TEMPORAL CARTOGRAPHIES
Temporal Cartographies would not have been possible without the guidance and helpful comments of many people. During the Summer of 2020, I began the research phase of this project, unsure of where it would lead. Thanks to my committee chair, Gabe Esquivel, I was able to develop a foundation of ideas to begin the project. His guidance during this project, as well as those previous, has been positively influential.

While developing my research, I benefited from a number of influential conversations with my friends and classmates, Brenden Bjerke, Brendon Bangert, Manny Alvarado, Chris Olivarez, as well as many others. Without their encouragement and dedication to their own work, I am unsure I would have completed this project without dramatic concessions. Similarly, the discussions and criticisms offered by the rest of my committee, Professor Stephen Caffey, and Dr. Susanneh Bieber, helped propel this project to its current level of completion. I am also thankful that they were present in helping sort through my ramblings at various phases during the project’s development.

I would also like to mention that far earlier than that, my participation in their history and theory courses during my time as an undergraduate helped formulate my current research interests. As the project’s title implies, Levi Bryant’s work on “Onto-Cartography” was deeply inspiring for this vein of research. I am very thankful for my studio professor, Brian Gibbs, who has helped me develop a deeper understanding of the more technical requirements of architectural projects, something I am certain will remain with me as I head into the field as a professional.

Over the past eleven months I was fortunate enough to have a very strong support group of fellow students, friends, and especially family who helped me work through the thick of it. Specifically I would like to thank my Mom, Dad, siblings, and Maria for their love and encouragement. Despite the strange architectural strategies I’ve proposed, they have always stood behind me.

All that is good in this book has come from the criticism, insight, and support of those mentioned as well as many others.
This book is a collection of research, references, representational experiments, and statements which explore the onto-cartographic ecologies surrounding architectural representation. The theoretical framework of this project is based on Levi Bryant's machine and media ontology. This collection of ideas is used to map and deconstruct a series of visual references in order to develop representational and design techniques for use during the proposal stage of this research endeavor. These references are historically relevant cartographic projects, art representing radical moments in landscape painting, and speculative architectural drawings. In a way, these references became a toolbox to draw from in order to communicate the difficult and complex topics inherent in the project. From here, a site was selected based on the goals of the research. A number of architectural strategies were proposed to address ecological thought as a cultural problem. Finally, this book is concluded with a short discussion about the project, covering the topics of representation, temporality, and future avenues of research.
INTRODUCTION

This project addresses issues of ecological trauma by focusing on the aesthetics and cultural issues associated with it. This approach was chosen in place of suggesting technical solutions following Tim Morton's argument regarding the development of ecological thought. In short, Morton suggests that relying on technology and the solutions it affords to overcome issues such as climate change, is exactly what got us in this mess in the first place. The project also recognizes architectural representation as the tool, or medium, in which these cultural ideas can be transmitted.

Following this foundation, the research began with the curation and analysis of various historic architectural precedents. These projects were selected because they exhibit distinct attitudes regarding site, the landscape, and how the architecture responds (or does not). These projects led to a hypothesis that
design practices associated with modernism were strongly rooted in problematic cultural attitudes. They often represent an adversarial relationship between man and nature, despite now contemporary claims by Morton and Bryant that this is not how the world really functions.

In order to move past these notions, the next set of collected images focuses on how complex ideas regarding mankind and the landscape are represented. These visual studies contributed to a toolkit of representational strategies which sought to suggest an alternate understanding of an architectural project and the landscape it exists within. This project specifically focuses on using the architectural drawing to communicate ideas about the material duration of various architectural characters. The research and proposal of this project relies heavily on topics discussed in the contemporary philosophical movement called “Object-Oriented Ontology” (OOO).

Site plays an important role in this project representing a place of contention between global neoliberalism, the ecological trauma associated, and a critical architectural project. Based on this research, the project proposes a garden containing various architectural follies. This garden is based on new interpretations of site and landscape directly critiquing the modernist attitudes uncovered in the first collection of precedent studies.

Lastly, the production of an onto-cartographic diagram represents the site as a gradient of material duration. Doing so places focus on the temporal and ontological arrangement of the proposed follies rather than emphasizing an imposed arrangement based on the logistic requirements associated with modern site planning.

The project takes aim at critical contemporary issues. The topics considered in this proposal are all things that architects must start thinking about in order to shift the discipline into one that is truly ecological.
In Sir Ebenezer Howard’s proposed Garden City, he attempts to remedy new urban issues associated with the first stages of industrialization. In doing so, he brings about the birth of an early modernist utopian project, the garden city movement. In its simplest form, the movement attempts to marry the picturesque and urban. Howard’s initial proposal describes placing pie slices of bucolic landscape partitioned by concentric satellite towns and transit routes in a hard edged circle. Howard’s utopian vision attempts to separate two intertwined machines, urban ecologies and “the natural.” He does so without recognizing the negative aspects of either. Morton would add that this move is problematic because it forces us to engage with the question “where are nature’s boundaries?” He believes that in our current framework of understanding, questions like this lead us down a twisted rabbit hole, ending with a perplexing conclusion; A border does not exist and we are free to partition it how we would like. This logic is ripe with anthropocentric implications. Howard’s proposal became a fundamental project within the early modernism but eventually came to be known as an urban planning experiment typified by failure.
The Farnsworth house could be argued as an architectural project representing the harmony between man and nature. In order to do so, the project has to position itself as something other than nature. Doing so reflects the current cultural understanding that there is a divide between the natural and mankind. The Farnsworth house is an exaggerated representation of that worldview. The project asserts its formal autonomy and its tentative relationship with the ground seeming to levitate off the site. As it detaches from its context we are encouraged to look at the house as a self-contained system separate from the site. The same thing happens in reverse. Wrapped in floor-to-ceiling glass windows, the Farnsworth house frames nature. It treats the surrounding environment as something to be viewed rather than engaged.
Frank Lloyd Wright takes a different approach in dealing with site at Falling water. Instead of denying the project’s ecological context, as the Farnsworth house does, Wright relies on a collection of fabricated adversarial relationship to accentuate its connection with the site. He emphasizes moments where horizontal meets vertical. This can be seen in the way he treats cantilevers and structural supports. These components are contrast against the horizontality of the stream and verticality of the falls. At another level, he extends this relationship across time as the monolithic stillness of the house is juxtaposed against the turbulence of the falls. Although Wright produces a more successful project under this framework, it still relies on an ideology that sets the project at odds with nature. In a sense he constructs his own interpretation of nature and the site, curating it in a specific way that allows him to dominate it and impose an order.
Wright rethinks site and landscape in his earlier project, the Ennis house, by encouraging multiple readings of the building’s posture and scale. It is often difficult to tell the extent of the house. Does the project sit above a retaining wall, or is that an extension to the house? Despite its concrete construction, the edges of the project are difficult to read. In addition to this, the textile block construction creates both ambiguity in scale as well as a level of uncertainty regarding its temporal qualities. What time is this from, past or future? This ambiguity encourages one to question and interpret the project for themselves. In fact, this multiplicity of readings signals that the project is working on an ontological level and forces us to contend with the intractability of nature. A misreading could be described as an attempt to “conceptualize and tame that which continually evades our mastery.” This relates to Bryant's discussion on wilderness.
VISUAL STUDIES
Developed during the early stages of England’s industrial revolution, JMW Turner’s radical approach to landscape painting acknowledges the fuzzy relationship between industry and the landscape. In contrast to other romantic artist such as John Constable, who lionised an idyllic natural past, Turner’s later works began embracing a new vision of the sublime by incorporating the advancements of the industrial revolution into his subject matter. Smokestacks and the hillside melt together against a backdrop of vaguely recognizable urban structures. A number of structures could be read as landscape while some are more apparently industrial buildings. This muddying of boundaries acknowledges the ecological issues Tim Morton talks about in his book “Dark Ecology.”
Bosch’s painting treats the representation of humanity and nature as a cartography of relationships. Regardless of what the painting’s narrative is, it depicts humankind in a way that questions its place in a complex ecology. Perspective and scale are manipulated creating a sense that each figure (human, animal, or otherwise) is a figure in itself. The landscape and figures are flattened by rejecting contemporary perspective rendering techniques. A dramatic and playful ecology is presented as objects find themselves dancing within a complex menagerie. This depiction is not isolated to the rolling hills and crystalline peaks present but goes to include the chaotic collection of undulating figures situated within the landscape. This ecology is not defined by the aggregation of objects or their relationships but by the lively ecological dance in which they participate.
In the Carta Marina, the fictional reality of medieval sea monsters are mapped alongside the political, geographic, and ecological relationships of the territory at the time of its creation. This document presents each of these mapped assemblages as valid and functional machines in the represented ecosystem. In fact, the map itself is a contributor and a product of the ecology it exists within. The interaction of these assemblages gives rise to new representational realities that exist as valid participants in their ecological assemblages. These fictional realities branch off from that which the cartographer aims to represent. The monsters emerge within this mapping as Nature continually foils our attempts at complete mastery. This mapping demonstrates the power of representation which is one of the main focuses in my early research.
This map represents the trans-temporal bounds of a river by taking geological snapshots of its becoming. This type of representation validates all the forms that the Mississippi river has existed the same way Magus’ mapping of monsters alongside political and geographic machines validates their existence in the represented ecology. As we look to understand the river’s reality we can develop a cartography that looks past a need for a boundary, or an explicit edge to the river. This type of mapping is helpful because it starts to reshape our ideas about territorial boundaries. The lines we draw start to look a little more fuzzy. In a 1987 essay on the human interventions made in rivers, Toni Morrison writes that floods, as we call them, are merely the memories of rivers. The water is asking itself where did we come from? What valleys have we seen and what were our banks like? Recognizing that territories are constantly shifting encourages us to question the boundaries we have imagined between humankind and nature.
Kulper's drawing practices explore qualities of a speculative spatial arrangements. They act as media between the holes that exist in the drawing and the unrealized architectural features to which the drawing points. The Strategic plot drawing simultaneously works as a medium for communication with a larger architectural project as well as a representation of a complex network of coupled machines that exist as a site. Kulper's graphic techniques rely on his use of construction lines to figuratively weave a mesh upon which a diverse array of proto-objects are tied. This mesh functions as a landscape in a similar way to Bosch's representation of the garden of eden. Instead of curious menageries of giraffes and cristaline architectures, kulper relies on the not-yet-figural graphic marks derived from a cryptic site analysis to construct his enigmatic ecology.
This drawing shows a collection of deconstructed architectural machines. Physical components are represented in both plan and axonometric. A collage of shadows exists on the same plane as the other parts lending clues about what may be happening in the third dimension. The collision of plan, axon, technical line, and shadow represent a more complex and sometimes surprising architectural ecology. Together these machine assemblies function as a representational mapping of the project. The drawing works by flattening objects through the shifts between various drawing projections. In doing so, we're challenged to expand our understanding of architectural parts to whole relationships; couplings that wouldn't be understood in a traditional section cut now present themselves as integral moments in the configuration of the project. The decontextualization of the objects alludes to an artistic intervention within the project and frees the objects of an associated function allowing it to be reprogrammed. Through the layering of traditional drawing projections the piece begins to represent a spatial ecology and asserts itself as an active component of the project's ontology.

ARCHITECTURAL MACHINES

Sixth Street House project, Santa Monica, CA (Isometrics and plan), Thom Mayne with Andrew Zago (1990)
ONTO-CARTAGRAPHIC MAPPING

This mapping study was developed from ideas uncovered in the previous visual studies. This drawing combines various representations of a hypothetical site including geological information, traditional maps, vegetation diagrams, and more in order to search for alternate modes of site study. Graphically, the drawing highlights the strange and complex graphic relationships that are uncovered when layers of site information are overlaid. The composition was developed using a bottom-up approach rather than imposing an organizational structure by placing emphasis on the parts that construct the drawing. Eventually, this drawing will aid in developing ground manipulation strategies by extracting the various figures hidden within.
Located in San Benito County, California, the New Idria Ghost town sits seemingly vacant in a shallow valley. Rusted mining sheds makeshift industrial facilities and unidentifiable debris are spewn across the hillsides. Named after a mining town in Slovenia, New Idria is an expression of the anthropocene and neoliberalism at a global scale.

Geological history could be described as the granddaddy of hyperobjects. This makes a site like New Idria a place of particular interest. The area is known for its abundance of rare minerals, most notably bentonite and cinnabar, the main source of mercury ore. Mining of the area began in 1854, around the time of the Sierra Hills gold rush. Mercury, being an important ingredient in the process of removing gold from its ore, was in high demand. This pushed New Idria to be one of the most productive quicksilver mines in the world. Despite having closed in 1972, the mining activity has played a role in a significant increase in mercury levels found in soil and the presence of acid mine drainage more than 100 miles north in San Francisco Bay.

Like the haunted houses of horror fiction stories, New Idria ghost town is animated alongside the non-human characters who have taken up residence. Distressed sheet metal sheds have become the leading figures alongside stilted mine towers and brooding industrial machinery. The ghosts of New Idria permeate the landscape extending their reach past the perceived boundaries between architecture and nature. The hillside is haunted by these inhabitants. In a sense, New Idria has always been a ghost town and it always will be.
The architectural material left in New Idria sits on one end of the spectrum in terms of durability and duration. It is a debris field, extending itself into time and space. While working with the duration of materials is not a new concept, this project treats duration as a material itself allowing it to act as a system of organization within the site. In addition, the project acquires a performative aspect as objects shift, play, weather, and become new against the landscape.

The concept of duration is explored as a way to understand the project in a larger ontological context. This strategy was influenced by the Mississippi river mapping reference. This strategy is a chance to understand the ephemeral nature of architecture. It stands against the concept of eternal architecture and suggests one that is more fleeting. As time passes, the follies weather at varying rates as the project matures. Duration also offers us an avenue to address ecological issues by considering that our understanding of time, a cultural pattern, is something that can be shifted. The objects in the garden are organized along a gradient of duration, beginning with a relatively short duration, extending down the slope and culminating with the abandoned mercury distillation facility, a structure that has already been on the site for 80 years.
SITE ARTICULATION

The site articulation strategy was developed based off the previously shown mapping study. The drawing revealed various graphic figures composed alongside others. These relationships were generated from a bottom-up scheme. The same graphic relationships are translated into three dimensions and aggregated resulting in various moments where figure relate to figure, and graphic profile to profile. The form of the site then takes on uncertain temporal qualities. Is this an uncovered ruin? The boundaries between intervention and site debris become fuzzy due to the aesthetic qualities of the ground articulation. The architectural pieces are then perched atop, between, and beside the resulting rammed earth figures. As lively architectural characters, the follies take on personalites and participate in a dance similar to the one present in Bosch’s “Garden of Earthly Delights.”
Among the all objects in the garden, the viewing platforms have the shortest material duration. They are constructed by covering a scaffolding structure with fabric and laying cardboard shipping pallets along the ramp and platform floor. They offer an outlook for visitors to view the landscape peering down the slopes and over the tops of the other inhabitants. As viewed from the base of the garden, the platforms are perched along the top crest of the slope. The scaffolding very delicately touches the site and the platforms precariously peek down hiding between silhouettes of the rammed earth masses and towering topiaries.
These wireframe structures host local flora. The topiaries also act as a soil purification strategy as a number of local species are known to absorb soil contaminants. These objects are scattered throughout the garden and treat the plant life as an architectural material. The duration of this material varies with the changes in the local environment but eventually becomes saturated with soil contaminants and needs to be removed. The topiaries vaguely resemble various historic architectural structures such as etienne boulee’s spiral cenotaph and various italian campanile. The ephemeral nature of architecture is revealed in these structures as they fade in and out as the garden ages. These structures argue against an eternal architecture in turn for one that is fleeting.
The third group of components in the garden are three shelters constructed of prefabricated cross laminated timber panels. These objects are low poly shapes. The shelters' faces play off each other casting false graphic shadows on the ground and neighboring objects. This suggests that they somehow landed on the site and are merely visiting. The shelters house resident ecologists and laboratory specialists as well as those visiting the garden. Constructing the shelters of precision cut CLT panels place these objects into another frame of material duration extending past the viewing platforms and topiaries.
RESEARCH STATION

The last three objects sit at the base of the slope and on the far end of the duration spectrum. They act as laboratories and water purification facilities collecting acid mine drainage and purifying it before emptying it back into the nearby creek. Formally, they are composed of collected objects in order to distance themselves from any recognizable typology. This creates the sense that they are a part of an off beat collection along with the other follies in the garden. These structures are composed of various metals and site cast concrete forms. Like the shelters, cast shadows fossilize into outdoor decks creating a similar landing platform effect. Unlike the shelters, these structures extend underground in a more intrusive and permanent manner.
The onto-cartographic drawing represents the site both as a section and a series of top view snapshots. These snapshots are taken at various points in the site's existence highlighting the geological and material changes that take place over the duration of the project. The two dimensional drawing extends into the fourth dimension. In doing so, the past and future of the site are flattened and represented alongside each other simultaneously. The present is represented in elevation and indicates a datum for the temporal projections to reference. Various geological layers are cut in section below the groundline also referencing the past history of the site. This drawing places priority on understanding the becomings of an architectural project rather than the logistical requirements typically associated with site planning. Doing so frames the drawing within the project's ontology and begins to encourage ecological thought. It does this by representing an architecture that is coupled with its site, rather than dictating the order in which the landscape is controlled.

ONTO-CARTOGRAPHIC DIAGRAM
DISCUSSION
GABE ESQUIVEL

So John, you talk about onto-cartography and using the drawing as a medium to discuss things that had to do with complex issues. In this case, time as a factor that kind of rules and so discusses the project. It has that temporal quality to it. Can you talk a little bit more about the role of the drawing as a medium? How in your project does the drawing communicate that at large?

JOHN SCOTT

Typically in master plan or site plan drawing projects are organized based on some set of logistic requirements. The majority of those drawings are kind of about imposing an order on the site. It is really dictated by the program, something client-related or of that sort. So the master plan was a really critical issue that needed to be addressed in this project. It goes back to my first architectural reference, Howard's Garden City movement and its strong anthropocentric attitudes. I was trying to subvert that notion, by producing an ulterior way of understanding how a site is thought of and represented.

So this drawing is really critical because it pushes for an understanding of the project not defined by some imposed spatial organization, but understanding how the architecture and site is going to exist beyond the moment that it's constructed. For example, you have the present. In this drawing, the present is happening in elevation. You can see that the site was mapped based on the state of the landscape 170 years earlier. It extends far beyond that into the future. So this drawing really, I think, takes that idea of understanding a site beyond its logistic requirements and the spatial organization and pushes it into another dimension. Maybe the drawing itself isn't critical of the master plan, but it does contribute in an additional way beyond what the traditional site
planning drawing is capable of doing.

SUSANNE BIEBER

Yeah. I very much enjoy how you incorporated time and kind of the deterioration by going back in time as well as forward in time. And I think it's expressed very well in this drawing as well as in your renderings. And I also like the fact that you think of time as something that we ourselves construct and you're working against a traditional Western notion of time. In this case, you particularly think or in terms of time is one that certainly goes towards a deep entropic notion of time, right, where things deteriorate.

So my question is, is there also a place for reclamation for regrowth? For example, the topiaries, is there a way that these plants keep growing? Is there a way that the viewing platforms and the cardboards not just deteriorate, but there's times where they regenerate and create new forms, so in a way that you go back and forth in time and not just one-directional?

In some ways, this drawing is based on understanding time as a continual flow. I realize that there are other ways of thinking about how events are related beyond just a kind of sequential flow of time. I tried to incorporate the idea of deterioration and reclamation in the topiaries by representing them as a dashed line. It felt like a very architectural way to think about it. Some of these drawing elements you can see are indexes of the material, whereas the time goes on... and specifically with the topiaries, you can see that they're kind of dissolved. The boundaries are vague, but they recur at some points in time. And so that's definitely an idea I was thinking about. It definitely could have been taken much farther. But for right now, where the research is, I kind of have to settle for this representation. In future projects, I would really like to focus on that issue specifically; my instinct says it is a rich topic for investigation.

I think also of course it kind of conveys the difficulty, right, of presenting something that is going beyond our conception of space and our conception of time. So I think the drawing works really well. I think if you verbally talk about it in terms of the drawing kind of can be a representation of going one way, but that you can imagine also going backwards, right? It's like it's not just moving forward into 500 years, 1,000 years, but almost just verbally communicating that it could also go backwards, that these are not linear, but we can jump back and forth. And I think one other idea was with the topiaries, I think you rendered them all in a state of similar decay. So some could be more lush and others kind of decayed, there is a parallel time that develops not just in one way, but really in all these different ways. And it's hard to convey these images. But still, I mean, just kind of a few little things here and there and you talking about it in that way already would make a big difference.

The drawing, to me, that's really where kind of where the project started. I remember very early in the summer that I wanted to use architectural drawing or representation as the tool that I would use to explore some of these issues regarding nature and relationship or wilderness. I guess we can just call it wilderness. And it's kind of hard for me to say this, but there are certainly limitations in the way we think about architectural drawings even when they're taken kind of to the extreme in this example, because I was very tempted just to make... Nothing's wrong with making a video of the site and that sort of thing, but it was very hard for me to focus on making a drawing first because a video would've communicated a lot of ideas very clearly without me having to verbalize them. In some ways, maybe secretly, I've been questioning the limits of what an architectural drawing can do with this project.

If you would do a video, you might be able to have different kinds of spatial ideas, but the video itself is linear, right? It goes from the beginning to the end. So these are the kinds of pressures that we are dealing with. And for you to deal with your project in
the drawing itself, I think very much always pushes against those boundaries. So I think you do that well.

I mean, I think my question was really because of that. I think what I really like about this project is number one, it is a very contemporary project that uses architecture as another part of the flat ontology. And it really uses the non-human aspect of it, architecture becomes artifactual. So it's an extension of some kind of moment of anthropocentrism. So the discussion of non-human really doesn't happen much, although it's completely part of it. What was really interesting is really what John is saying; how much can you push the drawing? So we use the drawing as a medium for communication as architects, et cetera. But the drawing, in order to convey kind of difficult scenarios in a way of the time aspect of it, the temporal aspect of it. So go before, after, the present, and the future, and really navigate sort of in that sense. It's quite difficult.

I think the kind of visual studies that he started at the beginning, trying to figure out how different ways to represent complex ideas in terms of drawing is really quite important. And I think the drawing really outlines not only the complexities and the problems of let's say the site plan as the way we communicate traditionally, which is sort of complicated at this point in time. Right? But at the same time to meet that drawing in and of itself. So it really tries to go at the core of the architectural project and the way it's communicated, which is via the drawing. Right?

That's really a critical question for a thesis rather than the idea of the dexterity of the great project at the end, right? It's like, yes, of course. There is a modesty in the project that is argued through temporal conditions through the drawing. It is also through materials; this is a project of materials and the notion of how much they last in terms of different periods of time. Some of them could last 500 years and other ones could last four or five weeks. So I think to me, that's really something very important today. It questions our cultural notion of how much we want architecture to last forever, an attitude inherited from modernism. And I think that is really a critical negotiation that we need to start having a conversation for the future.

So for me, the project is really extremely valid because it touches upon something that we don't normally do. I hope it would have been a little more controversial, in a way. The jury is just very limited. And a different invited jury would have sort of talked about it. I noticed that time is limiting. But I think it really questions, a lot of it. And I'm sure it sits on a very sort of different end from a lot of the projects that we presented today in your group. So hopefully that really kind of becomes a catalyst to rethink a lot of issues about what we think about architecture. So super congratulations. I mean, it's a fantastic, fantastic project.

Thank you. I really appreciate the comments.

I'm going to jump in here real fast and apologize for being late. I was sitting, waiting for somebody to start the meeting but my link didn't work. All right. So John, amazing. So you've fully resolved and reconciled this. I don't think anything that you were saying about secretly needs to be secret. I mean, ultimately the first thing that comes to my mind about this project is it's a Superfund site, right? And so it's one of those sites for which the federal government appropriated billions of dollars to clean up because of the levels of pollution. Right? And so to me, that's a metaphor for what you're doing here. You're saying sort of the tyranny of conventional representation is like a Superfund site that needs to be cleaned up. Right? And so there's sort of a very explicit type of transgression here that is very appealing to me.

One of the things I'm interested in is... and I'll just ask it because I've got some ideas myself and I don't want to impose them on your project. And I only arrived when you actually talked about the project. I wasn't here for the precedent stuff. There are these inexhaustible tensions between duration and durability, right? Because you're
talking about duration, but there's nothing durable about anything
that you've proposed here, essentially, which leads me to another
question is what is the difference in your mind with this project
and maybe beyond between ephemerality and disposability?

J.S.

I think that disposability implies that there's a function or
use that is associated with the objects we're describing. Whereas
ephemerality is... It doesn't really care about the use or the
purpose of anything. You can say a tin can is disposable, but when
you think about what ephemeral means for a tin can, that tin
can is going to be disposed of far sooner than it matures as an
ephemeral kind of object. That really goes back to choosing the
word duration over words like disposable or lifespan. Because
again, lifespan implies that you're getting some sort of use out of
whatever you're talking about, whereas duration is more specific
to the qualities of whatever you're describing. It's these kinds of
distinctions that I am trying to highlight with this project because it
is a shift towards understanding things within the framework of a
flat ontology, rather than a more human centric approach.

S.C.

Yes. I mean, the first part of your response is exactly
what I was hoping for. That's exactly what I was thinking about
because duration operates in the complete absence of human
agency, whereas disposability requires human agency, right? And
because this whole project is about transgressing, that idea of
the anthropocentric, whether it's an architectural representation
or whether it's in the relationship of your project to its site. It
happens despite human interest or human presence or whatever.
So that first part of your response. This was recorded. If you could
incorporate that into your book, I think it would be really helpful.
That was fantastic. Thank you.

So maybe talked about this in the precedent, but with these
new drawings, which make me so happy, and I thank you so
much for invoking Perry Kulper. He's one of my favorite things
in the world is Perry Kulper drawing. Is this idea that you sort
of transcended architecture and development into the realm of
land and environmental art. So the work of Robert Smithson
and Michael Heizer especially are really coming up here for me,
where they essentially destroy the landscape to comment on the
destruction of the landscape. Right? And so if you're interested in
that at all, there's a little bit more to be explored there.

And then there are two more things I'd like to just make a
 suggestion or ask you about. So one of the things is you've sort of
transcended architectonics. So the physical relationships between
different types of materials informs into what I call the aesthetic
tectonics, right? So you've got these sensory and emotional
relationships that are generated outside the realm of human
senses and emotion, which I think is a really interesting thing
because it reinforces that idea of the flattened plane of eminence
that is so essential to the onto-cartographic.

Echoing what Susanneh said, I love this idea of sort of the
onto-cartographic temporal that is focused on simultaneity rather
than on sequentiality or the chronological. And so just to inform
yourself, there is a tradition in Persian and Mughal painting in
which everything that is present, everything that has been present
in the entire narrative is represented simultaneously in a single
image. So it's illegible. There's no perspective. Unless there's a
really important character, then there's some scalar issues, but
everything's there down to the tiniest little leaf on a tree, right?
And so in these latest mature drawings, that was invoked for me.
And so theoretically and critically, but also practically in terms of
representation, it might be something that you would want to look
at if you want to take this project a little bit further.

I would strongly encourage you to think about publishing this
project. I think it's a really well-developed set of ideas. And this
idea of simultaneity is in physics, right, in metaphysics, but then
also in non-Western philosophy, something that's really common.
It's only in European and North American tradition that do not
include indigenous cultures, that this fallacious construct that
things happen in sequence, one after the other, is sort of another
type of tyranny that's comparable, I think, to the architectural
drawing that you talked about. And then finally... I'll share the rest
of these notes with you... one of the things that was evoked for me
that I've never thought about before...

I don't know if you know about Nicolas Bourriaud's relational
aesthetics in which artists create works, and then they only
exist when people interact with them. But what you've done here
is you've replaced the human in relational aesthetics with the
wilderness. And I think that's a really interesting and potentially
productive theoretical and critical mechanism. So I'll share these
notes with you and you can look up Nic Bourriaud if you think
he's a valid person to think about. But I'd never thought about it
before, that you could have relational aesthetics absent a human
being, basically. And so it raises that issue for me and I'm grateful
for that. So it sort of expanded my consciousness in terms of the
potential of relational aesthetics. So nice work.

Thank you. I am definitely interested in looking more into
Mughal painting as well as digging a bit into Bourriaud's relational
aesthetics.

BRIAN GIBBS

Thanks for the commentary. We're kind of right at the end
here. I'd like to create a breakout room for the committee to kind of
discuss apart from everyone else who's in the meeting right now.
So I'm going to create that room. John, I just want to very quickly
say really nice job on getting the site plan updated. This was kind
of the big missing piece of the puzzle, and it's just a fascinating
plan. I think it works really well on a lot of different levels. So I'm
going to invite Gabe and Susanneh and Stephen to the break room
now, and I may need to delete this other room.

All right. Well, I guess I'll pass it over to the committee to
deliver the news.

G.E.

So John, we just wanted to let you know that we unanimously
approved the project. As it was expressed by the members of

the jury, it was really sort of a well-developed project, tough, but
you are able to at the end sort of create the argument for a very
complex and sort of trailblazing project. So congratulations.

Congratulations. Well done.

And I want to congratulate you as well, John, but I also want
to thank you for sticking to your guns basically, right? So you could
have sort of caved and done a much more conventional project,
but you've demonstrated that you understand the fundamental
principles of good design, but that you can also use that
understanding to transgress those principles while staying within
the parameters of what is a groundbreaking project literally and
figuratively groundbreaking. So I'm really looking forward to seeing
this published somewhere.

Thank you. I couldn't have put this project together without
your guidance over the past few months. I really appreciate it.
CLOSING
CITATIONS
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