

## *Provocative Architecture*

In general, provocative architecture was one of the titles I felt most interested in, excited and personally closest to. Even today, I find the social basis for the spread of architecture to all, as claimed in Archigram, effective and up-to-date. Architecture must constantly question concepts such as freedom, identity, continuity, spontaneity, originality, and use its power to provoke people.

Matta-Clark understood quite differently than others the word 'architecture', and he bravely broke all memorization in a world where deconstruction has not yet been mentioned. In this context, how expressionless and meaningless the degree of Architecture degree he received from the university can be considered the most important and defining elements of his life. His architecture is dedicated to cutting, disrupting, reproducing. In "Splitting "and "Bingo", Matthew-Clark deflects the purpose of suburban homes, in "Window Blow Out "he distorts the entire understanding of urbanism, in "Fake Estates " he seizes and displaces parcels, in "day's End " he displaces warehouses. Matta-Clark assimilates the word, which over time will be replaced by deconstruction, and makes it the foundation of his understanding of art.

Archigram's chosen tool for spreading his views is their magazine, which uses the aesthetic of comics and leans on pop art with this side. in a Plug-in city that allows mechanical regeneration with spare parts; in an Instant city that can be installed and solved in an instant, as it is; in a Walking city that constantly moves without being fixed on the world; it can be said that it is used to expose this position, which finds freedom in consumption and sacrifices democracy to totalitarianism in its futurist fiction. They proved that the 'graphic language ' of the draft, which envisages the absolute dominance of technique in its essence, does not make sense as a field of formal freedom —that is, the introduction of innovative proposals instead of conventional building elements and forms, and the attempt to break architecture out of space by forcing the end of technological possibilities.

In the recent past and perhaps in the future, we have been able to experience the concept of quarantine by entering into the process of thinking about situations that directly affect every area of our life and trying to maintain our attitude of being able to produce in any situation with our life reflex. Considering our cultural background, it is far from reality to be able to change our habits momentarily. As our primary isolated situation continues, we will try to interact with people more and more; one of the exciting examples in 1971's the Inflatables Ant Farm.

And 5-Questions regarding to the presentation would be;

1- *"Dismantled by whom", " renewed by whom", or " service", as in Fun Palace, organized and provided by whom?*

2- *Should one ignore the contradiction between identity and continuity and freedom and spontaneity in Peter Cook's Plug-in City (1964) or Cedric Price's Fun Palace (1960s)?*

3- *Does the relationship between politics and architecture mean that people need provocative architecture to see the cultural, problematic issues that actually directly relevant to the humanity that forgotten and ignored behind the technical details of architecture?*

4- *How do we evaluate the concepts that make up Archigram's alphabet, such as freedom, identity, continuity, spontaneity, originality —at least in terms of the means of presentation?*

5- *How 'provocation in architecture' can be also related with the new era that we're going through during the pandemic?*