Dialectics of Space (D.O.S.) began with the intention to find a specific connection between architecture, labor, pedagogy, play, experimentation, environment and social situations through research as well as practice. Though these topics are quite different, it felt as though there would be or should be a singular entity that could connect or unify them under one umbrella. I tossed around many ideas but none could capture the group into one. After much reading followed by the process of actually making the work, it became clear that there was no umbrella to encapsulate these disparate ideas except for the process itself. The collision of nodes and events within D.O.S. become situations or happening which are able to consolidate architecture, labor, pedagogy, play, experimentation, environment and social situations.
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Light stretches from one node to the next, connecting spaces via the movement of photons. Particles and participants activate the architecture though laborious processes. A magenta environment where bodies play and experiment within each node as space-time collapses upon itself. What the “work” is in actuality, is not easily identifiable as it is not an entity so much as it is a series of nexus points which unify ideas, surrounded by materials and methodology. Things/structures/thoughts become similar to the magenta photons as they permeate spaces/individuals/time, crossing from one into the next. The “work” is not static, allowing it to be playful as well as experimental and thus can be modified in response to the situation. It can be learned from and reconfigured accordingly in a continuous sequence of trial and error. Every step is a pedagogical adventure for those who choose to interact while those who do not are relinquished.
On page 8 of Henri Lefebvre’s book, The *Production Of Space*, the author writes:

“We are thus confronted by an indefinite multitude of spaces, each one piled upon, or perhaps contained within, the next; geographical, economic, demographic, sociological, ecological, political, commercial, national, continental, global. Not to mention nature’s (physical) space, the space of (energy) flows and so on.” (Lefebvre)

This description depicts something like a cake or a matryoshka, where layers are built upon each other, upon a foundation of those underneath or inside. There is a natural hierarchy through this production of space which cannot be ignored. Space, as such, is no longer a democratic entity, accessible and free, but rather it becomes another constraint of the structure of society where the elevated tiers of space devalue others. The production of political, commercial and national spaces are built upon the sociological which is built upon the ecological. The weight of upper layers crushes those underfoot. Different kinds of space, however, are not something to be produced nor can they be controlled but they can only be inspired. Spaces are non-hierarchical as they communicate with each other, informing one another in the creation of a unified space-time.

In looking to define spaces which cooperate, where entities/topics/ideas fluidly pass through the porous membranes as a dialectic is created between them, we will explore examples of works which manifest different types of space and how those spaces converge. We will look at identifying architectural, pedagogical, experimental, environmental, playful, dialogical as well as laborious spaces as those which are necessary for the creation of democratic, open and non-exclusive, and participatory formulations of space-time. The goal of this is to define the production of space-time through different criteria which is overlapping and undulating, its fluid nature allowing one sphere to seamlessly blend into the next, eroding any identifiable borders. In looking to identify these spheres of space and points where they are able to merge into one body, we can focus on those methods
of production which manifest space able to promote a better quality of life. As Henri Lefebvre identified a dominant form of space which sought to overpower, so too did he point towards an alternative form of space which “straddles the breach between science and utopia, reality and ideality, conceived and lived” (Lefebvre) and that is what we are looking for by identifying nexus points where architectural, pedagogical, experimental, environmental, playful, dialogical and laborious spaces can converge.

In developing a trajectory for the concentration of such spaces, we will begin right before the midpoint of the 20th century, in 1947, when Aldo Van Eyck designed the first, out of hundreds, of his playgrounds which were installed in Amsterdam (Oudenampsen). Through his work, Van Eyck grew play spaces out of urban space using minimal, multi-purpose, modular structures which are simultaneously sculpture, toy and architecture. The simplicity of such structures and their materiality engaged with the materials of modern cities and labor, predominantly steel and cement, while accessing children’s imagination to use a static play space in a myriad of ways. Because of Van Eyck’s playgrounds, urbanity was infected by play as he appropriated existing sites around Amsterdam. Play, however, is not a thing unto itself but spaces of play, according to Johan Huizinga in his book Homo Ludens, are necessary in the generation of culture (Huizinga). By this creation of culture, Van Eyck’s play spaces also create social spaces; children playing in those minimal interjections into Amsterdam’s urbanity developed momentary communities among
those who were there in any moment while simultaneously encouraging those children to develop social, motor and cognitive skills, aiding to their perception of their own environment. The playgrounds of Aldo Van Eyck manifest multiple different types of spaces, all converging into one undulating form stretching across the urban landscape where each one is able to reflect and refer to the others, through materiality, form as well as function.

A peer of Van Eyck, Constant Nieuwenhuys also looked to play as an integral part of urbanity but rather than attempting to infect the city with play, he instead tried to imagine a kind of city, a *New Babylon* for Huizinga’s Homo Ludens to inhabit. In a text that Nieuwenhuys wrote for a Haags Gemeetenmuseum exhibition catalog published in 1974, he states:

*As a way of life Homo Ludens will demand, firstly, that he responds to his need for playing, for adventure, for mobility, as well as all the conditions that facilitate the free creation of his own life. (Nieuwenhuys)*

The city Constant Nieuwenhuys envisioned was a futuristic expression of architecture that presented a blank experimental space for potential inhabitants who would be incorporated into its body as participants. *New Babylon* was a modular proposition which could be modified, customized and played with, according to the needs of the population. The proposed architecture would become an event as it changed over time and use, conforming to the needs of social space. *New Babylon* would have been a kind of living body, working symbiotically with the smaller organisms (humans) living within it. The work speculates on a society where all non-creative labor has been automatized, providing ultimate freedom to play, explore, learn and create. Nieuwenhuys designed an architectural ideal, utopian and free. The very conceptualizing of *New Babylon* is play according to Huizinga’s five characteristics of play, especially because it is so far from “ordinary” or “real” life while attempting to become the alternative form of space talked about by Henri Lefebvre.
Unfortunately, *New Babylon* was never realized but some quarter of a century later, it started to become generally apparent that the future would need something more than what Nieuwenhuys was proposing. *Millennium Hut* (1998), a project by artist Claire Barclay who collaborated with the architectural firm Studio KAP and was commissioned by the Govanhill Housing Association in Glasgow, Scotland, was a response to the looming future of energy resources and global overpopulation. Perhaps coincidentally, *Millennium Hut*’s construction coincides with the beginning of the Tiny House Movement (Wikipedia). Barclay’s project was constructed out of a combination of new and recycled materials, occupied a footprint of just 22 meters of space and had solar panels on its roof. The project was supposed to be a community facility that functioned in a number of different ways: as a garden store, workshop, library, viewing platform and also included shelves for growing plants on (Thompson). *Millennium Hut* was commissioned to function as a social space in order to rejuvenate the local area of Govanhill while acting as an example of good ecological practices. It tries to be an alternative space which engages with the local community, creating a dialogue about the different spatial spheres which are contained within it (architectural, environment, pedagogy, labor, social, et cetera) but any documentation about such activities are rare, if they exist at all. There is very little information about it online, only briefly mentioned on the artist’s website in her CV while there is a short description of it alongside some images on the Studio KAP website as well as www.discoverglasgow.org. There is one blog post from 2010 by a Glasgow resident which asks “Is the structure ever open to the public and is it still in use? Does anyone know?” (Blogspot). Though it is nearly two-decades old, *Millennium Hut* seems like an important work, especially as it is described in *Living as form: socially engaged art from 1991-2011* to have generated “an economic benefit of 34 million pounds and served as a catalyst for further urban regeneration” (Thompson) so why does it have such a lack of presence on the artist’s website and on the Internet? In consideration of other work presented on Barclay’s website, there are no other apparent attempts at community engaged art, so perhaps *Millennium Hut* was an aberration of her practice and perhaps its lifespan was limited as the community never assumed ownership of it. It attempts to encompass the types of space that we are seeking but perhaps it just misses the mark.
If we traverse space-time a bit, from Barclay’s *Millennium Hut*, journeying one year previous and all the way to northern Thailand, where we arrive at a project called *The Land* (1998) by the collective which goes by the name, The Land Foundation. The project started as a way to reclaim the land as in recent years frequent flooding had caused rice farming in the region to become unproductive and local farmers have offered their lands for other development as they searched for better prospects (The Land Foundation). As *The Land* was cultivated through agricultural experimenting, so too were artists and architects invited to develop its infrastructure of buildings and alternative sources of energy. Assuming the methodology of an artist in residence program, the project hosts international artists who then work with locals to develop art/architecture as components to be incorporated into the natural surroundings.

Through cultivation, collaboration and community development, *The Land* is enveloped within a social space where experimentation is encouraged for the purpose of developing sustainable methods for land use. The project is a holistic, non-for-profit approach to land development and is currently continuing their activities with two “huge” construction projects (theland@thelandfoundation.org). *The Land* is a permanent project which obscures the definitions of art, activism, architecture, agriculture and economy.

The next project we will look at was partially developed at *The Land*. SUPERFLEX, a collaborative art group out of Denmark “challenges the role of the artist in contemporary society and explores the nature of globalization and systems of power” (SUPERFLEX). The work that they implemented in a number of different locations including at *The Land*, titled *SUPERGAS* (1996-2010), is a simple biogas production system which is able to create enough gas to satisfy the cooking and electricity needs of a family (Thompson). The project, through collaborations and experimentation,
addresses the basic needs of the rural global south as individuals in such locations strive to acquire the most basic of amenities which are taken for granted by those living in more privileged regions. SUPERGAS also contributes to dialogue surrounding the use of biogas (primarily methane) which is a sustainable, renewable energy source that is produced from waste and is a greenhouse gas. Though burning biogas is similar to burning natural gas in terms of its CO2 emissions, it is carbon neutral in the production and can reduce pollutants that would have otherwise entered wastewater (Wilkie). In looking for solutions to basic needs of households in developing regions, SUPERFLEX, through this project, is able to create a space within domestic architecture for those activities which naturally occur within such as learning, social interaction, as well as play. SUPERGAS is not just an object or an installation but goes beyond that to encourage groups of people to spend time together with the heat for cooking and the light it can produce while addressing environmental and economic needs.

Another group utilizing waste as the material for their collective research and creation is Basurama. Formed in Spain during 2001, the group has almost become an institution with permanent offices in Sao Paolo and Bilbao with Madrid as its base (Basurama). Unlike SUPERFLEX’s SUPERGAS, Basurama uses primarily non-biological waste for its activities. Finding those waste materials which are abundant in a location, Basurama then looks to repurpose them as they incorporate local peoples/communities into their practice. Resuduos Urbanos Solidos, also known as RUS or translated as Urban Solid Waste is one such project which has taken on many different formats and in various locales (Asunción/ Buonos Aires/ Cordoba/ Jordan/ Lima/ Miami/ Santo Domingo)
between 2008 and 2011. Through *Residuos Urbanos Solidos*, Basurama is able to engage with the city in a site specific manner which directly addresses the lived experiences of the local community while speaking to global issues of climate change and environmental destruction. Many instances of RUS have had the objective of utilizing that local waste as material to be used in the creation of play spaces, directly interacting and modifying the architecture of the city. Other instances have seen waste used to create spaces of learning and experimentation as common waste materials are transformed into new products, interventions and experiences. Basurama gives new life to materials as they repurpose them, reducing the weight of the labor and environmental exploitation that went into those plastics, pallets, tires, et cetera, so that they can be reincarnated and prevented from journeying to those spaces where waste coalesces.

While art collectives like The Land Foundation, SUPERFLEX and Basurama reject the idea of individual authorship, Theaster Gates utilizes it to “dupe” himself into putting all of energy into a project, allowing him to work on something which ultimately goes beyond his own needs as his studio work (Linden). For Gate’s *Dorchester Project* (2009), the artist imbues his own methodology into disused spaces, essentially, as Henri Lefebvre puts it:

“*Architecture produces living bodies, each with its own distinctive traits. The animating principle of such a body, its presence, is neither visible nor legible as such, nor is it the object of any discourse, for it reproduces itself within those who use the space in question, within their lived experience.*” (Lefebvre).

There are food deserts in some highly urban places, where fresh, healthy foods are relatively unavailable, but there are also cultural deserts which is a problem that the *Dorchester Project* addresses by buying abandoned architecture, laboriously repurposing, and transforming it in order to create social or community spaces
where participants can learn, explore, develop and interact with other members of the community. Through this project, Gates, honors place and objects through his personal rejuvenation efforts. Instead of buying new materials he cherishes the inherent history of things, reusing material, upcycling and imbuing value into the architecture, the neighborhood, the discarded archives, as well as the matter which composes the production that is *The Dorchester Project*. It is also important to note that this project is not about short term interaction where an artist moves into a place as an outsider, like so many other community-based art engagements, but is a long term commitment to respond to site through available local resources and an intimate, long-term relationship with the local population.

Thomas Hirschhorn, is an outsider in every sense to the community where his project, *Gramsci Monument* (2013), was situated. During the summer of 2013, the courtyard of Forest Houses (Bronx, New York, USA) was transformed into bustling center for community engagement, socializing, debate and learning. Hirschhorn has received a lot of criticism because of his own ethnicity and cultural background as a white, well-to-do European who produced this work in a public housing estate with a primarily Black and Hispanic, lower-income population as “colonialism” and “exploitative”. The artist brought the money, he created the concept and provided the context (Kester) but the community of Forest Houses owned the experience. In a writing published in the Dia (the organization who commissioned *The Gramsci Monument*) catalog, Lex Brown, who was running the children’s workshop for 11 weeks without a day off, wrote:

“Love was an explicit and crucial part of the Gramsci Monument. It’s the word for the kind of energy that people could feel when they were standing in it and on it. The way the kids reacted to the Monument, the work and participation that the residents put into it, the dedication of the people working there, and the reception of the people living in the neighborhood all contributed to make something that still feels too enormous to aptly sum up in words.”  (Brown)
Though the project lasted only for a summer, it ripples across space-time as the project lasts in the minds of local residents who, primarily, look upon it as having a positive impact on the community (Kimball). The project actually has the reverse effect of colonialism as the community took ownership of it, whereas art-tourists coming from the more affluent and primarily white parts of New York City could feel their otherness and discomfort because of it as they entered the space surrounding *The Gramsci Monument* (Brown). Through that ownership of the space, the community was not a recipient of social welfare but were able to collectively activate their own alternate reality that was merely catalyzed by the artist. Thomas Hirschhorn himself stated that “I don’t do something for the community. I do something, I hope, for art” (ART21).

The aesthetic of *Monument’s* architecture is a physical embodiment of the project’s non-exclusivity; pallets, plywood, 2” x 4” (5cm x 10cm) lumber, spray paint, linen, paper and cardboard are materials which surround us as the invisible matter which allows systems of labor as well as economy to function but also that of tree houses and every-day use. The work creates a pedagogical space, not just for participants to learn about Antonio Gramsci but for a space of peer-learning to develop from the community that choses to actively engage in the project.

The handful of projects we have explored over the seven decades between the middle of the 20th century until the teens of the 21st century draws a visible trajectory for the exploration of alternative methods of spatial production that is reactionary to the dominant, dominating space of wealth and power (Lefebvre). In one way or another, these projects have demonstrated the potential of architecture, labor, experimentation, pedagogy, play, environment and social spaces as working together, often times as seamless convergences. These projects desire for creating places which impart transformative effects upon their participants (real or potential) as well as the space-time in which they inhabit. Such projects become, only through the process of performance that participants bring to them (Kester). Though the care that is imbued into materials and designs in all of these examples, spaces are manifested that debate and discuss with one another. At the singularity where these spaces we’ve been proposing coalesce, in a nexus of swirling ideas where space-time collapses in on itself, is the truth and the totality in the dialectics of space. It is a Hegelian dialectic, not a Platonic one (Maybee). In identifying and exploring the relationships between these different spaces, in as much as they exist or do not in each of the works we have
reviewed, their boundaries have become malleable. The frequency of such places and projects, where these nexuses happen are increasing but they are not utopos (a good place) but rather they are outopos (no place). They exist as windows into another reality, they are ephemeral, always occurring and always shape shifting. The truth in possible utopias is that they are impossible to permanently maintain in a finite world. The nexuses we have been looking for are that which come into being like bubbles from a wand; emerging from reality that comes into existence only to disappear, just as quickly, leaving ripples in the fabric of space-time. Nexuses where architecture, pedagogy, experimentation, environment, play, labor as well as social space are able to coalesce into one.

*Dialectics of Space* looks to extend, experiment with and explore this history by way of purposefully creating modular installations using waste materials within different types of venue. Through trial and error, the project is able to develop a methodology in creating ephemeral nexus points where the types of spaces we have been talking about coalesce and produce alternate realities, the typical values of daily life no longer function as such. The fabricated space is able to envelop participants in a functional, though perhaps unusual, space where different elements work symbiotically and without hierarchy. Individuals are actively integrated into its body as participants, as they are encouraged to cooperate with others while the space itself imbues itself into them.

In the following pages, we will examine two installations where *Dialectics of Space* has been implemented and the results of that implementation. Each was realized under a different format of cultural venue. Contrasting and comparing these two examples gives and indication of *Dialectics of Space*’s advantages, limitations, as well as its potential. In this we can again look beyond what exists and conjure further manifestations which progress and create spatial nexuses which are more fluid and dynamic.
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D.O.S. Version 01 inhabited Temporary, a decentralized cultural space with programming consisting of “participatory, experimental forms which may not fit anywhere else”. Curation of Temporary happens through its own community network which chooses to pledge or not to pledge Temps (Temporary’s alternative digital currency) in order to support events (experiments) in the space. Dialectics of Space permeated this system and the space itself between April 6th 2017 and April 22nd.

During this period of Temporary’s settlement, D.O.S. overwhelmed the existing system with programming and installations which drastically transformed the space from what was previously a large open room with sporadic events into a space with different environments that have noticeable effects on social relationships and nearly continuous events. The programming developed for Dialectics of Space (also using Temporary’s peer review system) sought create dynamic social utilization of nodes which would be constructed within the existing spatial constraints, modifying the shape of the existing architecture as well as its purpose to accommodate the D.O.S. programming.

One particularly successful example of this coalescence of event and node were the Dialectics of Space: Dinner events (see Figure 1) which happened in a purposefully built greenhouse-like structure with an arched ceiling all made of recycled wood and covered in recycled industrial plastics. During the dinner events, a maximum of eight per-registered, participants would sit down at the table together where they would be brought five courses over the course of about two hours. The entirety of the happening attempted to meld the event and the space into one single entity; participants dialogue was enhanced by the atmosphere that was encapsulated and amplified by the architecture as they consumed playful dishes produced from a laborious process but fueled by experimentation as well as the desire for learning new techniques. In addition to these things, the dinner happenings were also environmental in that they promote
sustainable ecological practices (the food, wood and plastic are all waste products) as well as replicating some feelings of being in a natural environment through the audio installation, the smell and feel of the moss.

Different nodes of *Dialectics of Space* enhanced and modified the ways in which Temporary’s architecture was being used while creating different levels of social space with varying levels of isolation as well as simultaneously employing the other *D.O.S.* themes (labor, pedagogy, experimentation, play, environment). Implementation of the project’s constructed spaces was not done in a manner that fought with the existing functionality of the space, in order to create something entirely new, but attempted to collaborate with the prior utilization of the space, reformatting it so that users would continue to spend time in the space but would do so in the newly created nodes. Temporary’s regular visitors therefor had to adapt to the *D.O.S.* nodes, in contrast to what they have grown accustomed to, and that adaptation created a situation where different social dynamics could be seen through minor architectural modifications to the space.
**VERSION 2**

*D.O.S. Version 02* occupied *Kuvan Kevat 2017*, a conventionally formatted group exhibition with typical gallery aesthetics. The inherent function and expectations of *Kuvan Kevat 2017* are so different from that of *Temporary* which led to a less effective level of engagement in spite of the events being better integrated into the nodes due to what was learned in the previous version. The dysfunctional nature of the work in *Kuvan Kevat 2017* shows that though the work is adaptable, transformable, reconfigurable, it is nonetheless unable to completely alter the expectations of viewers if they come to witness rather than participate. In occupying a more formal gallery structure, the environment is static, unforgiving and engagement is unexpected. In addition to differences of spatial context, node-development and audience, the events of Version 2 were derivative of processes used during Version 1 in addition to being more focused and drastically reduced in quantity. Through *Artificial Photosynthesis, Pickle Time,* and *Moonshine Madness,* The nodes of *D.O.S. Version 02* were utilized through specific purposes which, through their integration, create a dialectical web between the multiple topics of the project.
The promise for *Dialectics of Space* lies in its ability to transform, and to change, to adapt to its situation. The inherent participatory nature of the venue which *D.O.S. Version 1* inhabited made it ultimately more successful than *Version 2* which was situated in the context of a group exhibition. The traditional gallery space was not the problem but the lack of overall focus and creation of a cohesive vision which made it problematic, obscuring any sort of interactivity in the audience. Possible future versions could be see *Dialectics of Space* structured in an apartment building, outside in a public area, on a roof, as a series of floating structures or wherever. The possible locations are innumerable and each one provides a different context in which to observe how these different spaces interact and inform each other.

Each new version builds upon those previous attempts in order to produce a different and more effective incarnation. *D.O.S. Ver. 1* learned from an existing history of artistic research and *Ver. 2* built upon the programming and spatial intervention, any subsequent versions will look to broaden that process of making through the purposeful collision of architectural, pedagogical, experimental, environmental, playful, dialogical as well as laborious spaces.
GLOSSARY OF TOPICS

**Labor:** The process of working through physical or mental means, labor relates itself to economy, process and production. It is typically seen as being in opposition to play but though the *Dialectics of Space* framework, the two become indistinguishable.

**Play:** Referring to that which can be seen as childlike but also that which creates culture and activates a process of learning through a safe space where mistakes are possible and without consequence.

**Pedagogy:** While formally defined as the method and practice of teaching, pedagogy in Dialectics of Space is a much broader term to include autodidacticism and peer or co-learning where teaching becomes non-hierarchical or limited in its hierarchy so that experimentation as well as the social aspects of the work create their own pedagogical structures.

**Environment:** Relating to ecology and that of our natural surroundings, environment can be defined as that which is created without human intervention, especially that of biology.

**Architecture:** The process and product of creating environments specifically for human bodies to interact with, architecture could be interpreted as in direct opposition to the natural environment.

**Social:** The dynamic created when groups of people are located within a communicable proximity to each other. Dialogical situations are naturally important to us as a species and they provide the basis in the formulation of culture.

**Experimentation:** The possibility of creating something new by trying something not tried before or of creating an environment which stimulates others to explore methods, formats, or materials which they have not explored. Learning and discovery are enabled through trial and error.
GLOSSARY OF EVENTS

**Tea Ritual:** Monday-Saturday at 12:15, April 6th-22nd, 2017

*Tea Ritual* was a daily event during of *D.O.S. Ver. 1* which attempts to reenact the same actions at the same time in order to link all of the other aspects of the project. Time(events) and Space(nodes) of the project are conceptually linked by the *Tea Ritual* which acts like a thread, passing through each one and binding them all.

**Cardboard Furniture Design Factory:** April 8th/15th, 2017

This workshop took place over 2 days:
Day 1) Participants discussed needs, wants and ideas followed by making glue and laminating used cardboard into sheets suitable for construction.
Day 2) Participants will finalize designs, document their processes, cut components out of the cardboard and construct their furniture.
The workshop explored the possibilities of cardboard as an aesthetic, biodegradable, waste material which can be made into a structurally viable option for furniture design.

**Dinner:** April 8th/15th, 2017

The Dialectics of Space dinner events combines the use of the space with menu items in order to create an overall sensory experience that is able to permeate participants during a multi-course gastronomical happening. The courses for each dinner were invented for that meal only with no recipes used in the production of the dishes or recorded to document them. Each one was playful and experimental, often times new culinary techniques needed to be learned in order to execute one or multiple components of a dish. Flavor profiles were created for the plates through a laborious process, sometimes beginning one month prior to the meal itself, then to be consumed during the event, never to be repeated. The environment utilizes a layering effect of sight, sound, smell, touch and taste - all of which are carefully crafted to give participants an other worldly and unique experience that goes beyond dining but as a penetration of their bodies through the chemistry which is slowly inhaled as well as that which is ingested. Fermented foods, distilled alcohol, hand-crafted hardwood plates, a live moss table, the magenta light, molecular liquids encapsulated in membranes, animated conversation, the sounds of chirping crickets in the background, textures and tastes and smells intermingling as all of these things wash over participants.
**Electromechanic Anatomies:** April 10th, 2017

*Electromechanic Anatomies* was an open lab-space which pushed participants to let their curiosity, imagination and ingenuity run wild through the process of dissecting appliances, electronics, toys and other objects in an attempt to make them better, modify their function or to make them more personalized. Through hardware hacking we discovered how things work, what they’re made of and how anything can be hacked. During ‘Electromechanic Anatomies’ we discussed what we aimed to achieve and how that could be done using tools such as soldering irons, screwdrivers, drills, saws, knives, hammers and other things in trying to modify the functionality of our hardware.

By hacking unwanted or nonfunctional objects and combining them with others, transforming, improving, or modifying them, Electromechanic Anatomies encouraged utilization of what is present in our lives through a Frankensteinian approach to creation.

**Game Development Meeting:** April 12th, 2017

Games are an important part of our well being; not only do we learn through playing but the activity refreshes us as we are engrossed in the temporal environment created by the game. Reducing stress and promoting competitive social engagement (IRL), games develop our social intelligence in addition to encouraging divergent and critical thinking.

Collectively, during the meeting, we came together for the purpose of developing a game. We looked at the history of games, different types of games, examples of games, then will discussed which format of game to develop, outlined the rules of the game, followed by trying to construct the game using available materials.

**Campout:** April 21st, 2017

*Campout* is an experiment looking to self-reflectively question what we think of as environment as well as how we define artificial through the re-creation of a camp-site. The Temporary space was momentarily transformed into an ersatz camp-ground as participants explored ideal and nostalgic camping activities such as sitting in front of a fire (an digital one), telling ghost stories, making s’mores and sleeping under the stars. The activities and the space, though their artificiality, are deliberately absurd and
thereby challenge all of our real “outdoor” experiences; questioning how much of it was actual nature and how much was fabricated experience.

**Artificial Photosynthesis:** May 6th, 2017

*Artificial Photosynthesis* is a structured workshop where participants constructed self-contained habitats for growing plants which are powered by computer use. Participants were encouraged to experiment with how light focuses on the plant and how the habitat was constructed. The workshop utilized research done by NASA for the purposes of growing plants in space and appropriated those techniques for growing plants in spaces.

**Pickle Time:** May 13th, 2017

*Pickle Time* is an event which explored different methods of food preservation in an attempt to create a dialogue about waste food and solutions for reducing its effects. In the workshop we reflected on what we think of as a pickle, discussing different methods of extending the shelf life of foods for long periods including pickles, ferments, jams, and also dehydrating. Such methods are not just ways to save foods from the waste bin but through them we can alter and develop towards a range of complex tastes.

*Pickle Time* used at-home chemistry and biology to enhance the taste and nutrition of food and also informs another ‘Dialectics of Space’ event, *Moonshine Madness* which was on the subject of distillation.

**Moonshine Madness:** May 27th, 2017

*Moonshine Madness* was an event looking to experiment with alcohol making and distillation as a way to go beyond the food preservation into real chemistry as well as a way of extracting the essence of ingredients. The process of at-home distillation is in many places illegal, certainly because of its dangers but also because alcohol is big business and home-made alcohol is nontaxable and thus unprofitable. *Moonshine Madness* builds upon what was learned/developed/produced during *Pickle Time* and takes it one step further into distillation which, in principle, can be used for making alcohol, extracting essential oils and also to simply purify water.
**GLOSSARY OF NODES**

**Fenced Node:** The fenced node isolates small groups of users and creates an awareness of territory.

**Elevated Node:** The elevated node exists between an overseer’s position and a tree-house where users become hidden from individuals in the rest of the space. The elevated node utilizes existing artifacts as well as architecture in the space and adopts them as critical aspects of itself.

**Dining Node:** The *Dialectics of Space* dining node contains a moss table, grow light and 24-hour audio loop.

**Isolation Node:** The isolation node creates a small private space which can be occupied by single participants where exterior noise is nullified by the sound dampening fabric walls and isochronic tones being generated by an Arduino in the space.
**Magenta Node:** The magenta node contains several troughs of soil and sprouting hemp plants but will go through changes during the course of D.O.S. Ver. 2. The hemp plants sprouted as of the opening of the installation but will grow and be documented over the course of its duration. The two corrugated plastic walls of the magenta node obscure the rooms contents while distorting the light from inside, across the sheets of reused plastic.

**Platform Node:** The platform node is built around a central hanging USB powered plant. Users of the platform can sit and use the node as a social space, they can stand on it to gain a different sense of perception on the surrounding space or they can walk across it.

**Pickling Node:** The pickling node contains a user-propelled ferry on a track to get participants across the node without harming the mossy floor. By sitting on the ferry palette and pulling on the rope in either direction, a user will move towards the node’s entrance or the pickling area. Heavy metals and other pollutants have accumulated from the moss, which has been collected around Helsinki, through phytoremediation. The moss continues to purify the air in the node, physically altering those who enter the space as individuals who use the ferry are forced to breath deeper because of their labor. Jars of waste foods which have been fermented and pickled are housed in this node and added to during the exhibition.

**Solarium Node:** The solarium node is hidden. In the background of the other nodes it offers a semi-private area for individuals to lay under the magenta light, suggesting an empathetic situation with the plants used in the rest of the installation.
Glossary of Materials and Structures:

**Moss and other plants:** With their own unique attributes, the plants used in the *Dialectics of Space* have various specific roles but generally that of being able to (potentially) penetrate individuals, affecting them on a biological level. Moss (of various subspecies) is the most abundant plant used in D.O.S. and is chosen because of its phytoremediative qualities, physically changing the spaces in which it inhabits by accumulating toxins and other impurities which are then nullified by the plant.

**Magenta LED lights:** Comprised of approximately 71.42% red and 28.57% blue light, the magenta LED strips and arrays are effective at growing plants. Because the spectrum contains minimal green light produced by the inexpensive and energy efficient LEDs, the chlorophyll in the plants are able to absorb more of the light radiation.

**1x1m square(5):** Built at 1/4th of the larger 2x2m squares so that they could be used on their own or combined with the larger squares. They are modular building blocks which can be combined in a myriad of combinations for various purposes.

**2x2m square(4):** Premade to exist on an architectural scale, the 2x2m squares can be easily and quickly assembled to modify the existing space and combined with the other D.O.S. materials and structures.

**2m long Arch(5):** The arches, made from discarded construction plywood, providing a strong overhead structure and are an economical use of materials.

**Palettes (varying quantities):** Ubiquitous and homogeneous, palettes allow the global economy to function quickly and efficiently. Because of these qualities, the often overlooked palette is a common item to discard and because of this it is easily repurposeable while also being strong, durable and weather resistant. Because of it’s life
before and during Dialectics of Space, the pallets used introduce added elements of labor and environment into the work. Following Dialectics of Space, any intact pallets are returned and re-introduced into the global economy.  
http://www.slate.com/articles/business/transport/2012/08/pallets_the_single_most_important_object_in_the_global_economy_.html

**Plastic scaffolding cover:** Used to drape the scaffolding used on the side of buildings under renovation, excess and used plastic scaffolding cover is often discarded causing a huge amount of plastic waste for a material. The material is highly durable, translucent in addition to referencing both labor and architecture.

**Other repurposed/recycled materials:** Coming in varying shapes and sizes, trash is an abundant resource for Dialectics of Space and comprises nearly all of the non-plant material. The wood, the plastics, the carpet as well as most of the electronics were all recovered in one way or another. This process of repurposing requires an adaptive process to alter the materials from their original configuration resulting in the reduction of waste as materials are repeatedly reincarnated.