FINAL DISCUSSIONS
HOUSES

The architectural core of the project has all the time been based on an idea of a horizontal movement. When attempting to extend the early sketches upwards I have had troubles to dissolve the horizontal planes and plateaus, which shows clearly in the house sketches where the units always are stacked with clear divisions between each floor. There is a hierarchy embedded in the stacking, and I do not look upon any of the sketches as being three-dimensional fields. If I were to sketch on the next house one way to go could be to dissolve the clearly distinguished floors.

Though, I do think that these five houses are collective in different ways, and that they take on different aspects of the discussion on collective form and field conditions. Whether it is a collective ground, collective movement, collective functions or collective views, they all contribute to the discussion and builds up a material that rather is growing than narrows down to one preferable solution.

My goal has never been formal in the sense that I am searching for a certain visual appearance, but instead a condition of an architecture that admits change, accident, and parttaking.

And worth noting is that a nonhierarchical form cannot guarantee a democratic and open society / collective construction. But by investigating residential buildings with a group from approach or as a field condition, that connects to the city, a space might be created that is open for improvisations of future inhabitants.
THEORY

It is hard to make strong conclusions or standpoints this short after the project, and also hard to summarize what exact knowledge that has come out of the work so far. The intentions with the project was to investigate the plural, as a comment or critique to the observation that we are becoming more and more isolated from people in our physical reality due to an ever increasing virtual impact upon our lives.

Architects as Fumihiko Maki and Stan Allen has been sources of inspiration and generators for the discussion and search. This adventure has been just as much a theoretical investigation as a spatial one. Without initially meaning to, I have strived to figure out how architectural theory can be useful to me when developing a building. It has been an attempt to connect theory and practice, to search for theoretical conceptual tools that can offer a deepened understanding of fundamental architectural themes. So my hope is that this work will be useful to me continuously.

Architectural theory is often used to explain things afterwards. In this project I have tried to take advantage of theory in order to generate something new. Instead of explaining the world, as Maki did, I have wanted to produce the world out of those explanations.
PROCESS

This project has been a chance for me to find another way of working and another way of thinking architecture, different from how I have often done before. It has allowed me to engage in a discussion rather than pragmatically solve a problem, or artistically design an object. So this is the result from my way of spending 100 days (and is today more important than the first?).

I have been very uncertain at times. It was frightening to give up on the idea of drawing one, fantastic building, and instead continue the search, to never settle. I had a quite long gone plan of making house #6, but time stopped me.

As architecture students we are so used to complete things. To know the answer already when we are asked the question. In that sense this project is unfinished. When looking back at this semester it turns out the process itself could almost be described as a field condition. The material is growing, in different directions. It has not a clear start, and definitely not a clear ending. These are questions that have occupied my mind before coming to this school, and they will probably continue to do so, even though the story of the thesis ended on day number 105.