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Abstract:
Urban analysis undertaken in one studio of the current Masters of Architecture programme at the University of Edinburgh ranges between grappling with the strategic and enacting the tactical. It is informed by Michel de Certeau’s prompts concerning engagement, negotiation and narrative in The Practice of Everyday Life (1984), where strategic, tactical (and in-between) ways of understanding and working are seen to have generative potential for the critical architectural project. Project is understood as a proposition situated in a specific cultural, social, technical, ethical framework, and in the discourses of the disciplines of architecture and urbanism, with a defined set of questions, and an empirical anchor- a studio city which offers a literal urban field, particular resistances. Urban is understood as a contested set of physical, temporal, cultural, socio-political and technical conditions, which require creative engagement to enable poised actions of intervention, measured restraint, “the irrigation of territories with potential” (Koolhaas, Whatever happened to Urbanism?). Motivations, methods and tested consequences become part of the process of design, of designing the project.

Individual Projects from this 2 year long studio are situated within speculative but substantiated potential urban transformations of the metropolitan area of the Bahia de Cádiz, Spain. Examples of research driven projects and project driven researches: the strategic: BioCity (Bush, Castle, Collier), Value- Displacement over time (Cremer); the tactical: memories of transgression: manifestations of an unofficial minority (Whitfield). The work of the studio has probably come closest to engagement with the contested complexity of the Urban+Project while operating on the margins of academic/ design practice- when ‘out of place’ during a field trip and fieldwork, when operating collectively, experimenting in Year 1 with a project to construct a City Plan, and in Year 2 with a project to construct a propositional City Model. Both drew attention to the shortcomings of single-vision projects, existing as manifestations of multiple project intentions and interventions. The co-existence of the strategic (overview, collective city operations) with the tactical (individual excursions and diversions) allows necessary responsiveness of shifting research strategies and tactics which may deepen the transformative potential of an Urban Project.
This paper outlines and reflects on the experience of recent collective and individual Urban Projects within the Master of Architecture studio at the University of Edinburgh, UK over the past 2 years, 2006-2008. An underpinning ambition of the programme is to posit the potential integration of research and design in relation to the (generally European) city, and to explore appropriate and innovative methodologies and pedagogies.

First, summarising the UoE Master of Architecture Programme’s structure and content places the design studio as an ongoing integrative and iterative component in a wider academic and educational context. The empirical anchor, the study city, is then described - why it was chosen, what issues are at stake, how it informs an understanding of contemporary urban (European) issues. Third, key concepts from Michel de Certeau’s text are set out, which have informed practices of, within and through the studio. The strategic and tactical are used here as a lens to interrogate collective and individual projects, seeking to define and to understand relationships between urban research (analysis) and architectural design (projection/ speculation), to conclude some comment on research driven projects and project driven researches. The definition of and development of the two collective projects and selected individual thesis projects has been formulated primarily within the academic studio, however there have been limited engagements with other parties - in the study city, visiting academics and practitioners, specialists/ experts in particular fields (geology, marine research, immigration etc). The output of the studio as a whole, currently on show as degree exhibition in Edinburgh (2-27 June), with a curated exhibition/ publication to follow in Edinburgh International Visual Art Festival, August 2008 (SaltCity: Field + Work) is open to the possibility of wider interactions, as a body of work which can now be edited, discussed, reviewed. The next ongoing UoE Master of Architecture studio based in Warszawa, led by Dr Mark Dorrian, is currently engaging with the city of Warsaw in a public exhibition and a series of public seminars focused around work emerging from the first year of the programme. These are obviously exciting developments which we embrace, being “not only an academic exercise just aiming at possible future situations, but an opportunity to establish a field of juxtaposition between different parties, to define an agenda, to orientate discussions relating to the future of our cities and metropolitan areas.” (extract from The Urban Project conference text). The paper
concludes that these examples of Urban Projects do oscillate between and rely upon both (scientific) research and architectural design practice, and that the best go beyond the potentials of each methodology/discipline. However the presence of both research and design makes the context of evaluation and measure more complex and potentially unclear. The Project is certainly an ‘intermediary’ in status, but also has to act and be of itself, to have a clear consolidation and a necessary autonomy in order to fulfill its potential as establishing a future field, defining agendas, orienting discussions concerning the future of our cities and metropolitan areas.

1. Design studio in the University of Edinburgh Master of Architecture programme

The Master of Architecture at the University of Edinburgh is a 2 year professionally accredited programme based around a research-oriented pedagogy that takes the form of a series of thematically linked studio-based design courses. Each student cohort focuses on one study city (usually in Europe), supplemented by a broad theoretical theme within which individual students position and develop their individual thesis work. The design courses (over 60% of each of 4 Semesters) are augmented by courses in contemporary architectural theory, architectural technology and professional studies. These seminar/lecture based courses all consciously overlap with the study city and the theme of the design studio through staff dialogue and inflections made to the content of these courses each year. A programme leader (architect Suzanne Ewing) and collaborating tutor (visual artist Victoria Bernie) have led the studio over the two years, with choreographed input from visiting professors, design critics, and other specialists. The design Courses are structured with an ‘Opening’ Semester followed by 2 semesters of Design Thesis, and a final consolidating ‘Closure’ Semester, when strands are drawn together, consolidated and presented in a final exhibition and Thesis report. Students are expected to undertake a number of projects and to develop and test their enquiries at a range of scales, holding these in productive relationship with each other. Thesis is defined as an active term, a critical positioning in relation to studio city/theme, and in relation to appropriate discourses related to the disciplines of architecture and urbanism. Reflective practice, invention and experimentation through critical and imaginative making and drawing is encouraged.
Cádiz: empirical anchor and theoretical theme

Cádiz is an Atlantic city on the southwestern coast of Europe. The Bahia of Cádiz, comprising the city on the isthmus and four other towns, is currently perceived of as one metropolitan area, raising questions of how to define urban field within a loose city/land/aqueous topography. Cádiz was a centre of Phoenician salt trade, a Roman city, and a key gateway for the Americas. Until 1884 it was a prime nautical meridian, a significant cosmopolitan pivot in the cultures of discovery and globalization, a punta of Europe, Africa and the Americas, a testing ground of military and naval tactics and a portal for flows of goods, people and ideas. It is a city of the south, a peninsular of the peninsular of Spain. It is not an island, it is set apart from yet tethered to mainland Spain and historically perceived of as ‘other’ to Europe. Its Atlantic situation conditions it as a place of raw exposure- salt, wind, light- and fragile ecologies- fish, ridges, wetlands. The city of Cádiz decadently exists in this extreme environmental situation. What does it mean to cultivate dwelling and public life in this context? How might this cosmopolitan ground be irrigated with potential through thoughtful, maybe radical architectural and urban engagement?

The high speed AVE train currently connects the 550km from Madrid to Sevilla in 2.5 hours. From Sevilla to Cádiz 9128km), a car, train or bus journey connection is 1.5-2 hours. Crossings from southern Mediterranean Spain to Africa take under 1 hour. It is a metropolitan area relatively disconnected by land yet strategically connected by sea. In a likely future where current decadent mobilities (particularly cheap air travel/ centralized land-based infrastructure) cannot be taken for granted, can salt cities like Cadiz offer clues and uncover potential for generating more meaningful relations between everyday life, production and spatiality, where sal(t) relates to salary, material production to time and land limits? As salt is an agent of slowing (or speeding) decay, adding wit, drawing out existing taste, how might architecture be an agent of tactical resistance in slowing the city, adding surprise and delight, poetically drawing out existing attributes and posing new possibilities for dwelling and public life?

The 2006-08 studio theme of field + work is premised on a need and desire for architectural design practice to be self consciously situated. Rem Koolhaas talks of the future role of architecture as “the irrigation of territories with potential” rather
than "the arrangement of more or less permanent objects"\(^1\). This statement provokes an exploratory approach to understanding territory (field, ground, site), what ‘potential’ might be (programmatic attitude) and what constitute acts of ‘irrigation’ (erasure, purging, resistance, friction, intervention, augmentation, accretion). Some provocations we have looked at include: James Corner, “Eidetic Operations and New Landscapes”\(^2\). Corner discusses the relationship between landscape and image, and highlights the notion of “landschaft (landscape as an occupied milieu, the effects and significance of which accrue through tactility, use and engagement over time)”\(^3\). He outlines a need for designers “to fully equip their arsenal of eidetic operations, in both the imaginative and efficacious sense of technographies.”\(^4\) He proposes a focus of attention on “the logic of making the landscape rather than its appearance per se”\(^5\) alongside hybridised and composite imaging techniques; Mark Wigley, “Prosthetic Theory: The Disciplining of Architecture”\(^6\). Wigley’s positioning of the discipline of architecture as a prosthetic extension to an educational institution, “Architecture was inside the university, but inside as an outsider.”\(^7\); Carol Burns & Andrea Kahn, “Why Site Matters”\(^8\). Claiming, naming and manipulation of land is an essential human condition, and the widely used, although often ill-defined notion of 'site' is central to the actions of architectural design.

3. Michel de Certeau’s strategic and tactical practices

In the General introduction to *The Practice of Everyday Life* (trans. *Arts de Faire*, University of California Press, Berkeley + Los Angeles, 1984; paperback edition 1988), de Certeau sets out his project: “a continuing investigation of the ways in which users...operate”, and an articulation, a making explicit of these, countering recent dominant frameworks of individualised atomisation. This is oriented in the General Introduction through an exploration of ‘Consumer production’, ‘The procedures of everyday creativity’, ‘The formal structure of practice’, ‘The marginality
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3. Corner ibid. p158
4. Corner ibid. p163
5. Corner ibid. p164
7. Wigley p15
of a majority’, exposing the question of understanding a logic of (a) practice, an art or a way of making. His investigations concern firstly ways of making, ‘“readers’ practices, practices related to urban spaces, utilisations of everyday rituals, re-uses and functions of the memory through the “authorities” that make possible (or permit) everyday practices..” and secondly relevant scientific literature from the disciplines of sociology, anthropology, history, ethnomethodology, sociolinguistic studies, analytical philosophy. Part 2 of his Introduction concerns “an antidiscipline” (xv) ‘The tactics of Practice’ – ‘Trajectories, tactics and rhetorics’- a search for a problematics articulating collected material-, ‘Reading, talking, dwelling, cooking etc’- descriptions of a number of significant practices, ‘Extensions: prospects and politics’- analysis extended to other fields apparently governed by another kind of logic.

The exploration of practices related to urban spaces is relevant here both at the level of the architectural student/ educator operating in a design studio- undertaking fieldwork and engagement with a given study city (cities), and also as embedded in the student/ educators’ reading and understanding of the practices of others in the urban context of the empirical study cit (site) which may more strategically inform or generate a project and which may influence its direction. All projects are to some extent a “wandering line/ ligne d’erre” (quoting de Certeau quoting Deligny xviii).

Stages of practical investigation “tentative moves” to pragmatic ruses” to “successive tactics” (xxiii) could be a sketchy description of an inquiring design process responding to a given Academic framework, Programme briefs and tutor/ reviewer interactions and are used to analyse the process of selected projects on this Programme.


---

tricks...maneuvers, polymorphic situations, joyful discoveries, poetic as well as 
warlike” (xix), “seducing, persuading, making use of” (xx), “surreptitious” (xxiii), 
“to outwit” (xxiv) etc. Chapter III “Making Do”: Uses and Tactics’ situated in the 
more theoretical Part I ‘A Very Ordinary Culture’ (p 29-42 of the paperback) outlines 
in more detail a differentiation between the strategic and the tactical.

“The space of the tactic is the space of the other...it must play on and with a terrain 
imposed on it and organized by the law of a foreign power. It does not have the 
means to keep to itself, at a distance, in a position of withdrawal, foresight, and self-
collection...an art of the weak” (p37). By contrast, de Certeau calls a strategy “the 
calculation (or manipulation) of power relationships that become possible as soon as 
a subject with will and power (a business, an army, a city, a scientific institution) can 
be isolated. It postulates a place that can be delimited as its own and serve as the 
base from which relations with an exteriority composed of targets or threats...can be 
managed.” (p35-36)

De Certeau describes strategies as seeking “to create places in conformity with 
abstract models” (p29), whereas tactics can “only use, manipulate, and divert these 
spaces” (p30). Does this mean that an architect has to be inherently and primarily 
strategic if he/she is to offer something new, to truly invent or imagine? This has 
certainly been the predominant position of the twentieth century. By emphasising the 
design studio and the Urban Project in a University setting as having tactical as well 
as strategic potential, as we are doing in this Programme, the emphasis privileges 
understanding and working with the existing civic (institutional) situation with all its 
cultural, social, technical, environmental, political complexities, and relational 
possibilities, over and above pursuit of developing the internal logics of, for example, 
autonomies of a new architecture, such as the development of form, structure or 
innovative imported technologies.

“Superimposition”, “displacement”, “modes of re-use” (p30), potentially “protean” 
(p31) allows interplay between what exists and how/ to what extent it is 
manipulated. The professionalisation of architectural design of course pushes design 
practice towards the fundamentally strategic, operating within the constraining 
orders/ “institutional” powers of financial formulae and frameworks, city control/

governance/ legislation, risk management. Exposing students to more tactical ways of operating, placing the ‘making’ of architecture as part of a larger understanding of cultural ‘making’ of cities in de Certeau’s terms, is intentional, and aims to provoke a critical engagement with future modes of architectural (professional) practice and what this may constitute.

De Certeau uses the category of trajectory to account for the practices of ‘antidiscipline’, “It is thus a mark in place of acts, a relic in place of performances: it is only their remainder, the sign of their erasure” (p35), suggesting a movement but also a flattening out a transcription, a line which can be reversed (xviii). We talk a lot in the studio of tracing the path of design practice, being able to track moves, in order to provide opportunity to re-enter or manipulate ‘out of’ sequence.

My observation through research into the site visit/ field trip in design education is that students are generally tactical in their initial engagements with a study city, they therefore operate with ‘tact’, ie: precisely, opportunistically and in direct relation to instant, circumstance and faire, using tricks and tenacity (p26). The question of measuring and evaluating ‘tact’ and its consequences within the more strategic framework of the Academy is raised.

4. 2 Collective Projects

Hinge Project 1: the Cádiz City Plan(ning) Office 2007 was an 8 day project which took place in the first year of the Programme, acting as a hinge between the Opening projects of the first Semester, and the beginnings of the Design Thesis work. An exploration of “performative architectural education”, 32 students (including 8 MSc Advanced Architectural Design students) participated, working with 2006-7 Visiting Simpson Professor of Architecture, Ben Nicholson, and Course leaders, Suzanne Ewing and Victoria Bernie. The brief for the CCPO was to work together to collate and to consolidate the 32 territories and themes identified so far by each student. The Cádiz City Plan was presented at 1pm on Thursday 18\textsuperscript{th} January 2007 in Studio 5, 20 Chambers St, Edinburgh to Professors Ben Nicholson and Andrew Benjamin.

Individual student responses to “What went on in the CCPO?” completed shortly after the project, demonstrate a rich range of new understandings of the potentiality but contingent nature of collective practice, and how the project opened up new ways of
imagining and dialoguing with the complexities of city, its processes, and logics for action.

“How a group of people choreograph themselves and motivate themselves is probably the most difficult challenge of large group projects. The matter of who is in charge or apparently telling people what to do, whose ideas you use, whose ideas you don’t use and who goes to buy the coffee are issues that become more and more insurmountable the larger the group becomes...personal ego was an impossibility in the project because so many people had ownership in having touched the ideas at some point.” (Andrew Brooks)

“The piece can withstand many unpickings. A crowd of spinderly legs intertwined, interlinked, a forest of parasitic vines, a museum of silent cocoons, deformed mannequins, stalagmites and stalactites (stalactights). Each speaks directly of body and (slow? suffocating?) movement and abstractly of time. As for the question of scale, the use of a material which is so directly human binds it to this reading, but it is equally of urban landscape, and microscopic organism. It is all of these yet it is also of the scale itself - the scale of the process, of its manufacture, of its siting.....Each of the 32 class members could point to the part that is them...It is about anonymity, about questioning self, questioning where one idea begins or ends or overlaps or becomes simultaneously multiples and one.” (Emma Bush)

“It has neither beginning nor end; neither points of culmination or termination – yet always a moment of middle (milieu) and multiple entranceways.” (Euan Cockburn)

_Hinge Project 2:_ The Cádiz City Model 2008 was a 12 day project which took place precisely one year later. The project acted as a hinge between individual design propositions and technological investigations on empirical sites in Cádiz, and a consolidated, re-assembled urban field as the context for concluded thesis investigations in Semester 4. The brief for the CCM was to work together to construct 23 ongoing architectural propositions on their sites and in relationship to each other at 1:500 scale with a considered, well crafted urban armature, and complementary visual field context. “The Cádiz City Model” was launched at 8pm on Tuesday 22nd January 2008 in Studio 4, 20 Chambers St, Edinburgh to an audience of invited students, tutors and visitors, and later presented to 2008-9 Visiting Simpson Professor of Architecture, Iñaki Abalos. Individual student responses to “What was made in the CCM?”, completed shortly after the project, demonstrate a
confidence arising from the augmenting of collective practice begun in the CCPO, a collective ownership/authorship in dialogue with deepened understandings of individual propositions and potential new relationships with other projects.

“...it makes twenty-three versions of a fiction solid. As if twenty-three authors were trying to write the same book at the same time. Some characters may be straightforward, if only one person is concerned with that section of the story. Others may be more complex, positioning a system of collaboration, over- and re-writing....Collectively we learnt exactly what is meant by our Cádiz. What its extents are, where its borders fade to nothing, or where they butt up precisely against another.” (Emma Bush)

“Opportunities arise from conversations, often with the appearance of argument - ideas are worked through and questioned, taken apart and put back together... Contrastingly, compromise is often achieved when people don't question -it is either the moment when someone relents or it is the moment when people have apparently agreed, done something in the meantime, come back together and found they no longer 'fit' and have to be pushed together in the way that both parties are least uncomfortable with. This is often necessary for a group project, especially that in a limited timeframe to happen at all. There is a point when someone needs to relent or something needs to be made.” (Michael Whitfield)

5. Individual projects - research driven project/ project driven research, between the strategic + tactical

These 2 year Projects are only recently complete. Questions at this point of reflection are: How did the student engage with the urban/city project? How did the student negotiate- with the city/theme and within the design studio? How were narratives constructed/ forgotten/ reconstructed? In this context I am looking for logics of action, expecting to see ‘tactical’ evidence, representation of ‘stages of practical investigation’- moves, ruses, tactics- probably hidden at the current moment when strategically these Urban Projects are offered to the public (examiners/ Degree Show audience) as product, with values of educational and professional capital attached. The titles of 24 Projects completed over 2 years are:
What I mean by a strategic project is illustrated by: *BioCity* (Emma Bush/ Adam Collier/ Sarah Castle). This project was generated following *Hinge Project 2*, the Cádiz City Model, when 3 students saw an opportunity to further interrogate their individual programmes and site proposals in the city. They met together and over 2 weeks constructed a ‘Development Framework’ document which consolidated their individual research and design projects into *BioCity* Commercial, *BioCity* Residential, *BioCity* Industrial, placing this in the context of current policy frameworks, precedents such as BioBasque. They produced an urban scale drawing and 3 individual bus stop designs as an exploration of material threshold at each of their project territories. This articulated consolidation of a development context was intended to validate and to situate their more individual design testings in a dock area (Bush), by the City Gate (Collier) and in a run-down industrial zone (Castle).

Tact/tactics are hinted at in many of the final Project titles. Some of the most explicit and successfully followed through examples of a tactical project are illustrated by *Secreted seams/ memories of transgression: manifestations of an unofficial minority* (Michael Whitfield), *Microsurgery, Ossiointegration + the Taphonomic boundary* (Katie Nicolson), *New worlds within the old town* (Ross Perkin), *Gap city...hidden spaces* (Jie Lin).
spaces (Jie Lin). In Secreted seams (Whitfield), a key move was identifying specific narratives of the movement of immigrants into and through this area, which generated a project framed around the 40 days between when an individual arrives and when they may become ‘official’. This ‘ruse’ generated a complex programme of support in response, including a mosque, a laundry, a non-citizen's advice bureau, a clinic. The design proposals tactically extended to the interweaving of timber structures as a ‘secreted’ arcade threading its way through the least accessible semi-public parts of the urban fabric of the old city, only conceptually imagined as a whole. The project documentation consolidated the tactics of the project through a series of material/fabric metaphors contingent on an implicitly more expansive setting: seam, veil, thread, weave.

Much research undertaken in the early stages of the Programme were tactical, and intensified around the field trip activity. A starting point for Secreted seams (Whitfield) was observation of how one African umbrella seller mobilised and occupied a particular street extraordinarily, in responsive to inclement rain, spatial positioning and time of day. An experiment with rhythmanalysis was undertaken by Bush/Brooks during the field trip following desk research on Lefebvre’s original text, and a presented hypothesis of the base rhythms of Cádiz. Tested findings were clouded by the ad-hoc nature of the equipment, a camera crudely strapped to chest, which produced footage dominated by footstep rather than external rhythms. However, the route taken, chosen to investigate crossing the old town city from Atlantic to Bay became significant in subsequent studio investigations in drawing sites and connections to attention through rigorous drawing of some of the outcomes (Brooks). Landscapes of production (Bush)’s first project on return from the fieldtrip concerned mapping the subtle topography of part of the old town, surmising it being flooded, and proposing a series of urban salinas (salt production pools) with a gatekeeper’s house. The proposal’s arrangement and detail was underpinned by the daily and seasonal rhythms of tidal flows exploring how the gatekeeper would interact.

While some of these projects have a tendency to be research driven (essentially though not exclusively more strategic) for instance Hydroscape: the hydropolitical strand (Fotheringham), most are project driven (arguably more tactical).

Reprogramming the ruptured city (Collier) has primarily been design led. The first
project, a House for a Seismologist, investigated through drawings and models, what might be at stake pragmatically and conceptually in engaging with the ground of Cádiz and the addition of weight and load at vulnerable points. A key move in this project was the re-describing of the urban morphology as a geological landscape, which identified areas to work in. Through modelled and drawn investigations of the possibilities of one key site, coupled with research into the history of the Puerta de Tierra, a programme was ‘uncovered’ to include public routes of connection, exposure of Phoenecian archaeology, and places of intense activity which might ‘lock’ new pieces of built city. A key move in New worlds within the old town (Perkin) was the identification of an unusually large ‘cleared’ site in the Old Town, which became the locus for all subsequent work- field documentation, historical research which led to a speculative placing of an existing Roman Circus under the site, which informed design proposals for a film institute. Interest in transformation of material, load paths, the typologies of threshold (street to casa patio) were explored primarily through design methodologies- drawing, comparative scaling, model testing, tactical making.

6. Conclusions: Project status

The paper concludes that these examples of Urban Projects do oscillate between and rely upon both (scientific) research and architectural design practice, and that the best go beyond the potentials of each methodology/discipline. However the presence of both tactical and strategic research and design makes the context of evaluation and measure more complex and potentially unclear. The Project is certainly an ‘intermediary’ in status, but also has to act and be of itself, to have a clear consolidation and a necessary autonomy in order to fulfil its potential as establishing a future field, defining agendas, orienting discussions concerning the future of our cities and metropolitan areas.