

the project of theory

May 3–7, 2022
Moise Palace, Cres, Croatia

BOOK OF ABSTRACTS

SUMMER SCHOOL: PHILOSOPHY AND ARCHITECTURE



UNIRI



DELTALAB



Politecnico
di Torino



INSTITUT
ZA FILOZOFIJU
I DRUŠTVENU
TEORIJU

Book of Abstracts
The Project of Theory

Editors

Miloš Ćipranić
Igor Cvejić
Marko Ristić

Language Editor

Edward Djordjevic

Layout and Design

Milica Božić

Publisher

Institute for Philosophy and Social Theory, University of Belgrade
Gazela Pudar Draško, director

Belgrade, 2022

ISBN 978-86-82324-20-1

SUMMER SCHOOL ARCHITECTURE AND PHILOSOPHY

Summer school *Architecture and Philosophy* is joint interdisciplinary project (started in 2016) organized by Institute for Philosophy and Social Theory (University of Belgrade), Center for Advanced Studies Southeast Europe (University of Rijeka), Institut für Architektur (Technische Universität Berlin) and Politecnico di Torino.

1st Summer School Architecture and Philosophy,
19-23 September 2016, Inter-University Centre Dubrovnik
Social Inequalities and Cities
<https://cas.uniri.hr/course-philosophy-and-architecture/>

2nd Summer School Architecture and Philosophy,
11-15 September 2017, Inter-University Centre Dubrovnik
Between Intellectual and Sensory Reason: Towards an Epistemology of Architecture
<https://cas.uniri.hr/summer-school-between-intellectual-and-sensory-reason-towards-an-epistemology-of-architecture/>

3rd Summer School Architecture and Philosophy,
17-21 September 2018, Inter-University Centre Dubrovnik
Notation, Algorithm, Criticism: Towards a Critical Epistemology of Architecture
<https://cas.uniri.hr/notation-algorithm-criticism-towards-a-critical-epistemology-of-architecture/>

4th Summer School Architecture and Philosophy,
25-29 March 2019, Inter-University Centre Dubrovnik
Around 1800/2000 – Aesthetics at The Threshold
<https://cas.uniri.hr/call-for-papers-around-1800-2000-aesthetics-at-the-threshold/>

5th Summer School Architecture and Philosophy,
3-7 May 2022, Moise Palace Cres
The Project of Theory
<https://cas.uniri.hr/5th-summer-school-the-project-of-theory/>

BOOK OF ABSTRACTS

5th Summer School: THE PROJECT OF THEORY

Table of Contents

<i>Foreword</i>	6
5th Summer School “The Project of Theory”	7
Project of Theory and the (Creative) Failure of Translation (Jörg Gleiter)	8
Architectural Objects as Persons (Miloš Ćipranić)	9
Projects: Academic Research Labs on the City (Federica Joe Gardella)	10
What Laboratory for the Architectural Project? (Tommaso Listo)	11
Monument, Document, Lineament (Klaus Platzgummer)	12
Expanding Notions of Tectonics at the Turn of the 21st Century (Ozan Soya)	13
Non-Linear Methodology of Design (Ida Križaj Leko)	14
Modal Logic Considerations and Architecture (Željko Radinković)	15
Architecture <i>and</i> Philosophy. Forms of Conjunction or Origin of Conject(ure) (Petar Bojanić)	16
<i>And</i> . The Invention (Projection) of <i>the Third</i> . (Snežana Vesnić)	17
The Birth of a Type (Teo Butenas Santos)	18
The Process of Type Formation in Church Architecture (Paulina Błaszczyk)	19
Starting Over from Technical Anthropology to Survive the Anthropocene (Giulia Montanaro)	20
Architecture of Excess in the Anthropocene (Lidia Gasperoni)	21
Between Norms and Exceptions – An Ecology of Urban Practices (Saskia Gribling)	22
Far from the Will: The Destination of Resistance (Isidora Popović)	23
Urban Ergonomics and the Transferability of Models in China (Francesca Moro)	24
Four Ways of Innovation in Architecture: a Pragmatic Chart (Alessandro Armando)	25
The Projective Character of the (Positional) Sur- in the Concept of <i>Surrationalism</i> (Marko Ristić)	26
Material Scaffolding of Affectivity and Architecture (Igor Cvejić)	27
Style – Sign and Meaning in Contemporary Architecture (Viviana Torero)	28
To Read or to Experience? On Possible Ways of Understanding Architecture (Aleksandra Jaročka-Mikrut)	29
Cities and Diversity: The Evolution of Architecture and its Aesthetic Cognition as a Result of Cultural Contamination (Jonida Alliaj)	30
Historical Tracings and the Creative Act (Fedor Torgashev)	31
Fragmenting the Urbicide of the Former City of Solidarity (Tamara Koneska)	32

Foreword

This publication presents the abstracts of the fifth annual Summer School *Architecture & Philosophy*. Held in Cres, Croatia from May 3-7, the 2022 Summer School was entitled “The Project of Theory,” allowing postgraduate students, early career researchers, and established academics the opportunity to share the findings of their work through short presentations. The issue of the projective character of theory was approached through a number of different perspectives, such as architectural design methodology, epistemology, theory of the project, and phenomenology. The order of the abstracts in this book follows the order of the presentations, which were thematically grouped into several sessions. This classification, however, has been omitted from the book, allowing the abstracts to stand on their own and encourage readers to read them separately.

5th Summer School “The Project of Theory”

The 2022 Summer School “Architecture & Philosophy” raises the question of the projective character of theory. Genuine innovation in architecture, we argue, is always a project of theory. By making visible the immanent deficits, the social conditions and paradoxes of architecture, critical theory opens up architecture to the new.

This is all the more important today, when under pressure of debates about sustainability, energy balances and certifications, architecture practice is increasingly dominated by instrumental, technical reason. There is even a belief that theory can be dispensed with altogether. This, however, must be countered with the assertion that there is no institution of architecture without theory. Echoing the philosopher Christine Blättler, it can be said that theory directs the “gaze from metaphysical sense to material intrinsic meaning.” This also means that theory makes architecture possible in the first place: there is no true innovation without theory.

Topic Editor: Jörg Gleiter (Technische Universität Berlin)

Co-Directors: Petar Bojanić (Institute for Philosophy and Social Theory, University of Belgrade, CAS SEE, University of Rijeka), Jörg Gleiter (Technische Universität Berlin), Alessandro Armando (Politecnico di Torino), Snežana Vesnić (Faculty of Architecture, University of Belgrade)

Organizers: Institute for Philosophy and Social Theory (University of Belgrade), Center for Advanced Studies Southeast Europe (University of Rijeka), Faculty of Architecture (University of Belgrade), Technische Universität Berlin, DeltaLab (University of Rijeka), Politecnico di Torino

Organizing Committee: Igor Cvejić (Institute for Philosophy and Social Theory, University of Belgrade), Miloš Čipranić (Institute for Philosophy and Social Theory, University of Belgrade), Marko Ristić (Institute for Philosophy and Social Theory, University of Belgrade), Morana Matković (DeltaLab, University of Rijeka)

Project of Theory and the (Creative) Failure of Translation

The project of theory is grounded in the translation from thing to word, or in the tension between object and language. It is characterized by the fact that things are never completely absorbed by words. Thus, the project of theory consists in the openness or difference of word and thing. In philosophical anthropology, one speaks of the resistance of things. This is at the heart of the formation of human consciousness. In classical rhetoric, one speaks of *ekphrasis*. This focuses more on the process of translating sensory experience into language so that one can talk about the world and exchange ideas about it. The project of theory, however, is grounded in the failure of *ekphrasis*, which is the creative moment of the project of theory.

Miloš Ćipranić

Institute for Philosophy and Social Theory, University of Belgrade

Architectural Objects as Persons

In everyday language, people tend to spontaneously personify buildings and there are certain reasons for this inclination. Analogies between architecture and the human body are a phenomenon reflected in theoretical discourse. Buildings are indeed capable of acting on those who observe, work and live in them. This issue can be considered from at least two points of view. From the perspective of law, the thesis that an architectural object can be understood as *persona ficta* is debatable. On the other hand, buildings are aesthetic objects able to arouse an emotion or other kinds of response with their structure and appearance. If buildings were treated as non-human persons then the question arises as to whether these objects, or even “subjects,” are capable of autonomously “speaking” on their own behalf, or whether they need a human being to represent them, such as their tenants, architects who designed them, or theorists and other authors who write about them.

Projects: Academic Research Labs on the City

This presentation is located in the field of the observation of contemporary architectural design research, and it aims at studying the projects developed by University Laboratories of Architecture, concerning the transformation of the city, and, in particular, the forms of the political agency of these projects. Cities are assumed as the terrain of investigation to measure the effectiveness of the architectural project, as they are constantly facing complex challenges, concerning social and spatial justice, public health, inclusiveness, economic accessibility, quality and safety of spaces... These urban problems are derived from conditions of cities that cannot be included in the boundaries regulating traditional professional firms: they are rarely confined to a space, and do not have specific clients. It is here that academic research can play a fundamental role, addressing them through critical observation and design.

The hypothesis of this presentation is that this type of architectural research, in order to be effective, must be strictly linked to decision-making and political conditions. The project cannot be autonomous, designed as an authorial complete form, which first organizes its discourse and its values according to an internal coherence, and then transfers them to the world. On the contrary, the constructive capacity of the project needs to emerge every time from the concrete circumstances in which it is inserted. At the same time, the presentation argues that it is only through the project that the political decision to deal with urban problems and transform space can be achieved. Therefore, the first insights raise some questions, which are then elaborated through case studies. Where is the place of architectural project research? When addressing urban issues, how is an academic research action built? How is a project selected and what methods and technologies are used to pursue it? In which networks does it strategically move? How is it made effective and what does it produce? *What is the constructive power of the project?*

What Laboratory for the Architectural Project?

Can architectural design be considered a research practice providing some (peculiar) knowledge of the world, or is it an action exclusively linked to the technical sphere of its transformation? In the current European research mandate – the one defined by calls such as Horizon, concerning the environment, sustainable buildings, and the living ways of people in cities – the architectural project does not seem to be considered among the reference interlocutors, at least not so much as design, architectural technologies, engineering and computer science. Consequently, at the institutional level, in architecture schools and universities, we are witnessing a reshaping of the epistemological panorama.

One of the spaces that (should) relate architectural project and research practices is the laboratory. Laboratories represent the operational institutionalization of research; spaces and infrastructures that allow formalized procedures (test, prototyping) in which consequent social and technical reconfigurations are produced. At the same time, labs and workshops are traditionally at the core of architectural schools (atelier). Still, in laboratories that deal with the built environment the architectural project is a secondary and ancillary competence. Could also the architectural project, if understood as a research action, have its own laboratories? What kind of experimentation could they do and how would it fit with the organization of research today, given that it is mainly funded by top-down programs? Through an examination of different laboratory spaces and conceptions, with their practical and logical procedures, the presented inquiry uses a theoretical methodology to develop a hypothetical object: the Architectural Project Lab. The aim is to question and provoke the architectural school as an institution capable to innovate its role in the contemporary world.

Monument, Document, Lineament

As society at large is computerised, the *mode of production* (Marx, *Produktionsweise*) in architecture transforms. In particular through the use of drawing and modelling software, the relations and forces of how thinking, drawing and building converge — the convergences of lineaments, documents, monuments — are shifting; the use of BIM software for example entails a transformed mode of collaboration and interaction between the actors involved in the design and construction of a building. However, it is not only the *mode of production* of architecture practices that is transforming but also — and this is often overlooked — the mode of production of the theory of practice undergoes significant shifts. The theory of practice is no longer an exclusive project of architects. It is the software developers and their imaginaries that begun to prescribe — in other words, to theorise — the architecture practices of today. The *productive forces* (Marx, *Produktivkräfte*) and relations of production (Marx, *Produktionsverhältnisse*) are no longer exclusive prescriptions in books; as in Leon Battista Alberti's *De Re Aedificatoria*, in which construction workers were degraded merely to instruments of architects. Rather, computerised architecture practices operate with instruments in which a project of a theory of practice is inscribed as script — the project of theory of architecture software developers.

Expanding Notions of Tectonics at the Turn of the 21st Century

This research fundamentally aims to understand the contemporary condition and evolution of tectonic thinking in architecture at the turn of the twenty-first century. The significance of tectonic thinking lies in that it has been a prolific area of discussion for architectural theory since it first entered the discourse nearly two hundred years ago. Etymologically referring to carpentry in ancient Greek, the term *tectonic* started to be used by the German architectural theorists in the nineteenth century, to address architecture's coordination of structural and constructional aspects with systems of decoration. Towards the end of the twentieth century, the cultural context of tectonics gained more importance with British architectural theorist Kenneth Frampton's elaboration of the term. Frampton described tectonics as poetics of construction in his 1995 seminal book: *Studies in Tectonic Culture: The Poetics of Construction in Nineteenth and Twentieth Century Architecture*. Frampton's primary goal for writing the book was widely considered a call of return to the profession; inviting architecture back to its own field against the influence of consumer culture. However, after Frampton's call back, the development of tectonic thinking entered into a relatively unclear state. Today the intellectual topography of the scholarship remains quite fragmentary, and its contemporary contextualization still expects further investigation, particularly concerning the rise of technological developments and socio-cultural conditions. On this account, the research investigates the contemporary status and evolution of tectonic thinking in architecture, and expects to find the multi-faceted direction indicators of the expansion of contemporary tectonic thinking in the twenty-first century. The present research claims that, rather than depending on a single poetic connotation of tectonics, contemporary tectonic understanding needs to confront emerging technological and socio-cultural challenges, conditions, possibilities, and constraints. With this in mind, the research is designed on four areas of critical investigation, expected to incorporate multiple sources of information. These grounds of discussion are materiality, morphology, and topography as the ontological modes of tectonics, followed by a section dedicated to the representational mode.

Ida Križaj Leko

DeltaLab, University of Rijeka

Non-Linear Methodology Of Design

Starting from the point of view of a practicing architect, it is expected but also learned, that the house (architecture as an object) develops from an abstract concept through a spatial idea and is finally confirmed through its realization. But what if the process is reversed and the final objects become the abstract means used to create a new principle of design?

Through the creation of the architecture of the exhibition “Fiume Fantastika: Phenomena of the City” and its 10 pavilions, which also served as a structure for the book of the same title, the presentation will show a specific methodology of design derived from research of materials and archives that led to the creation of the so-called 11th pavilion - the project “Togetherness / Togetheless” with which Croatia presented itself at the Venice Biennale 2020/2021. Through both projects, it will be shown that the non-linearity of the creation of the “final form” or “final assembly” opens wider views on architecture as a discipline.

The presentation is an architect’s vision who is part of a large interdisciplinary team that has created its ideology or hopes to create it. It is called DeltaLab – Center for Urban Transition, Architecture and Urbanism.

Željko Radinković

Institute for Philosophy and Social Theory, University of Belgrade

Modal Logic Considerations and Architecture

The lecture deals with the concepts of reality, possibility, virtuality, and contingency in the context of considerations about the character of the specifically architectural conception of space. With the inclusion of the phenomenological-hermeneutic perspective, the view of the “significant” spatiality should open up. In this context, particular attention is paid to the so-called existential concept of possibility, which Martin Heidegger worked out within his existential ontology. The presentation examines to what extent the constitutive primacy of the existential project or the existential future reference is also decisive for the constitution of the significance of the architectural spatiality. On the basis of these insights, the difference from other ideas of projectivity, such as the projectivity of the architectural concept, can then be examined.

Petar Bojanić

Institute for Philosophy and Social Theory, University of Belgrade
CAS, University of Rijeka

Architecture *and* Philosophy. Forms of Conjunction or Origin of Conject(ure)

Architecture *AND* Philosophy is a gesture to do away with and replace the constructions and grimaces such as Philosophy of Architecture, Architectural Philosophy, Architecture + Philosophy, Architecture/Philosophy, Philosophy for Architects, Philosophy and Architecture or Architecture and Philosophy. My intention is multiple and I will unfold it in several steps: the relation of theory and philosophy, along with a reconstruction of the “advantage” of philosophy over theory; the invention of a new difference or new connection between the fields of architecture and philosophy; the discovery of an independent and unexplored space and time coordinated by the conjunction “and;” and finally, the classification of forms of connection, disjunction, and vanishing of the “and” into architecture philosophy. I will first attempt to name this rupture or overlap of two “epistemological genres” with the notion of “conject;” following which, I will present the two key words of which it consists, and which always hold architecture and philosophy together: concept, project. Conject is a bond or mix of the first two architectural protocols and the first two key words of both architecture *and* philosophy: concept and project. The third holds the two together, architecture *and* philosophy, by throwing them forward together (*conjicere*).

And. The Invention (Projection) of the Third

My intention is to distinguish between the new and novelty. Using the impossibility of projective difference defined (made, determined) by the other and the third, I will elaborate a deconstruction of the creation of the “new”. As the other appears from the possibility of difference, invention is a discovery (in what already exists) of the other. If Derrida placed the appearance of the other outside the methodological procedure, thus projecting (designing) deconstruction above all as a “metaphysical project” with explicitly phenomenological projection, we can claim that, upon the invention of the other (the new), we must also produce “the third”, as inspiration of real creation (novelty). Invention is not the same as creation, but refers to alteration (movement, change) of what already exists through qualitative openness to other readings. The other is the projection of openness, or the other is what contains a “projection”. Distinct from the “new”, novelty is pure creation, that is, it refers to the concept. Thus, the other could be said to belong to the project, that is, it is a projection that constructs a new object, opens it and places it into reality. “The Third” is an unstable position that emerges from the constant tension between what exists and what is thought. This uncertainty could manifest “something” entirely novel, beyond projective geometry, which aims to oppose deconstruction with the “perfect” or “ideal” structure. The new is thus equated with invention, that is, the project; while novelty relates to the concept. Since the concept mediates between architecture and philosophy, and as novelty is essentially the future of the discipline, then the concept – the conjunction AND – contains the contingency of the third: the possibility of novelty for the new.

The Birth of a Type

When discussing the production of theory in the field of architecture, we seem to either perceive it as an *a posteriori* operation – by analyzing existing architecture and its implications – or as an *a priori* operation – when conceiving something before it is put into paper, before it has any physical form. By thinking in ways of clear genealogies and linearity of time, we struggle to conceive both possibilities of theory production as happening not only simultaneously, but also subconsciously through the act of design. In this presentation I propose that theory (in architecture) is simultaneously before and after (J. Gleiter), and try to exemplify this thesis. The presentation takes a case-study of the Berlin Philharmonie and the process of formation of a new architectural type – the Vineyard Style Concert Hall, which has become hegemonic since the turn of the 21st century – developed as part of the “Type and Model” seminar at the Department of Architectural Theory of the Technical University of Berlin. It expands the case study to demonstrate ways in which theory is produced, and then it questions this supposed dichotomy. The aims of the presentation are to expose the dialectical as well as circular nature of theory production, and argue that in architecture, theory is always embedded in models (as forms carry symbolic and ideological content), even without the conscious intention of the architect, without intentionality. This makes it possible for future interpretants to paradoxically produce radically new theory that in a way was already there.

The Process of Type Formation in Church Architecture

The presentation follows up on a video project made for a class Type and Model, held by the chair of Architecture Theory at TU Berlin. Its topic is the significant change in the church architecture brought by the modern movement and the transformations within the church institution (Second Vatican Council) that could be noticed in the twentieth century. The video tries to investigate whether the above-mentioned changes have led to a new type creation. It gives an overview of particular examples of Berlin churches, provides their semiotic analysis, and proposes the abolishment of the word 'type' in this case.

I will give a critical view of the conclusions made in the video and try to defend using the word 'type' with three arguments: the modern movement change was one of many changes that the church has undergone and the type is a frame within the change operates (Moneo), the act of naming architectural objects, here based on their function, is an act of typifying (Moneo), and the shift in typology from basing it on dominant morphological aspects to soft parameters like types of experience, performance, and atmosphere (Gleiter, Ballestrem). To prove the latter, I will talk about the experience of the church based on light, sound, and materiality, and try to underline its superiority over studying the church's form and structure. In my presentation I want to talk about two aspects of the projective character of theory: the relation of the theory and practice in the architecture of churches, and the process of making the video itself, a critical view of it, and its analysis in terms of being a project of theory as well.

Starting Over from Technical Anthropology to Survive the Anthropocene

The great acceleration that has taken place in recent decades has also led to various forms of destruction, cultural, environmental, social, and political. We are now, so geologists tell us, living in a new epoch of the Anthropocene. Surviving it will demand reflection upon and transformation of the practices inherited from the modern to overcome modernity itself. The reconstruction of the question of technology aims to unfold the concept of technics in its plurality and act as an antidote to the modernisation programme by reopening a truly global history of the world.

One of the most common criticisms made today is how building technologies are responsible for the massive homologation of cities. Following the dictates of a theoretical systematization of construction history, as suggested by Werner Lorenz, his object of investigation is the process of production, the “art of making,” or the science of architectural design understood as the technical process through which man builds the environment in which to live. In this sense, construction history is nothing more than a “technological anthropology,” a definition that in many ways well identifies the intention of linking technology and cultural sustainability.

Architecture, and in particular built space, if understood as the result of actions aimed at or derived from construction creates, in itself, a natural language common to designers from different backgrounds, capable of acting as a “bridge” between cultures and attitudes to the critical reading of the design. This applies as much to tectonics in the case of analysis at the scale of the building as to morphology in the case of studies at the urban scale allowing planning and designing culturally sustainable urban development that could reconnect disjunctions given by the intensified development of the last decades giving value to the existing cultural plurality and its potential.

Architecture of Excess in the Anthropocene

Climate emergency and the Anthropocene represent a radical challenge for contemporary architecture, which is being forced to exceed itself grasping and incorporating new fields of knowledge. This challenge, which only apparently determines the crisis of architecture, represents its potential by developing design practices and cultures capable of responding to conceptual and perceptive challenges that have already shaped the project of philosophy, for instance in phenomenology. The concept of “excess” in philosophy can help to grasp this potential for the spatial imagination embedded in architectural design. The paper focuses on the field of innovative practices that are emerging in architecture with regard to experimental diagramming and architectural pedagogies based on the Anthropocene.

Between Norms and Exceptions - An Ecology of Urban Practices

The aim of this research is to investigate the changing role of the design project and the potential of the architecture profession by looking at its effects. Does architectural design have a transformative power on its own? Is there a mobilisation potential related to the project itself rather than to the one coming as an effect of the logics of capital (De Graaf)?

Looking at a peculiar group of actors, architects or architectural collectives which defined themselves as *antagonistic, alternative or dissenting*, this research investigates their practices and interrogates their possibility of achievements and changes by focusing on their effects.

Considering them non-institutionalised actors who, without a direct or official mandate, nor technical-administrative authority, manage to intervene in urban space and actually transform the city, the research inquires how they actually get into the process of *institutionalisation*. These urban and architectural practices are studied and analysed in the relations they intertwine with other nodes they encounter within their networks. At the same time, the focus on abrupt projects allows to analyse the means and the actions through which those create their spaces of interventions.

On the one hand, particular attention is paid to the way they communicate and compose their actions within institutions (Bojanić), understanding those as the “*rules that govern people’s behaviour in complex social interactions*” (Guala). On the other, it analyses the weak space between urban regulations and the architectural project, and questions how the city changes “*regardless and sometimes even against rules and urban polices*” (Pasqui, Sini).

Methodologically, the research positions itself by following ethnographic methods applied to the study of architectural projects, and applies direct observation, qualitative interviews and in-depth study of the archives (Cuff; Yaneva). Thus, it takes the study of selected particular case studies as a “specific form of the generic” (Cuff) in order to unfold how specific urban practices and their *modi operandi* could possibly be integrated in urban processes.

Isidora Popović

Faculty of Architecture, University of Belgrade

Far From the Will: The Destination of Resistance

In its attempts to identify the splitting points that define concepts, this paper deals with the use of resistance as a tool for reconstructing distance. Norms can be re-examined by rooting resistance as a method. Resistance lies in the possibilities of rejecting actuality. At the same time, resistance is created in response to the destination. The process of architectural design as a gestural act allows for its own sequences. The question arises as to which of these sequences suggests purely unforced spaces, and whether they are the backbone of the project or its destination. Does not liberation, however, reveal a kind of revival of freedom, a covert revolt? When it comes to such moves, with the use of mechanisms on which irony is based, or sarcasm as its extreme form, meaning is contextualized by commas and mimicry. As these moves are close to individual concepts, absolute freedom is questionable, and as such appears exclusively in its own negativity, at the point of resistance.

Urban Ergonomics and the Transferability of Models in China

Urban ergonomics is a new-born research field that fosters the collaboration between Politecnico di Torino and Tsinghua University of Beijing, with the essential aim of placing as central the relationship between humans and space in developing cities. The goal is to understand what kind of new approach and ideas can emerge and push forward – in theory as well as in practice – the architectural design in future-oriented scenarios.

The shift towards the definition of urban ergonomics as central in design processes necessarily addresses the issue of theoretical models that lie beneath this phenomenon, and in what way the transferability of these models of knowledge, particularly in architecture, takes place. Pushing forward this preliminary consideration, another element apt for investigation concerns the supposedly inherent efficacy of the newly-recovered centrality of ergonomics within space, given that the underlying effort is to make performative the paradigms within which design theory and projects are interpreted. The aim of this research is to investigate the implicit and explicit effects in design practices that derive from using ergonomics as the main principle to design and describe space: if the principles of urban ergonomics are to be leading features in architectural processes, unfolding their theoretical principles can represent a starting point for its transferability.

In a threefold and parallel conception, this research aims at considering the origin and development of the conceptualization of ergonomics in European and Chinese thinkers and its progressively intersecting relationship to urban space within the Chinese context. Then, to understand the connection between these studies and design innovation, efficacy within architectural actions, and intellectual technologies. Finally, to define a selection of Chinese laboratories that could become the observing ground of this transformative process that keeps ergonomics central to Chinese design thinking and practices, in a strict bilateral connection linking actual practices and design theory.

Four Ways to Innovation in Architecture: a Pragmatic Chart

In this presentation I propose to consider the architectural project in its pragmatic consistency, that is, as an activity of exchange and production of a certain type of documents, capable of producing effects on material space. According to this hypothesis, the art (*techne*) of the project can be seen both as an individual skill in which it is necessary to acquire a particular dexterity, and an activity that takes place collectively, through a chain of mediators and prostheses.

What kind of innovation can we think of for such a project? Is it possible to innovate dexterity? What kind of prostheses can architects develop with their direct expertise?

To critically measure the possibilities of “progress” in design research, I propose a classification of the modes of innovation, on two distinct axes.

In the first dimension, I distinguish between two areas of action: the *theater* (as a place of the project representation), in which the effectiveness of designing depends on the speed and flexibility of the means of inscription, and the workshop or *bottega* (as a place of production), in which the effectiveness depends on the cumulative capacity and stability of such inscriptions. In the second dimension, I propose the distinction between *independence* and *dependence* on innovation, that is, between research practices that architects can carry out with their own hands, and practices that require articulated chains of external technological skills and resources.

A space of differences emerges, organized on two perpendicular axes, which allows me to formulate a specific hypothesis on the innovation of the project, through a series of examples.

The Projective Character of the (Positional) *Sur-* in the Concept of *Surrationalism*

This research aims to reconstruct the question of the ‘projective character of theory’ through Gaston Bachelard’s concept of *surrationalism*. Bachelard begins the essay, “Le surrationalisme,” published in the first issue of the periodical *Inquisitions*, with the following words: “The decisive action [*l’action décisive*] of reason [*raison*] is almost always confused with monotonous recourse [*recours monotone*] to the certitudes of memory [*aux certitudes de la mémoire*].” The ultimate consequence of this ‘looking back’ would be the loss of the originally dynamic character of reason, and, correspondingly, the loss of the potential for the new. In order to deconstruct such a *recours*, Bachelard introduces the concept of *surrationalism*, which he uses to emphasize the importance of restoring the ‘function of turbulence and aggressiveness’ to reason. Accordingly, the character of this *sur-*, which stands for such mobility, would have to be *psychological*. However, ‘psychological’ here does not mean subjective, but rather non-discursive. Its value lies in the possibility to *singularize* reason, that is, to revive it in order to bring forth the new. Precisely because of this affinity to the singular, we could consider *surrationalist* activity particularly projective. But its projectiveness could result only from a certain act of *negation*. In the phrase ‘the project of theory,’ there is an implicit assertion that theory is not complete; yet, if this ‘project’ were aimed at the completion of theory, then it would cease to be *its* project. The specificity of such a project would then be objectification of rationalism, suggested by the prefix *sur-*. In this sense, *sur-* indicates a positioning which, although it occurs in terms of negation, is directed towards a ‘synthetic epistemology,’ thereby producing the new as an epistemological difference. So, the negation inherent in the *sur-* of a *surrationalist* act remains constructive, and therefore, entirely architectural.

Material Scaffolding of Affectivity and Architecture

The term scaffolding has gained much importance in the contemporary theory of situated or extended cognition. It designates the use of environmental elements to enable, support, regulate, and enhance our skills, capacities or activity. In that sense, the term transitioned from the understanding of human cognition to the understanding of situated affectivity. Affective scaffolds can be various including biochemical (e.g., food and drugs), representational (pictures, monuments or rituals), technical (smartphone or laptop), sociobiological (other people and animals), sociotechnical (social platforms) and socioinstitutional (conventions and norms). Material scaffolding of affectivity serves to highlight the various ways in which material objects in the environment enable, support, and regulate our affectivity. Architectural objects and planning are one of the most obvious examples of such scaffolds, but rarely directly addressed in the literature. In addition to the introductory theses on scaffolded affectivity and its taxonomy, the lecture will place special emphasis on understanding affective atmospheres. Affective atmospheres are affective qualities in a public space realized in a distributed manner, making up dynamic situational gestalt. They are at least partially detachable from individual experience, which manifests in the fact that we can neutrally behold an atmosphere. To that degree affective atmospheres are “object-like”. In the last part of the presentation, I will address four reasons why manipulation of affective scaffolding is important for architecture: functional, environmental, aesthetical and general sociopolitical.

Style - Sign and Meaning in Contemporary Architecture

My dissertation, “Style – Sign and Meaning in Contemporary Architecture” follows a line of research in architectural theory, supported by the architectural theory of semiotics. Semiotics, in relation to architecture, deals with everything that competes with architectural communication. The relationship between style, sign, and meanings is an essential part of architectural language, and the variation of these elements has been the basis for the formation of new semiotic theories that aim to understand the sense of architecture. Thus, using a theoretical approach, my dissertation proposal seeks to face the problem of style in architecture, which, under the influence of current digital processes, creates a new relationship between architecture, the architectural sign, and its meanings

To Read or to Experience? On Possible Ways of Understanding Architecture

Architecture is a multi-layered field which requires comprehensive knowledge covering various disciplines. For years, future architects have been taught how to design functional and visually pleasing buildings. The importance of style, aesthetics, and inspiration standing behind each concept has also been emphasized in the design process. However, it is worth asking whether it is everything that is required in order to understand architecture. To propose an answer, I would like to concentrate on the concept of reading buildings. It needs to be stressed that reading, in literature as in architecture, is a complicated mechanism which can operate on different levels and, therefore, might be analysed from multiple perspectives. Hence, in my presentation I would like to approach reading architecture as a project of theory and discuss the ways this process is understood in contemporary scientific research by selected literary and architectural scholars.

Moreover, I address the issue of the changes that have been taking place in the subject matter over the years. Additionally, I address how the idea of reading buildings might differ when considered from the perspective of an architect and non-architect reader. I also pay attention to possible relations, including similarities and differences, between experiencing and/or visually perceiving architecture and reading it. Hopefully, the proposed presentation will ignite a discussion concerning not only essential requirements necessary to thoroughly and consciously understand architecture but also the need to introduce more theory concerning various ways and forms of reading to be applied in conjunction with teaching architecture.

Cities and Diversity: The Evolution of Architecture and its Aesthetic Cognition as a Result of Cultural Contamination

The aesthetic cognition of space, form, colour and architecture, in general, is a subjective matter and depends on: “coherence (ease of organizing and comprehending a scene), fascination (informational richness and generated interest), and hominess (personal ease and comfort)” (Chatterjee, Anjan et al). Two of these elements (coherence and hominess) suggest that familiarity with a given architectural style or characteristics may influence a positive aesthetic experience in a city. This paper argues that cultural background, traditions and exposure affect the architectural aesthetic cognition of an individual and the meaning they apply to architecture.

Culture can be defined as “group typical behaviour patterns shared by members of a community that rely on socially learned and transmitted information” (Laland and Hoppitt, 2003, p. 151). In a globalized world where the exposure to different cultures is enhanced and they contaminate each other, how has architecture and the built environment been evolving? Can we say that it has benefitted and increased its aesthetic value, or not? How has the aesthetic perception of individuals exposed continuously to different architectural styles been changing?

Finally, focusing on the “cultural nomadic individual,” this research tries to study ways for our cities to have a positive aesthetic experience for people from different cultural backgrounds. The solutions may be (i) the choice of architecture that has characteristics that resemble to the natural environment as the common preference of people from different backgrounds, or (ii) a combination of different styles of architecture (traditional and eclectic) to represent the major part of citizens or (iii) a combination of both of the previous solutions for an inclusive and diverse city.

Historical Tracings and Creative Act

The presentation is a further development of the video project “Historical tracings as a memory and permanence of the city” created as part of the “Type and Model” course at the Department of Architectural Theory of the Technical University of Berlin. Particular attention is dedicated to the concept of permanence and memory introduced by Aldo Rossi, and it is traced how urban morphology acquires its semantic value in the process of continuous transformation. The thesis is put forward that the creative activity of an architect is a project of theory, associated with the responsibility of adding a new layer to historical tracings. These tracings, in turn, already contain the idea of the future, since they are a posteriori, and serve both as the result and the beginning of a new practice.

The “project of theory” is understood as a visual system of thinking, referring to Oswald Mathias Ungers, who relates this to the notion of imagination – a process of conceptualizing an unrelated, diverse reality, using tools such as metaphor and analogy, which in general is a mnemonic technique. Special attention is paid to the concept of the dualism of the image, which is both the beginning and the result of the creative process, dealing with the essence of intuitive genius in the process of translation. The thesis is being advanced that the idea of the future is already potentially embedded in the past and has an impact on the present, thereby defining the activity of the architect to distinguish this idea in the form of a new sequential transformation in order to ensure the potential formation of future permanence.

Fragmenting the Urbicide of the Former City of Solidarity

The synthetic urban emptiness of the new reconstruction project “Skopje 2014,” with its no man’s land of a neoliberal city center, is now the new foundation of the city’s artificial scenery. How to “cure” modern urban amnesia that is already subconsciously imprinted in architecture? Does this city still have its invisible driving forces so skillfully described by Italo Calvino in his book *Invisible Cities*? Is Skopje becoming a city that forgets? Is Skopje slowly becoming a city without history, a modern space created on the forgotten modernist terrain vague?

Uncovering the traces in Skopje’s urbicide through a new parallel reading of the object and subject position in analyzing, understanding and transferring the philosophy behind “Skopje 2014” and connecting it further with other projects. Starting from the assumption that “Skopje 2014” cannot be treated only as a product of one government agenda and identity policy, I examine the broader perspective of the project phenomenon, including recent events in the architectural and urban history of the city center, giving a new interpretation of the universal discourse of urban trauma and confirming the wounded state of the city. Finally, I look at the project as a modern transitional reconstruction that deals with the politics of memory and changing the image of the city.



UNIRI



DELTALAB



Politecnico
di Torino

