a fluid entity, constantly in motion. For those who grew up in its shadow, the consequences of the border are of the utmost importance. It is not just the divide between a common land, but a catalyst that draws together the people, goods and natural wildlife around it.

The Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo's placement of the border along the centerline of the Rio Grande River in the aftermath of the 1848 Mexican-American War is the prime historical antecedent for the location of the modern US-Mexico border. However, natural borders—particularly waterways—are never static and tend to shift and meander due to heavy rain, dry spells, soil erosion, ease of flow as well as deliberate engineering and terraforming. Over time, different sections of the Rio Grande began to extend further north and south, taking the border along with it. This resulted in several conflicts over issues of governance, land ownership, and citizenship as people began to settle along the shores of an ever shifting international boundary. To resolve this issue, the US and Mexico selectively exchanged nearly 30,000 acres and 247 shifted parcels of land, known as "bancos," along the Rio Grande from 1907-1976.[1]

Particular contention surrounded a community called the Chamizal. This banco first emerged after a series of especially heavy floods shifted the Rio and the US border south, despite legally belonging to a Mexican landowner.[2] The site became so politically charged that, in 1909, it was temporarily deemed neutral territory during the meetings of Mexico's President Díaz and the United State's President Taft in nearby El Paso.[3] Throughout the 1920's and the rise of Prohibition, the Chamizal became a casual border crossing for US citizens to legally drink in Mexico. By the 1930's, Cold War propaganda was spread in Mexico, emphasizing the status of the Chamizal as a stolen territory. In 1964, under those pressures, the two governments came together and agreed to attempt a recreation of the original river pathway in order to resolve the dispute and solidify the border. This was done by re-extending the river north and building a canal through the Chamizal neighborhood, erasing it from the maps and minds of the populace, all while forcibly displacing its inhabitants.[5]

As the Rio Grande begins to dry up due to rapid climate change, this natural boundary shall slowly fade from the landscape. In response to the need for conservation, the U.S. and Mexican Wildlife Service have purchased land along the river in an effort to preserve the diverse natural environments present. National Forests, including the Coronado, are now some of the most ecologically diverse in North America, hosting a wide variety of wildlife. However, further fortification of the border shall only exacerbate the adverse effects present. It will cut off those ancient migratory paths, isolate adjacent populations, and degrade the already depleted river, leaving behind a desolate and dusty corridor between the two nations. As that time comes to pass, we must ask ourselves what we would want from such a border. Manifest walls built on further divisions born from the creeds and privileges, unevenly divided unto us through accidents of birth, or draw upon our common humanity and that ceaseless desire for hope.

1 (Kramer, Paul. "A Border Crosses" The New Yorker, 21 September 2014, https://www.newyorker.com/news/news-desk/moving-mexican-border, Accessed 16 January, 2020.)

2 ("Did You Know... Massive Flood in 1864 Altered Course of Rio Grande Resulting in Border Dispute?" U.S. Customs and Border Protection, The Department of Homeland Security, 20 December 2019, www.cbp.gov/about/history/did-you-know/flood. Accessed 16 January, 2020.)

3 Ibid.

4 (Payan, Tony. "How a Forgotten Border Dispute Tormented U.S.-Mexico Relations for 100 Years." Americas Quarterly, Winter 2016, www.americasquarterly.org/content/how-forgotten-border-dispute-tormented-us-mexico-relations-100-years. Accessed 16 January, 2020.)

5 (Staff, NPR. "50 Years Ago, A Fluid Border Made The U.S. 1 Square Mile Smaller." NPR, NPR, 25 Sept. 2014, www.npr.org/2014/09/25/350885341/50-years-ago-a-fluid-border-made-the-u-s-1-square-mile-smaller. Accessed 16 January, 2020.)