

## The field of the project

We could describe the relationship between architecture and program stopping in two clearly differentiated episodes.

In the architecture of classicist heritage the programme determined the type, that was at the same time responsible for the identity of the object. These conditions encouraged an approach of the project in which a great part of it was solved with a come and go from the index to the content of each discourse. Modern architecture overflowed building types leaving the identity of their products to the consistency of their own formal structures, which should as well come into tension with the functional structures coming off each programme. It is precisely the friction between both structures that led to this architecture.

Although being both moments diametrically opposed regarding the relationship between their constructions and programs, they both agreed on one aspect: the passivity of the architect against the programming of his own products. In all cases, the work of the architect began when receiving a document that contained the functions that the project should organize. Such is so, that the academic world has systematically reproduced this scenario in their lessons of project, delimiting the tasks of each proposal to the formalization of a future which has already been largely determined by others.

If we want to renew the sense of our profession, we should wonder today over that portion of future that we silently delegated. Assuming this space would mean incorporating a new working material that would amplify our notion of project. Understood in these terms, our work would now begin with the description of a situation that requires a specific spatial reorganization. Present and future, description and reorganization, could lose their individual inertia when being amalgamated in this new concept of project. Incorporating programming to our field would definitely mean the recovery of the interest in the event. Projecting programmes would enable us to keep us close to public needs in order to have a constant feedback of our private ambitions. It would allow us to build our own demand and decide on its appropriateness. It would build a notion of both a critical and enterprising architect at the same time.

Sebastián Adamo, Marcelo Faiden. 2012.