

Frédéric Bonnet, architect, teacher, OBRAS office Paris FR.

A park in the docks of Le Havre, a pole of exchanges in Versailles, a road in Fontainebleau : hybridise tracings of uses today-mobility, networks, leisure, retail, - with permanent foundations of geography and economy of means that we inherit from designers of previous centuries; allow the gradual appropriation of shared project from the phase of the project through a thematic approach of choices to make . Contemporary mutations of sites beautifully shaped by history, where nature now has a major role, are an opportunity for the office to define what could be a sustainable development. Obras won European 3 in Alicante and built the Park of the Ereta

### Return on European

Winner in 1994, participating in five successive juries, I also follow the latest European sessions. The evolution of the themes follows, and often anticipates the questions asked. It was still almost impossible to speak of "nature" in 1993, for example, a subject that emerges fully in sessions 6 and 7. Inventive competition, requiring, and prospective undeniably ... It seems that everything has been said, as it is rich. Reading the document " topics " on European 12 and 13 shows me that this trend continues. The three themes resilience, adaptability, economy still seem very relevant to me - and I guess it does not disappear from future sessions. It is therefore necessary, in order to answer the question, to go beyond.

### A fragile Europe,

One might think that the economic crisis we are living, in very different degrees in Europe, is episodic. It is hard to imagine politicians having another speech. This is not so sure. I do not have the distance of scientific experts, but my recent trips, and constant interaction with colleagues from the north and south of Europe, show me a very strong caesura , contrasts settling in time. This does not weaken the idea of a common home, properly installed. But this caesura challenges the belief widespread in a community of answers, of inter-changeability of alternatives. In short, it emphasizes the idea of context, but it emphasizes also the differences in use and financial capacity. How about quality of urbanity, even of beauty, beyond the differences revealed by the crisis? This leads to a criticism, probably a bit harsh, of some European proposals once jubilant, with generic plethora and seduction, for example I think to crystalline forms of Spanish proposals on the northern coast of Norway.

European undeniably carries the European dream. The mixing of Erasmus helping, mixed teams and cross symposia, often scattered in wonderful places, from Thessaloniki to Karlskrona, from Sintra to Graz, have revealed it, gradually building it. To the extent, perhaps, to suggest that there would be an "urban community" whose interests and concerns converge - nature, resilience , urban , mobility -. How to react to the contrasts revealed, sometimes brutally, in recent years? How do these differences ultimately are fertile, and allow to install the dream and sharing on stronger bases than too generic themes, where the economy and culture have not taken enough space?

That seems to me to be a first question. Civil, political, full of danger, of course, but urgent, for that.

### ... but an inventive Europe. The resources of the place

The European capacity for invention should be stimulated by this paradoxical situation. This is economy and culture, political vision. To wake the fatigue of the European idea, to remember its deep and essential generosity. This without the ingenuity of an equal urbanity, assuming in a creative the differences of emergency, of issues , of resources .

You are right: the economy should be at the heart of this commitment. Sobriety is associated with resilience, adaptability. The right framing, too, between the means, resources , effort, and effect. It will not be equivalent in Tromsø or Lecce. And yet, the commitment is no different : a site deserves no less attention than the other. How this effort adapts itself to local conditions? What can be taken from the common idea? How it remains firmly rooted in reality with very specific means?

Drawing is one thing, building is another. However, our commitment is to act with actual changes.

It is therefore better to speak of production, of resources, of finance also of means, of ways of doing.

And more precisely. In the same way that previous sessions have seen the emergence of multidisciplinary teams with ecologists, landscape architects, engineers, architects could now integrate economic experts, policy experts or financial experts, to propose alternatives anchored in local conditions.

This explicitly, on two levels:

- A work on the effective participation of the inhabitants, but also of firms, of public authorities. Building of partnerships, of new fixtures.
- a work on the building economy, in the broadest sense , on the possible "products."

Why these two plans together?

The first plan (participation, local project) is already an old idea, also repeatedly explored in previous sessions of European . We often pose it as the only viable alternative to a market economy, which has produced in urban and residential terms, the excess that we know.

But the fact remains that the economic mechanisms remain linked to this "market"; the subsidized housing does not escape to the perverse effects of liberalism. Whatever they say, "large operations" abundantly financed by the municipalities, under public control, will take other forms. The role of the public structures, underlying the game of actors of European, is in mutation. Pins change.

We must therefore also work on new economic arrangements, otherwise we let the power on one side to an unscrupulous liberalism (in tense areas), and another side to impoverishment, abandonment. In other words, should be in the team, not only economists, with prospective capacity, but also bankers - or at least finance specialists, and manufacturers.

I do not know, really, how we can integrate this experiment in a competition, or how we keep the anonymity associated with concrete commitment, in situ (independence of juries of experts gathered is undoubtedly a pledge). But if European wants to keep its singularity, and its capacity for invention, it must exceed the exercise, even virtuoso, of some designers, thereafter loaded, with strong seduction and know-how, to convince hypothetical operators of the feasibility of their designs.

The link to the place has always been a constant in the themes of the competition. It becomes more vivid again. In economic terms, but also in cultural terms, the crisis of the past five years shows that the location resists, that the equalization have limits, and that generalizations are dangerous. What resources have, now that we know that it is no more plethoric and unconditional rate mortgage, the most European bruised territories? This question is not hopeless, quite the contrary. It belongs to all the territories, even the richest. It anticipates, with roughness, the questions that will arise when the financial crisis will become energetic, global. There has always a way. For this, it is better to talk about men, potential money, know-hows.

With the idea that it will be, necessarily, a happy experience.

### **Fragile city, light city**

This suggests developing two tracks.

1 / Light City. Do more with less, from what exists. Not necessarily an ode to "micro- project", but something that moves away, in any case, of the most opulent implementations of Innsbruck in Groningen. Past sessions already include such answers, little valued (I remember debates Jury Switzerland, for example, in Nyon).

2 / From crisis situations, where the economy is fragile and where we must stimulate invention (that which we can already detect, we can imagine). This does not mean that all sites are in Greece or Portugal, but perhaps in the weakest areas of Germany, the rural hinterland of Finland, the countryside of Massif Central ...

This will raise the question of project management. Which, in this context, pay the entrance fee? Certainly. But to play again the market, may reduce the sites to fruitful countryside or large cities, still rich.

### **Fresh City, city based on solidarity post hedonistic**

Three other critical issues (especially if they are articulated with the above assumptions)

- The peaceful link of development with nature (gently, sweet city). This theme is dear to me, but not very original: it is a subject, which is refined in the various sessions of the competition;

- New conviviality and solidarity, not just "nice and friendly city, quality of public space, hedonism," but rather on the new solidarity, where the "free" time is not just invested in leisure or in "pleasure of living together", but associative availability in various solidarity in social engagements, etc. .

- Third theme related to the second, the work: by what methods / devices can territory can help to build a new attitude to the work, which takes into account recent changes (volatility, uncertainty, mobility), making them "softer" again.