

Intelligent Beehives as Predicates for Metabolic Architectures

Dennis Dollens
Universitat Internacional de
Catalunya, Barcelona

Theory-driven architecture may be organized to encode and set procedures for research-by-design seeking data from prototyping as an extension of art. Through art, a research scaffold may emerge for exploratory architectural experimentation and discussion. Associatively, interlinked sets of observational data, sensor readings, laboratory tests, environmental analysis, and fablab models permit potential hybrid materials to embed data for exchange between science, design, and urban sites. Enabled data and observations herein act as foundations for reasoning a building or sculpture's inclusion of AI, synthetic life, and bio-algorithmic performance as part of evolutionary nature.

Critically, in relation to AnneMarie Maes's research, it is human-to-bee intelligence and evolutionary nature I looked to for underpinning metabolic architectures and urban infrastructures as they call for new typologies of environmental bioremediation. I emphasize Maes's artistic practice developed over the past ten years focused on her urban beehives as first instances of metabolic buildings. These art and nature works demonstrate applications of bee and microbe architecture mediated by technology, biology, and artistic insight reported here in the urban context of architectural intelligence. In this milieu Maes's *ElbBienen* (Elbe Bees) exhibition, presented as part of the *Hamburg Maschine* (Hamburg Machine) at the city's Entenwerder Golden Pavilion (Figs. 1. 2. 3), is scrutinized for artistic vision capable of dialectically tutoring metabolic architectures in biological intelligence and AI environmental/cultural crosstalk.

In relative terms Maes's intelligent hives — bee-buildings — teach us about advanced approaches for architectural machines. Mae's beehives push biological-natural interactions in directions of enhanced ecological performance we normally register only in extreme artificial environments such as






Figure 1.
The Entenwerder Golden Pavilion on the
Elbe River, Hamburg. The site for AnneMarie
Maes's installation, *ElbBienen* (Elbe Bees).

Keywords

Intelligent Beehives. Art. Urban Bees. AI. Bacteria.
Hamburg. Urban Design. Public Art. Metabolic
Architecture. Urban Sculpture. Installations.
Environment. BioFilms. Nature-Surveillance.
Computational Fabrication. Living Technology.
Bioremediation.



Dennis Dollens (exodesic @ mac.com) is a Senior Researcher at iBAG: Institute for Biodigital Architecture & Genetics. He teaches Metabolic Architectures in the Biodigital Architecture Master at the Universitat Internacional de Catalunya's School of Architecture (ESARQ), Barcelona. His most recent book is *Metabolic Architectures: Turing, Sullivan, Autopoiesis & AI*. He has a Ph.D. from the School of Architecture (ESALA), University of Edinburgh.



Figures 2. & 3.
Digital renderings for visualizing the Intelligent Beehive before fabrication. And, for this text, as membrane/panel interfacing bee occupation inside and urban environments outside.

AI-regulated space stations, arctic research outposts, submarines, or even airplanes — all whose interiors are continually monitored and adjusted by sensors and computation. Those shell or monocoque constructions interface the environment as membrane/panels. In this consideration, the beehives Maes builds are metabolic thin-walled constructions similarly interfacing bioactive urban nature. Her designs have biodigital and cellularly intelligent responsiveness in realms that prompt questions never before posited in relation to buildings and cities.

For instance, if a metabolically intelligent building could experience nature in ways similar to her beehives (involving microbes, plants, animals, and/or AI), could it be evolved as biodigitally sentient? And, could advanced metabolic buildings exist in realms of artificial life approaching consciousness?^{1,2,3,4} Here, for an anatomical analogy, consider the machine-fabricated biological walls of *ElbBienen* as beehive equivalents of bioactive building curtain walls, panels, or skins. They function as architectural prototypes for influencing bee-to-human learning illustrating how artworks significantly push boundaries to evolve urban and building design.

Aptly, Maes milled the Hamburg beehive (and its sister in Brussels) with a CNC-programmed Kuka robot (Fig. 5) in collaboration with the digital woodshop at the University of Applied Arts, Vienna. The Kuka's tool path (Figs. 6. 7) was intentionally instructed to cut wavy patterns enveloping the hive's exterior thereby enabling airborne microbes, moss, and/or lichens to colonize the hive's surfaces. The hives are thus hybrids of robotics, biology, and artistic intention. Their physicality reflecting a digital heritage steeped in machine intelligence and tooling expressed in their wavy, exoskeletal walls. Those walls are further made active between resident bees and monitoring technology (cameras, sensors, and programming) embedded by the artist.

By formulating questions of hybridity, not frequently asked, yet lurking behind, for instance Google's AlphaGo,⁵ AlphaZero,^{6,7} and AlphaFold⁸ — ontological nature-to-machine communication enters realms of design dialogue involving AI, synthetic biology, and evolution. Nevertheless, further questions are pertinent for considering Google's DeepMind

implementations of neural-net AI-learning, playing, and winning Atari video games, beating world champions at the Game of Go, triumphing over human and machine chess players, and aiding doctors in medical diagnostics.⁹ If, as widely reported, programmers cannot fully understand how some of those feats were processed,^{10,11} should we anticipate a neural-net category of AI/biological species that is existentially, phenomenally, and/or experientially capable of learning and autonomously interacting with us and the environment?

Those unexplained realms of machine intelligence foreshadow the first appearances of artificial consciousness and sensibility^{1,2} through which *Science Magazine* defined a debate: "What would constitute successful demonstration of artificial consciousness?"¹¹ To this question of sensibility, consciousness, and cognition, Maturana and Varela established a theoretical foundation in *Autopoiesis and Cognition*¹² from which I evolve underpinnings for justifying metabolic architectures based in biological theory. They wrote:

[L]iving systems are machines, that they are physical autopoietic machines is trivially obvious: they transform matter into themselves in a manner such that the product of their operation is their own organization. However, we deem the converse is also true: a physical system [metabolic architecture or Intelligent Beehive], if autopoietic, is living.¹²

After all, learning, distributing, and acting upon knowledge is something people have considered core abilities, preeminently human. In reality however, microbes, plants, and the vast range of planetary life participate in differing types of metabolic intelligence not predicated on human models. These new beehives occupy a niche in that category where research tactilely and intellectually acknowledges vast discrepancies in realms of metabolic intelligence displaying physical morphologies such as shells, nests, boroughs, hives, and (human) houses. *The Hamburg Machine* exhibition thus emphasizes another zone of occupation leading to different questions: Under what conditions do we recognize a beehive (or a machine or



Figure 4.
The Intelligent Guerrilla Beehive, 2016-2017. Two views of the 3D-printed beehive, clad with microbial cellulose skin and inoculated with *Lactobacillus plantarum* bacteria growing as a biofilm.



Figure 5.
Kuka robot and part of the Intelligent Guerrilla Beehive during fablab building in collaboration with the University of Applied Arts, Vienna.

building) as metabolic and/or intelligent? I shall extrapolate from such queries using Maes's experimental hives for application to building and cities along lines I use to teach her works to master students in biodigital and metabolic architectures.²⁷

The above may seem disjointed, distant from how we think of future cities, buildings, and the technologies. But Maes's research is a pathway for us to imprint and understand bio-experimental realms of art as prototypes for architecture and urban design in concert with living organisms — not only with bees — but also with microbes and plants (and AI).¹³ Understood as relevant to urban nature and culture, Maes expresses mechanisms for sustaining urban species, community gardens, parks, and waterways while her multifaceted research parallels architectural and urban requirements.

Specifically, in this case, Hamburg is supporting its city curator (stadtkuratorin) Dirck Möllmann's exhibition *Hamburg Maschine* in a search for new visions and dialectics for urban art as a response to scientific and technological breakthroughs and their huge impact on city life, aesthetics, and environment (Figs. 8, 9, 10.) In this framework of urban space and habitation, I consider Maes's bees as resident citizens — indicators of urban biodiversity. Neighborhood bees are biologically intelligent engines of pollination and biomonitors of urban toxins — thus engines not only of planetary life, but also neighborhood well-being made apparent by apiary friendliness.

The Intelligent Beehive lineage therein spans Maes work through incarnations begun with *The Transparent Beehive* (2012) followed by the first biologically performative *Intelligent Guerrilla Beehive* (Fig. 4.) In that metabolically active work, biofilm functionality appeared in her research involving bacteria, and now includes algae and lichens. In this framework, the Hamburg/Brussels hives are the first to be occupied by bees, field-tested in public, and live-streamed.¹⁴ With bacterial experiments ongoing in collaboration with the Open Biolab in Brussels (and forthcoming with Vrije University in Amsterdam), it is expected that future hive physiology will unite with cyanobacteria functionality for an organic energy source serving the digital systems within the bee colony as predicted in the first *Intelligent Guerrilla Beehive* (Fig. 4). (Discussed in a

forthcoming 2020 Dollens/Maes *Leonardo* text.¹⁵)



Considering the Hamburg/Brussels hives, I'm not suggesting one-to-one animal-like or plantlike parity involving microbial life/cognition with human intelligence. I am suggesting new domains of collaborative pairings between nature, computation, AI, and architecture where intelligent/biological abilities such as quorum sensing are searched for metabolically performative communications.¹⁶ The Hamburg beehive (Figs. 8, 9) and its near relative in Brussels, become a case study for architecture and urban planning. The two hives suggest that subsequent buildings could be bio-fabricated with robotic AI sensors and actuators as hybrid machinic/biological organisms far beyond today's conceptions of prefabricated buildings for extreme conditions.

In this unlikely combination — technological hives and urban bioAI buildings — we find new implications for buildings and cities that must be contemplated if biologically active architectures and bioAI computation become hybrid candidates for membership in intelligent nature. The claim for metabolic architectures as participants in nature stems from ideas of biochemical and biointelligent agents embedded in buildings to autonomously clean and monitor the environment. Furthermore, the implication of biointelligent architectures could reorient malicious corporate surveillance to suggest repositioning their technology as sentinels, guardians, and instruments for bioremediation and toxic cleanup. This is contentious, if autonomous living microorganisms are considered for hybridization with machine intelligence, but taken out of a bioremedial environmental context — that's scary. Scary, because neural-net-AI, as noted above, has abilities to teach itself and modify its behavior based on its own research — it thereby crosses into areas humans allocate as domains of nature's intelligent life.

Used as a pathway for emergent theoretical experimentation, we may perceive the *Intelligent Beehives* as evolutionary in nature following Richard Dawkin's¹⁷ theory of extended phenotypes and J. Scott Turner's *The Extended Organism: The Physiology of Animal-Built Structures*.¹⁸ Through the argument of extended phenotypes, nature consist of objects



Figures 6. & 7.
Top: Kuka robot and part of the *Intelligent Guerrilla Beehive* during fablab building in collaboration with the University of Applied Arts, Vienna.
Bottom: Kuka milled beehive test assembly, Brussels, April 2019.



Figures 8. & 9.
Top: Installation of the *Intelligent Guerrilla Beehive* on Elbe River piers near the Entenw- order Golden Pavilion, Hamburg.
Bottom: Kuka robot fabricated *Intelligent Guerrilla Beehive* before installation.

and environmental interventions (earth works) built or produced by organisms (microbes, plants, animals — including humans). Those interventions are dependent on genotype/phenotype impulses or responses to instigate (among other functions) the construction of shelters that determine/influence the production of animal architectures and environmental works such as hives, nests, termite mounds, and skyscrapers.^{17,18} Consequently, we can place Maes's artistic vision and sensibilities as influencing urban and architectural crosstalk with genetic nature where human shelters, architectures, cities, and infrastructures retrieve "for human beings some lost dimension of their own animality, their own immersion in a world outside of language."¹⁹

Extended phenotypes are thus biologically and urbanistically relevant. They emphasize biological perspectives through which humans maintain connections to primal animality while extending human connectivity to technological, computational, and scientific networks for tactical investigations of matter, force, and phenomena vis-à-vis nature itself.

Expanding boundaries of our animate, if phenomenal intelligences, like the expanding universe itself, is spatially and culturally situational and sometimes difficult to comprehend. Investigations, as constituted in this text, foresee building performance imagined/visualized through symbolic language, drawings, and design modeled on propositions philosophically anchored in Wittgenstein's *Tractatus*^{20,21} and the Vienna house he subsequently designed for testing *Tractatus* precepts in space, form, and Modernist design language.²²

Investigations through language, computation, and design symbols incorporate and mold the artist/architect/designer's vision mediated by biological materialization, design, and spatial partitioning. Those investigations unify aspects of performative biocommunication whereby nature situates metabolic buildings/cities as potential species of hybrid biointelligence given form by integrating living technology¹³ in a manner Maes's beehives pioneer.

This may sound over exaggerated, but benign or collaborative observation (bio-surveillance) in nature may eventually include communication between insects, microbes,¹⁶ forests, and humans. Mae's vision of built shelters suggest

Livestream:
Intelligent Guerrilla Beehives from
Hamburg & Brussels:

<http://dev.bxlab.net/beehive/>




Figure 10. Streaming from Intelligent Guerrilla Beehives in Hamburg and Brussels for research comparison of hive and bee behaviors.



Figure 11. Stereolithograph (STL) skeleton model of an Intelligent Guerrilla Beehive with Scanning Electron Micrograph (SEM) of Glossa (bee tongue).

infrastructural ways by which humans can learn *Tractatus*-like mechanisms (operating systems) for participating in the conversation of nature — and, her own books furthers this continuum from *The Transparent Beehive Notebook*²³ and *Alchimia Nova*.²⁴

Comprehending that bees communicate through a language of dancing, underpins their intelligence in relation to hive-to-design and discussions of urban/technological environments as sanctuaries when pesticides have made countryside living deadly. Furthermore, in the realm of language I speculate Wittgenstein would have acknowledged bee dancing as a kind of semaphore language. And, because bee language involves signing in bodily poses, positions, and alignments (the vocabulary), it is akin to his discussions of picturing (pictographs/glyphs) in the *Tractatus*.²⁰ Bee movements transmit semiotic signals cognitively coding flight/landscape directions and plant descriptions in data cognized and transmitted in linguistic-like performances through bodily configurations linked by choreographed movement (the grammar). With infrared cameras streamed to the Internet (Fig. 10) as part of the hive's suite of electronics and biological functions, observation and study become part of an Intelligent Beehive's environmental performance.

The cultural and experiential propositions ingrained in Maes's *ElbBienen* for the *Hamburg Machine*, expand human-thought territories to include bee intelligence and their environmental protagonists and allies in an individual artist's visionary implementation of design-by-research. Resulting design/art implications embed, encode, and invite bioremedial formulations of matter, space, phenomena, language, AI, and intelligences.

These may be debated as environmental assets directed to remediate environmental toxicity dating back to the industrial revolution. Furthermore, the environmental assets inherent or suggested in Maes's physical biomachines (the hives) may be collaborative with other scientific monitoring. For example, the use of honey itself, as reconfirmed in *Nature*,²⁵ reacts to urban pollution by registering trace Pb (lead) isotopic compositions and thereby hives/honey act as neighborhood geochemical

biomonitors.

In this context Intelligent Beehives are hybrid biological, intelligent machines — urban sentinels, and pedagogical markers the *Hamburg Machine* is hosting in order to introduce them to public scrutiny. Biological lab research (Fig. 4), CAD/CAM milling (Figs. 5, 6), and STL fabrication (Fig. 11) anchors artistic conceptualization. They seed environmental relevance for ways of designing and restoring urban cores through the practice of art and design. As the cornerstone for an operating/research system — an OS verging on ecological tactics and bioremedial mind-sets waits to emerge from *ElbBienen*. Such mind-sets will nurture differently oriented conceptions of nature, cities, technology, and individual intelligences opening new realms for thinking and living with technology in wilderness and cities.

This is architectural and urban ecology at the level of interfacing species with living architecture. It promotes reconstructing and redesigning objects, tools, infrastructures, and buildings in conceptual frameworks based upon cellular intelligences as well as neural-net AI and ALife. The theoretical scaffold must therefore accommodate hybridizing materials with evolutionary procedures found only in science, technology, and design to reconnect nature's multitudinous cellular life/intelligences with current human lifestyles and technologies. Resulting organism/intelligences, compatible with synthetic life, AI, and neural-net learning are thus linkages for new types of performative machines, cities, and architectures.

From such linkages, I build this text for assembling bioactive agency and/or hybridizing it with materials following Maes's lead. Beehives fit into this profile and experimental mode. With remediating abilities, living technology and biological intelligences (including the artist's cognitive imprint), emerge as metabolic factors ready to be investigated, discussed, and applied to building design. Instances of this procedure require recognizing types of intelligence, potentials of AI learning, and capacities of generative computation perceived by the artist/architect as enacted in continuum with nature.

The act of defining intelligence is aided by theoretical autopoiesis^{12, 13} situating all living organisms, to varying degrees, as intelligent. Autopoiesis stipulates life = cognition, and that

emergent life forms will eventually be constructed by humans. Thereby, a baseline for defining that all living species are intelligent is established. That baseline enables us to distinguish between microbe, plant, animal, and AI intelligence in discussions recognizing varying types of cognition, diversity, and safeguards they entail. This is particularly important because it recognizes distributed intelligence in non-neurological organisms such as bacteria and plants and thereby becomes a vehicle for bioAI (technology) to meet cellular life as equals.

Between Hamburg and Brussels the two Intelligent Beehives straddle physical/phenomenal life where inanimate matter and intelligence meet and generate forms and agency . . . debate and questions (Fig. 10). For example: How can architects transfer and program intelligences from organisms and/or AI for environmental bioremediation? And, once transferred: How can architects design to activate living organisms where machine/bacteria ingest pollution as nourishment for their building's energy supply? Such questions rapidly become self-referencing when public debate, design teams, urban planners, or classes need to consider biological tasks carried out by associations of microbes and AI. In this framework, a building could, among many other things, be assigned to monitor passive ventilation, maximize photosynthetic exposure, and/or metabolize CO₂ with onboard microbial agents.

What is then defined as biointelligent performance extends research and case study operations to ontological ways of being/thinking for metabolic art and architectures in urban/natural systems. It generates questions normally asked in biology, plant, and material sciences for understanding how organisms thrive, create community, and signal/communicate with each other (e.g. bee language, biofilm cities, or biochemical signals). In those steps, AI-microbe hybrids requires theoretic logic for simulating and/or prototyping behavior activating cells implanted into a building's infrastructure or façade walls. Cellular actions might also take place in manners modeled on a leaf's production of photosynthesis (natural or artificial photosynthesis) or through a bacteria's enactment of biochemical homeostasis and quorum sensing.¹⁶ Both microbes and AI are enmeshed as metabolic scaffolding/agency supporting networked

façade-to-interior performance and thus establish a kind of living morphology in the *ElbBienen* hive. That living morphology and intelligence has an interesting proximity to Hamburg's 2013 Bio-Intelligent Quotient (BIQ) Building a short distance away — what the *New York Times* called,²⁶ a “vertical algae farm.”

Close observation by Maes includes instrumented images (Fig. 10 background) for studying functions in nature (via electron microscopy) suggesting visualized morphology studied and scaled to embed cellular agents — microbes, plants, and AI — as monitors to address bee survival, climate change, and/or bioAI organisms. Those observations presuppose subsystems and sub-subsystems provisioning and nourishing aggregate behaviors between machines, microbes, and AI. Linked to research — thinking-to-biology, biology-to-code, and code-to-prototype²⁷ — exercises species' cognition and our notions of machines rooted in Alan Turing's^{28,29} bio-tinged question: “Can machines think?” From “Can machines think?” I extrapolate and ask: Can buildings/ sculpture remediate pollution? The new question presupposes a building's or sculpture's intelligence enabling, for example, bacterial life feeding on carbon dioxide (CO₂) converting toxins in ways pioneered by oil-spill cleanup.

Today, constructed species of AI and ALife³⁰ extend Turing's above question. Answered positively, it gives credence to the proposition: Buildings can think. Thereby, generalized research goals emerge from realms of theory and art justifying science/technology and architecture extending life functions from hives to machines/buildings. As the *Hamburg Machine* experimentally establishes in the junctures between human intelligence, technology, nature, and art — another question arises: Can AI think it is alive? If so, autopoietic structures such as *ElbBienen* emerge as symbiotic-biomachinic prototypes we may contemplate to transmit nature's coded/decoded instructions for the operation of buildings entering zones of autonomous ecological remediation.

If an intelligent-metabolic design OS sounds like science fiction — that's good — it portends a future where AI and design's biology/cognition are contemplated as design aspects of human-extended-phenotypes^{17,18} identifiable as units of nature. Once a method of thinking about living biocomputation,³¹ AI,

biotechnology is theoretically usable and publically agreed upon, it may logically proceed. And, new iterations of AI — biological, synthetic, and hybrid — are in development in laboratories around the world. So too, plant intelligence predicated on sensing, signaling, and biochemically reacting are equally subjects of international research.³²

Theory and prototyping for metabolic buildings should recognize that collective bio/AI intelligences impact near-future fabrication, materialization, and expectations for metabolic architectures and cities. Hives now literally enliven the *Hamburg Maschine* as it engages the public to discuss responsive systems, protocols, and methodology for joining sustainability with art and living technology³³ to proactively unite in cities and nature. Those discussions include cohabitation between organisms in wild/urban nature devoted to eradicating toxic pollution and conducting ongoing environmental monitoring and endangered species preservation.

References

1. Stanislas Dehaene, Hakwan Lau, and Sid Kouider. 2017. “What is Consciousness, and Could Machines Have it?” *Science*. 358. 486–492. 27 October 2017.
2. Carter, Olivia. Hohwy, Jakob. van Boxtel, Jeroen. Lamme, Victor. Block, Ned. Koch, Christof. Tsuchiya, Naotsugu. 2018. “Conscious Machines: Defining Questions.” *Letters. Science*. 26 January 2018. 359:6374. 400.
3. Kuang, Ciff. 2017. “Can A.I. Be Taught to Explain Itself?” New York. *The New York Times Sunday Magazine*. 26 November 2017. https://www.nytimes.com/2017/11/21/magazine/can-ai-be-taught-to-explain-itself.html?ref=collection%2Fsectioncollection%2Fmagazine&action=click&contentCollection=magazine®ion=rank&module=package&version=highlights&contentPlacement=9&pgtype=sectionfront&_r=0
4. Spatola, Nicolas and Urbanska, Karolina. 2018. “Conscious Machines: Robot Rights.” *Letters. Science*. 26 January 2018. 359:6374. 400.
5. Burton-Hill, Clemency. 2016. “The Superhero of Artificial Intelligence: Can This Genius Keep it in Check?” London, UK. *The Guardian*. 16 February 2016. <http://www.theguardian.com/technology/2016/feb/16/demis-hassabis-artificial-intelligence-deepmind-alphago>
6. Silver, David. Hubert, Thomas. Schrittwieser, Julian. Antonoglou, Ioannis. Lai, Matthew. Guez, Arthur. Lanctot, Marc. Sifre, Laurent. Kumaran, Dharshan. Graepel Thore. Lillicrap, Timothy. Simonyan, Karen. And Hassabis, Demis. 2017. “Mastering Chess and Shogi by Self-Play with a General Reinforcement Learning Algorithm.” <https://arxiv.org/abs/1712.01815>