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introduction
The **Annual National Deleuze Scholarship Conference** is a working symposium intended to bring together scholars, students, researchers, activists, artists, and others whose work revolves around the philosophy of Gilles Deleuze. Each year the conference is hosted by a different university in the Netherlands. Previous editions addressed the following central themes:

2012. **Deleuze and Cultural Studies.** University of Utrecht  
2013. **Affect.** Delft University of Technology  
2014. **Passions.** Erasmus University Rotterdam  
2015. **Aesthetics.** Radboud University Nijmegen  
2016. **Machinic Ecologies.** University of Amsterdam  
2017. **Pedagogies.** AKI, Enschede  
2018. **Politics of Sustainability.** University of Utrecht  

In 2019 the conference returns to **TU Delft Faculty of Architecture**, with a very distinguished guest speaker from Newcastle University, Professor **Andrew Ballantyne**, alongside our dear Professor **Rosi Braidotti** from Utrecht University.

**conference theme**

*Humanity is that form of psycho-social life which, by means of the non-living artefacts that support it and found its historicity, extends bio-psychic animal life of which the non-living condition is not yet the artefact but simple apoptosis ('cellular suicide'), and whose origin is a third form of 'non-life': the chemical non-living.* (Barthélémy, “Du mort qui saisit le vif”, 2007).

Throughout his working life Deleuze devoted a great deal of time to rethinking ‘ways to die’ and the focus intensified in the period leading to his death. It was explicitly addressed in his final text, which is key to understanding that Deleuze’s affirmative vitalism, or his emphasis on life and joy, should not be confused with the so-called search for happiness. Enduring the pain, or living the wound, means, especially in our times, that we must thoroughly rethink death, pain and madness. These issues are especially relevant for posthuman subjects situated between the Fourth Industrial Revolution and the Sixth Extinction, in the context of the Anthropocene and climate change, rising populism, growing poverty and inequality. How does Deleuze’s ethics help us organise rather than agonise in the face of these challenges?
Building on and expanding the theme of the 2018/19 Deleuze Seminar, the participants of the Architectures of Life and Death conference will examine both the structures and operations of what is alive in matter and ‘non-living’ in life. We start from the assertion that life extends beyond its merely biological aspects through the non-living artefacts that support it and, at times, oppose it. If an artefact, and its capacity for creating a life, is conceptualised on the basis of its interventionist and manipulative agency, then the very concept of technology – the production and control of artefacts – can surpass the binaries of social and material, human and non-human, living and non-living. The animate has always been utterly dependent on the inanimate. Driven by the Foucauldian attitude of subsuming architectural history into a general history of techne, the conference will examine how the built environment and its technicities produce a style for living and dying that may take place simultaneously. In doing so, we embrace Guattari’s claim from his “Architectural Enunciation”

Once it is no longer the goal of the architect to be the artist of built forms but to offer his services in revealing the virtual desires of spaces, places, trajectories and territories, he will have to (…) become an artist and an artisan of sensible and relational lived experience. (Guattari, Schizoanalytic Cartographies, 1989).

Guattari urges us to understand architecture as a practice devoted to the processes of subjectification. If architecture does not produce spaces but subjects, then it is no longer a discourse on design styles. Rather, it becomes the producer of styles to live and styles to die, beyond good and evil or any such Manichean binaries. The only viable distinction is the one between active and reactive subjects. Namely, those who follow a becoming that connects them to the becoming of a world, and those who constantly retreat to segmentarity, to the reassurance of established givens and limits. Consequently, there are two types of subjects precisely because there are two types of deaths. A subject can nest into its idiocy and make itself more and more rigid and progressively smaller, or it can let itself dissipate until its disappearance. The way that one styles one’s dissolution is not merely determined by
the inevitability of entropy but by the expressionism of becoming. It is possible that by examining the ways architecture plunges into the infinity of experience – how it confronts chaos – will teach us how to die without dying.
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keynotes
Gregory Bateson coined the idea “ecology of mind”, which sees the unit of survival as “organism + habitat”. Bateson calls this unit a “mind”. The obstacle to seeing this unit of survival as a thinking subject is that it does not have consciousness and cannot articulate its own desires and fears. It was Elisée Reclus who said “l’homme est la nature prenant conscience d’elle-même”. If only the Earth could scream with pain … (Professor Challenger). This paper takes as a fulcrum the sacrifice at an ancient altar, articulating fears and desires. Most “thinking” is unconscious, and happens through chemical interactions as well as logical syllogisms, through habitual associations of ideas as well as algorithms. The ecologies of ideas and desiring machines are part of our habitat, and in Bateson’s sense these ecologies are our mind. As humans we have consciousness and can articulate ideas. As participants in ecologies we must have a concern for the unit of survival, which does not have its own consciousness separate from “us”, but which needs our voices to articulate its needs.
affirmative ethics and ways of dying

prof. dr. Rosi Braidotti
Department of Media and Culture Studies
Utrecht University

The posthuman convergence, defined as the simultaneous occurrence of cognitive capitalism (aka Fourth Industrial Revolution) and the climate change (aka Sixth Extinction), encourages a critical reappraisal of what counts as human, living matter and Life itself. Cognitive capitalism extracts capital from the informational codes of all living entities, human and non-human, erasing qualitative distinctions between species by subjecting them all to the logic of profit. This opportunistic form of post-anthropocentrism involves not only to the zoe/bio/geo/techno-management of Life, but also new ways of dying and of letting die. These include environmental devastation, unequal distribution of wealth and access to the new technologies, the persistence of technologically mediated wars and surveillance strategies which, together with the rise of xenophobia and illiberal governance, are defining features of these times. What kind of ethical accountability can we develop on the ruins of anthropocentrism and human exceptionalism? What can a neo-materialist affirmative ethics offer to posthuman subjects, in order to deal with the conflicting demands currently made on them?
radically alive,
a disappearing mining town at Europe’s margins

Karin Reisinger  
ArkDes Stockholm (Architecture and Design Center)  
Institute of Art and Design, Vienna UT

There is life in capitalist ruins, as Anna Tsing has proven with her book The Mushroom at the End of the World, and “life finds a way,” we can learn from the Jurassic Park films (quoted by Cecilia Åsberg).

To these observations I want to contribute an urban case that is materially relevant to all architects and beings using technologies. Above the Arctic Circle, at Europe’s margins lies Malmberget, literally meaning “Ore Mountain.” The town has been built around ore mines since the 18th century, fuelled with new life by the advent of the train in 1888. It is now slowly disappearing due to the expansion of the underground mining cavities, which destabilizes the grounds and would eventually endanger the lives of the inhabitants if they were to stay in their town. The building of the town around the former open pit mine, and the destruction of the town, have always gone hand in hand with the exploitation of the ore, which is located as deep as around 1,3 km under the town. What was the town’s centre in the 50s is now replaced, after continuous growth of the mining cavities and after a subsequent “expected landslide” in the 70s, by a 250m deep hole called Captain’s Pit. A fenced off area literally slices the town in two. Both parts of this leftover of a vivid welfare state mining town, planned by architects such as Hakon Ahlberg and Folke Hederus, are slowly disappearing.

My presentation, a natural-cultural continuum of looking into the colonial past, presence and future of a mining town at Europe’s extractive margins, will include the nonhuman practices in relationship to material connections discussed from a feminist posthuman perspective. This will then be followed by technologies as compounds (Donna Haraway), which mobilise deepness, and, above all, my own architectural practice as a response to such complexities in reaction to the repeated male and neo-colonial narratives of mining areas.
“We came because of mining, now we go because of mining,” a young inhabitant explained, expressing the interdependency of nonhuman and human agents in the town when I had actually asked about the absent protest to the destruction and displacement. “The ore must be mined for the community to survive – and the community must be torn down for the ore to be mined,” explains the synopsis of the film Malmberget. The Home and the Cavity by Alexander Rynéus and Per Eriksson. These complex interdependences which obstruct any binary thinking, do not even tackle how ore as a material distributes agency around the globe, manifested in the architectures and further technologies in each of our lives. Instead, my observations rather stay with the exemplary site of extraction and its practices of a myriad of actors who have learnt how to “die without dying” by collecting and connecting past and future, memories and visions in their local practices. Furthermore, the literal deepness of the mountain creeps into each corner of the world to serve as opportunity for many of us, and yet, leads to restriction, pain, wound and sadness for some of us. However, what is a dangerous ruined landscape for humans, can and does become a new attractive environment for a pilgrim falcon, who inhabits the artificial steeps caused by mining.

My architectural practice, looking for the life in extractive ruins, is a complex feminist cartography of observations and activities, adding architectural pasts and futures in dialogue with local actors usually not in the centre of architectural observations:

_ Women’s practices of building up a mining society in the harsh climate above the polar circle,
_ Indigenous practices of securing further areas from exploitation,
_ Displaced inhabitants, now dispersed all over the world, but still connected via facebook and further collecting and connecting practices,
_ Geological practices of claiming back volumes after exploitation; collapses after cavities,
_ And nonhuman practices of re-inhabiting such space, such as the pilgrim falcon.

These complex practices, all interdependent in their connection to life from the land, I argue, need to be mirrored in a dialogic interplay of observation and impact that is consequently becoming a feminist cartography of knowledge extraction, negotiation and
infusion - a scientific practice of taking and giving. This methodology, very much inspired by Rosi Braidotti’s work, and the result of a process of becoming radically local as architectural researcher shall contribute to a richer image of the sites of resource extraction, leaving an empowering impact in the life of feminist, nonhuman and indigenous on-site actors of a disappearing town.

keywords

disappearing cities, feminist cartography, feminist ecologies, posthuman neo-materialism, resource extraction
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machine désirante: architecture + form + life

Katarina Andjelkovic
Atelier AG Andjelkovic

This presentation analyses architecture as a form of life by identifying the mechanism machine désirante (desiring-machine) in the philosophy of Gilles Deleuze & Félix Guattari and in the artwork of Marcel Duchamp. Could built forms, such as architecture, practiced to shape and regulate the material foundation of life, be considered as an agent of desire?

If life was a product we wouldn’t be able to sell it; if architecture was a form of life we would be able to think of it as commodity. Nonetheless, no traditional form of life would survive today’s realm of vision as a cultural construct untwined between how we perceive new world and how we adapt to its constant recreation. Operating between the Forth Industrial Revolution and the Sixth Extinction, techno sphere tends to synchronize the simultaneous opposite processes of dying and living – the agony it created by itself. Architecture reflects their schizophrenic consequences only to stimulate the irrational desire for circulating in the endless loop of techno sphere. The hypothesis is that the notion of schizophrenia does not only relate to the problems with capitalist society, to which Deleuze and Guattari refer (“Capitalism and Schizophrenia”), but also contribute to reveal architecture as a subject of its own desire (to give form), in anticipation of the mechanism for diagnosing the effects of techno sphere on architectural ‘formlessness’.

Yet architecturally most pertinent experiments, like Duchamp’s installation The Large Glass (1915-23), also known as Bachelor Machine, have recognized possibilities in testing the limits of reality and its philosophical connections. By juxtaposing the allegory of architectural and art processes with the machinique approach of Deleuze and Guattari, Duchamp’s work can be contextualised as a machine désirante. As in his Bachelor Machine whose uncanny image transforms love into a death mechanism, the structures and operations of life nowadays seem to link the two extremes of schizophrenic behavior. In other words, similar to a tense relationship in which ‘desire’ pulls out a simultaneous
processes of attraction and repulsion, techno sphere manipulates architecture in the schizophrenic mode by emphasizing utter dependency of both life and death. Taking this tendency to engage the ‘desiring-machine’ as mechanism in architecture, conditions have been created for connecting Deleuze & Guattari’s conception of art gesture and Kiesler’s interpretation of Duchamp’s work. Analysing the common notions they use, such as ‘art gesture’, ‘desire’ and ‘assemblage’, I will examine how Duchamp’s understanding of architecture as the ‘mechanism of desire’ (described by Kiesler) can be related to Deleuze’s affirmative vitalism - a “so-called search for happiness” (to which Deleuze refers) - as ‘mechanism of pain’.

To consider architecture as an agent of desire we ask: what is in Deleuze’s ‘mechanism of pain’ that makes it relevant for the demystification of architectural ‘formlessness’ at the expense of stimulating the irrational desire of techno sphere? Could negative connotations of this mechanism be overcome by identifying machine désirante that operate on the threshold of pain? First indication may be Duchamp’s sensory stimulative lesson given more than 100 years ago and betrayed by Deleuze’s work on ‘anti-humanism’ (destruction of the idea of man) in the name of a more general affirmation of the force of ‘becoming’. Duchamp’s Large Glass is a multiplied shapeless life form projected on a thin film - transparent glass, which alludes to vanity and the absence of being. It could be recognized today in the entropic appearances of life saturated with information and the corresponding context of the two-dimensional techno-sphere. Kiesler’s pseudo-technological reflections, his second reworking of the Large Glass through photographic collage, borrowing images from research into glass technologies, clearly portray visual themes that offer a passage to a different world: framing and drawing on glass, shooting and breakage of glass panes, and a ‘Bride’ figure above to draw attention of the lonely ‘Bachelors’ below. In his interpretations any possible loss, that the glass may allude to, is replaced by an insight that expands the theme of desire. In other words, Duchamp’s installation reveals a space of tension, the agony with schizo prefix, by establishing a clear link between his approach to the ‘mechanism of desire’ and the way complex spatial constructs are arranged from the constituent parts of optical machines. Informed by mathematic procedures and a 4-dimensional geometry, Large Glass has often been used to describe the complexity of relations within the
metropolis: to detect schizophrenia in the urban mechanisms that are exhausted in coupling all kinds of processes like machines. It is exactly the schizo lens through which Deleuze observes the world that prevents us from deciphering the vital mechanism of architectural production. In turn, it hallucinates the satisfaction of vitality and this hallucination determines the creation of a desiring subject and a new substitute object. In opposition to Kiesler’s terminology that clearly alludes to id, ego and superego as the three elements of Sigmund Freud’s structural model of psyche, Marc Cousins claims that “desire is not a metaphysical category in psychoanalytic thinking but one arising from the failure of existence.” Similarly, the erotic-dynamic operation of thoughts in the agony of reading what is before our eyes operates like unraveling a psychological space in the structure of the artwork, but equally to reveal the possibilities of life as a critical philosophical issue in human existence. It is this threshold of pain within which desire moves.

keywords
machine, desire, architecture, form, life
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With a Ph.D., M.Arch.Eng., is a theorist, practicing architect, researcher and a painter. She served as a Visiting Professor, Chair of Creative Architecture at University of Oklahoma, Institute of Form Theory and History in Oslo, Institute of Urbanism and Landscape in Oslo, University of Belgrade. She lectures internationally at conferences in modern aesthetics of architecture, film-philosophy, art history, media, drawing, performance, visual culture: in Europe, UK, North America and Canada. Katarina has published her research widely in international journals (Web of Science) and won numerous awards for her architecture design and urban design competitions. She is a full author of the Preliminary Architectural Design of the National project supported by the Government Republic of Serbia. She won the Belgrade Chamber of Commerce Award for Best Master Thesis defended at Universities in Serbia in all disciplines. Katarina has published two monographs and an upcoming book chapter and several journal articles with Intellect UK.
With its juxtaposed architectural elements, intersecting wall configurations and bright colors these buildings by Shusaku Arakawa and Madeleine Gins (hereafter A+G) overturn the concept of architecture to date. Free of established design rules their architectural pataphysics even suggest to defy gravity. As artist-and-philosopher turned architects A+G creatively make mistakes on purpose by hanging doors on the ceiling, tilting floors and randomly place columns as to create an indoor forest. The experiences presented in this paper are a report from a ‘Reversed destiny’ as experienced in A+G’s architecture during a residency at the Bioscleave House (Life Span Extending Villa) in East Hampton, New York in May 2018 and a residency at the Reversible Destiny Lofts Mitaka – in memory of Hellen Keller in Mitaka, Toyko in October 2018.

#treat each room as if it were a close relative or friend who wishes to learn how not to die.

What for A+G counts, rather than proposing ‘innovative architecture’, is architecture as way to innovate and change the world. A + G see architecture not merely as passive, shelter providing or monumental structures, but as active participant in life and death matters. They believe that when fully associating yourself with your architectural surrounds it is possible to outlive your death sentences. Therefore, moving beyond an ideology of time, A+G construct an architectural life in which dying is illegal.

#. Invent a least ten ways to use the shaped volumes whose colors suffuse the atmosphere to heal whatever you need to have been healed in you.

To further their philosophical implication’s and its impact on human life they designed architecture as so called procedural tools for daily research. Their system of design is based on observational, transformational and reconfigurative procedurals to construct life, rather than to design architecture. Procedural
architecture offers ‘process-oriented speculations to the way our moving bodies and environment mutually form and extend each other. A functional tool, whether it be a hammer, a telephone, or a telescope, extends the senses, but procedural architecture examines and reorders the sensorium’ (Gins, M. and Arakawa Shūsaku (2002) Architectural body).

As architects we can ask ourselves if we want to live in an apartment that can help you to understand the nature and extent of interactions between us and the universe and if we actually want to learn ‘how not to die’. Moreover, an architectural intervention coming together with a philosophical text and instructions for use leaves the critic with some questions. Why not just read the book? Is the design of this architectural badinage not good enough to stand by itself (and vice versa)?

#.In addition to treating your floor as keyboard from time to time enter into conversation with it (For example: ‘Hello’; ‘What is going on with you?’ ‘I wonder what you are like over there in that remote corner’ “what would be another way for you to be a floor’?)

The work of A+G provides a form of tacit knowledge that is, especially in contemporary urban landscape, an utmost valuable learning school for every architect. Also when you have no intent to change the world or propose a reversed destiny. Activating an architectural procedural means to make tacit knowledge explicit. The double operation of thinking and (counter) experiencing makes it possible to understand what situated body awareness means conceptually as well as experientially. New meaning and actual habitual changes emerge from which surprisingly different experiences inevitably form.

#.Interact with the floors so as to produce sunlight.

Dying does not come in just two types. Recalling the open call of this symposium: ‘A subject can nest into its idiocy and make itself more and more rigid and progressively smaller and a subject can let itself dissipate until its disappearance.’ It can also dissipate until its disappearance by becoming more rigid, become more rigid through disappearance and freely and creatively come up with multiple other ways to (live) and die. A+G both in their architecture and their live have left us many
examples, procedurals and instructions to do so. Moving from an ideology of Time to A+G’s Materialism of Space means dying is reversible. Though we cannot converse with A+G anymore as we are used to, let's keep on talking to and moving with their architectural surrounds beyond precast destinies.

**keywords**
procedural architecture, reversed destiny, materialism of space, Arakawa and Gins, situated body awareness
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necrotic urbanism: a critique of violence and resistance

Ayesha Sarfraz & Arsalan Rafique
Cofounders and Principal Investigators of The Urban Research Frontier (TURF)

The beginning of the twenty-first century has been shadowed by unanticipated events that have cast doubt on certain normative certainties that were acquired in the last century. Agamben claims that the current state in which we live now is no more a disciplinary state but what Deleuze called: état de contrôle, control state. What it demands is not order and the execution of discipline, but rather to manage and control subjects and their movement. Amidst what could be termed as a continuous state of exception, where valid law is suspended to accommodate control, authorities exercise emergency powers through processes of security that contribute to the subjectification of the corporeal body. Reacting to such mechanisms of power are users enacting resistance to their subjectification embedded within the everyday lived experience. The thresholds where the state and these micro-resistances engage, such as airports requiring biometric identification, guarded entrances to gated communities et al, are broader symptoms of the city becoming contested biopolitical territory.

In Pakistan, which is ranked number five on the list of countries most affected by terrorism in 2018 by the Global Terrorism Index, the public realm is rigorously contracting putting every user under scrutiny. With attacks and violence being experienced at a faster rate than legislation can process, the experience of securitization varies from improvisational and mobile to fortress-like over a single urban field. Boundary making is further understood as a dialectical process dispensing xenophobia and homogenization contributing to the normalization of fragmentation which is evident when temporary checkpoints (d) evolve into permanent walls. These boundaries confirm how spatial typologies and social tensions contribute to shape an urbanism of exception, curated under the influence of biopolitical practice. A range of case studies from multiple societal aggregates in Pakistani cities reveal both stark and subtle enactments of the states of exception by various actors. State-sanctioned
military cantonments, which function as elite housing and operational headquarters for the army have become retrofitted gated communities in the recent past with concentric layers of security including surveillance, checkpoints and barricaded thoroughfares. Mutations of such typologies are evident as emerging technologies of control are self-deployed by users in neighborhoods without state approval. Powerful illustrations of this are witnessed at compounds such as “Nine-Zero” in Karachi - a self securitised territory for the political party, Muttahida Qaumi Movement, spanning across multiple neighborhoods with independent security, education and healthcare. Marriabadi in Quetta is another example where the persecuted Hazara minority resides, with young volunteers arming entrances and exits.

The state of securitisation in Pakistan can be categorised as paradoxical at best: visually significant security measures allow the fabrication of a sense of safety yet these conspicuous spaces highlight themselves as a target, becoming frequent sites of attack. Furthermore, if the states of exception and societies of control are meant to sanctify politically qualified life, they also relegate the remaining city to the realm of what Agamben refers to as bare life. The clear demarcation of territory to preserve qualified life in turn creates extraterritorial space and flexible zones of indistinction absorbing an increasing demographic into the realm of lawless violence. As this state of insecurity becomes permanent, ‘safety’ as a product becomes an inflated commodity. The rise of gated communities is in fact another symptom of internment as an overriding force in cities, where citizens readily accept what Deleuze called apparent acquittal (between incarcerations) and the limitless postponements of the societies of control.

This work will analyse emerging conditions in Pakistani cities where, far from being a linear or gradual sequence or acting as two dimensional borders, spaces of exception in the city politicise the right to space through complex biopolitical constructs. Through the analysis of distinct conditions across various metropolitan areas of Pakistan, examples of such organisations of space will be investigated with respect to the Deleuzian ideation of control and society. Additionally, it will be argued that the propagation of ‘barricade urbanism’ as a paradigmatic form of biopolitics, under the pretense of safety, is not dissimilar to radical thanatopolitics directed towards the city in the form
of urbicide and terrorist attacks. Furthermore, this context will feed into an interpretative framework, which intends to illustrate urban border mechanics defined by principles of a constant state of exception: a series of tensions that materialize in cities via a comprehensive security apparatus. This framework can further contribute to debate an urbanism of exception, not as a specific condition, but as a process that depicts how cities are recreating themselves through reconfigurations and reorganizations that include multiple perceptions and agencies. In doing so, the work aims to contribute to the discourse of cities, violence and urban borders, where the meaning lies both on the lines of signification created from exception and in the spaces in between.

**keywords**

biopolitics, state of exception, urbanism, security, Pakistan

**bioblurb**

Ayesha Sarfraz is a co-founder of the urban research unit TURF and principal architect of the Lahore based studio, MAS Architects. She previously worked as an architect at the Office for Conservation and Community Outreach and has taught at the National College of Arts and COMSATS University. Ms. Sarfraz was a Fulbright scholar and has a Masters of Architecture from the University of Michigan, Ann Arbor. She earned her undergraduate degree in architecture with a distinction from the National College of Arts in Lahore.

Arsalan Rafique is a co-founder of the urban research unit, TURF and creative director of the game development studio, Cloudcade in Lahore. In the past he has worked at Anti-Statics in Beijing as an architect and taught at National College of Arts and COMSATS University in Lahore. Mr. Rafique earned his Bachelors of Architecture with a distinction from the National College of Arts in Lahore. He attended graduate school at Cornell University’s College of Art, Architecture and Planning on a Fulbright Scholarship and was awarded the Outstanding Performance in Architecture.
sentio ergo sum vivus: aesthetic coma, the architectural cyborg and Descartes’s errors after Deleuze and Democritus

Liana Psarologaki
University of Suffolk

This is a debate on life as sensed condition (aestheton) challenged by contemporary embodied and subjectified experience in and of architectural space and place. Matter and mind of subject and architecture in a mutual becoming of lived experience will receive a critical interrogation on ontological terms. The somatisation of architecture and the pathology of aesthesis in the time of information dynasty (the now) are examined against the sense of architecture as question of life and philosophy as question of death (suicide), in reference to the myth of Sisyphus and perseverance against futility. The living condition as we know it will be scrutinised against its constitutional elements an in relation to the primary condition of sensing and making sense. The questions raised are underpinned by post-structuralism stances of empiricism in architecture and create a philosophy of architectural experience considering the latter as lived event from an ontological and almost epistemological perspective transcending the phenomenological.

The debate that concerns the lived, non-lived and un-lived experience of architecture (as well as any potentiality of gradients in between the three) is addressed implicitly in reference to recent neuroscientific approaches. The latter take a particular focus on notions of neuroexistentialism through the lens of fiction and questions of inadvertent reliance to the sensorium as the sensory package through which the world is actively rendered through life and therefore constituting the subject. These ideas are brought forward and interrogated via and index of three key critical observations with no hierarchical distinction. The first observation creates the basis for the debate to unfold and concerns the current tendency of people to become spatially zombified by the constant use of technological aids of communication. These have progressively become and are sensorily acknowledged as necessary bodily extensions to which we cling to live at the same time missing the potentially lived. They constitute a phantom limb we search for by habit and reliance
once we lose them. The self-consumption of and by such, I argue, is and accounts for aesthetic coma that can define and shape experience, and which brings us to the second observation: that subject (sensorium and I) becomes cyborg; the latter reflecting on the etymological root for automatic and taken for granted.

A cyborg as such (to follow Dumit) presents sensorium and self in parametric capacity; one change – the other changes, and does not distinguish between sense, cognition and affect. In the context of architecture as thought and practiced place, Rendell’s critical spatial practice has the capacity to invert the aesthetic coma and zombification of the individual (the un-lived experience), who has the capacity and potentiality to become one with the world in a heightened condition of lived experience. This I define as sensoma; the architectural cyborg. The third critical observation acts as umbrella for the previous two. It sees the lived experience as a haecceity (a thing) in architectural chronotope (time and place following Bakhtin and Bergson). I see the prioritisation of sensation in such over thought to define the lived condition. I will synthesise the philosophy of time by Deleuze and Guattari as noted by Ronald Bogue with principles of quantum physics and approaches of art history with regards to the psychology of architecture to contextualise the ontology of lived experiences around flesh and atmosphere (sense, cognition and affect). The latter is seen and examined as condition generated by granular matter -after the model on matter by Democritus- and therefore of cosmic as well as molecular implication.

The subjectivated living condition is defined by its capacity to become fundamentally sensational and therefore empirical event. Critical spatial practice in this context is the mediating agent that can intensify the lived, in favour of aesthesis and therefore bring the subject (sensorium and self) to a condition of active sensory input and output. More emphasis must be put towards what the experience consists of and less on what it accounts for with an in parallel reflective examination of critical spatial practice and evaluation of poesis and praxis. Critical approaches by Deleuze, Guattari, Bogue align with theoretical scientific stances by Carlo Rovelli, Steven Shaviro and Antonio Damasio, in particular when the latter explore spatial models of quantum gravity and issues of primacy in aesthesis respectively. I am attempting through the three key
observations outlined and the contexts and concepts underpinned to understand and critically discuss the minimum and essential matter of and for aesthesis, defined in neuro-aesthetic terms as 'qualia', and its contribution to subjectivated embodiment as active sensomatisation in architecture in the era of distraction and aesthetic oversaturation.
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As the globally-predominant human habitat, the urban built environment has an essential effect on life. Over the past decades, the built environment has thus begun to be greatly reconceptualized through various posthuman, post-ecosystemic, new materialist, material-discursive approaches that explored the socio-spatial, technological, cognitive, relational and affective effects of how material arrangements, such as architecture, have on our lives. Architecture is intricately intertwined not with processes of easing and facilitating (human) life, but also the management of dynamic processes involving both living and non-living matters. With Stiegler, we can say that architecture is “life by means other than life”; or more precisely, perhaps: architecture shapes living matters, by means of non-living matters.

The paper started with the intention of offering a literature survey on discourses on ‘architectures of life and death’ in a sense transgresses simple symbolic approaches to spaces or buildings for life or death, or questions of ‘living’ as simply ‘dwelling’; focussing more on works contributing to a genealogical understanding of architecture’s present predicament as a middle ground between life and death; between organic and non-organic matter flows and systems. Having said, so, it was not trying to deal with contemporary hot topics of ‘organic architecture’, or building ‘life-cycles’. Rather the aim was to map the multiple current efforts to understand architecture as a practice uniquely engaged in the purposeful transformation of our material world, that while having shaped our present forms of inhabiting the world, is also a larger factor in the ongoing endangerment and extinction of many traditional, minor, forms of living and non-living entities. As such, my aim was to provide not simply an overview of works that have helped foster such a transformative ethics (or ethico-aesthetics) of architecture’s material agency upon our existential territories; rather I hope to provide a ‘cartography’ that allows to navigate these discourses. In this aim, I hope to facilitate a dense discussion by means of a
complementary diagram that maps these works and related streams.

The basic inspiration for this diagram is taken from Charles Jencks’s famous illustration of the evolving stylistic streams in 20th-century architecture. But more than illustrating co-evolving parallel streams, I wanted to also render visible the various converging and bifurcating lines of thinking as to how architectural arrangements influence, frame, or style various modes of existence and forms of living and dying. Here, my diagram shows a ‘stratigraphy’, or an ‘epigenetic landscape’ if you will, of discourses that have unfolded from Deleuze’s and Guattari’s and Foucault’s thoroughgoing reframing of the agency of matter on processes constituting life. What we see therein is a true proliferation of discourses; proving that —“when two bodies enter into a relation they always produce something new”. In architecture, the post-Foucauldian and post-Deleuzo-Guattarian streams were initially quite separated in their topical inspiration (dispositifs/heterotopias/spaces of enclosure/curing machines/biopolitics, or assemblages/folds/smooth space/war machines/nomadology), and only converged incrementally; mainly first via feminist, queer discourses on the body; and then genealogically on the question of power, and the various historical formations, becomings, or figurations; as an understanding that recently urges us to arrive at an ethological, eco-systemic, assemblage-theoretic, nor ‘new materialist’ conception of material-discursive practices. In what follows, I will trace some of these discursive layers, streams or enclaves, in their different approaches and focal concepts, as contributive readings, relevant for the ongoing theoretical repositioning of architecture as a (posthuman?) technique of existence.
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fun machines: rethinking mess and method in architecture

Dulmini Perera
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Crisis sites are not products but processes where the complex negotiation between living and dying of places, objects, institutions, materials, and people are experienced at its strongest. Whether we consider crisis in its more explicit forms such as environmental, refugee, etc., or as an implicit reality in the daily muddles within the practice of architecture—a crisis is “an event”—where wicked, malignant, vicious, aggressive properties of systems are most apparent. The wickedness of the design problems is an invitation for designers to come to grips with the complexity of working with living systems that are assembled, or a logic of life that is post-human. Regardless of the growing practices and discourses of new materialism, post-humanism, ecologism that point towards ways of dealing with posthuman complexity—within the “language of systems” (the operational language of the policy makers, politicians, civil servants, architects, stakeholders of crisis systems)—there is still an implicit tendency to resort to “systematic” operations of taming wicked problems. The “taming” or by extension the “making sense of” in this discourse is often linked with clarity, accuracy, morality, of working with information structures to frame the complexity of the problem. In doing so, it allows the designer to get rid of the mess or what appears as nonsense (the components that cannot be made sense of such as the contradictions, paradoxes) in the system. What if instead of trying to make sense one were to take nonsense seriously?

In this session, I will briefly introduce Fun Machines, an experimental construct that enables systems designers to work better with the nonsensical and thereby rethink the relation between the methods machine and sense making. The Fun machine as the name suggests is a play on the serious expectations of methods as machines tuned to provide optimized right answers. The project uses the opening towards mess within systems discourses mainly in the work of planner Horst Rittel as a departure point. It is further informed by Gregory Bateson and William Fry’s
collaborative work on paradox, humor (fun making) in the emergence of new systems and Deleuzian discourse on the genesis of sense. The project explores how the structure of wicked problems and its unwitting relation to the structure of humor can be used to develop “play frames” that allow working with crisis sites in alternative ways. One may not be able to work with the paradoxes/contradictions as it is, but when turned in to a fun machine, it can be handled, grasped, operated on, and handed over to others.

More specifically using the observations from our pilot projects Fun Machines (2018), Something Stinky This Way Comes (2018), Architectural Clowning (2019), Institute of Utmost Environmental Justice (2019) conducted with designers who are in fact middle managers or entangled agents in various real-world crisis sites I will discuss 3 potentially interesting ways in which Fun Machines have allowed to develop more transversal modes of operations. Namely the following: How fun machines can allow one to work with the “scrambled” nature of the system at hand without resorting to the morality of methods or placing the system within normative categorical frames; How fun machines help “framing flows not taming flows” or in other words aid in mapping open systems; How “architectural clowning” enables affective encounters and empower agents who experience a lack of freedom within professional modes of operation. Claire Colebrook makes the distinction between systematic and systemic modes of poractice. Concerning the latter, she states: “In the beginning, there is a system. It is through the system that we think. One has to understand the emergence of the system.” (Colebrook, Deleuze and the Meaning of Life, 2010) To understand emergence is to understand the mess. Next time when confronted with a mess, we should perhaps ask the question--shall we make a fun machine out of this mess?
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city and the crypt-space

Emine Gorgul
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In the last decades, we have noticed a significant increase in the debates that focus on the human psyche and its transformations due to the plethora of the social traumas afflicting it. Besides affecting individuals, social traumas transform the psyche of cities and their citizens, creating and recreating entire cityscapes capable of turning into triggering machines for future traumatic encounters.

Trauma occurs as an “extraordinary event” which enfolds unexpected transformative characters that “create disruption and ‘radical change’…within a short period of time’” (Neal, 1998) (Alexander, 2004: 3). Whereas trauma also enfolds the capacity to change the future identity of individuals and societies in fundamental and irrevocable ways. On the other hand, at each moment of the traumatic experience, there emerge two diverse but intertwined agencies of memories that intensify the trauma, operating as they do both on the body and the space: the foreign body and the liminal space--or the crypt space--in Freudian terms. While the agency of foreign body paves the way to the processes of becoming molecular, on the other hand the liminal space or the crypt space controls the displacement and detachment and emerges as a “pocket" folded in the spatiality of the individual psyche. The crypt-space exists as a “no-place or a non-place” in the topography of the mind, and leading the individual at the end to the uncanny feeling of the trauma (Wigley, 1993: 179). The invisible spatiality of displacement and isolation, responsible for the discontinuity and the mental labyrinth, where the psyche is trapped and confined, being paralyzed and deceased.

Being trapped generates the feeling of imprisonment and the perception of the absolute interiority of the enclosure. The mechanisms of confinement ensure the immobility of the detainee in the controlled environments and the escape-proof spaces of repression. Similar to Piranesi’s depictions of dark and hostile vaulted crypt-like spaces of no-man’s-land that evokes the uncanny (Vidler, 1992: 40), they also cause timelessness to emerge as the prevalent perception, with the viewer’s confined gaze appearing frozen inside the dark interiors. Imperceptibility, immobility
and timelessness constitute the essential characteristics of confining labyrinthine enclosures where oppression prevails. In these spaces of oppression, subjugation and the rise of submissive models of authoritarian spaces is inevitable (Stoner, 2012: 9,19). The latter emerge as striated spaces of molar structures where everything is defined, classified and homogenized (Deleuze and Guattari, 1987). Like Piranesi’s depictions, Kafka’s labyrinth refers to an “incomprehensible and timeless” milieu, where the static characteristics of the space lead to a motionless system of detention (Hahn, 2013: 83). Timelessness and immobility prevent the incarcerated from tracing and actualizing lines of escape. The archetypical labyrinth becomes a psychoanalytic symbol of the repression of the captive (Hahn, 2013: 13). Besides, Borges too tells stories about confinement and impenetrable environments, (Hahn, 2013: 55-56), as he discusses the detainee’s condition and their psyche in the context of the contemporary socio-political life in the modern-city, power relations and sovereignty (Hahn, 2013: 55-17).

Is it possible to be confined within a space that has no physical borders, and if so, how? How does a city become a mechanism of confinement, or in the Deleuzian sense, an apparatus of capture? In other words, how could it become an agent for the generation of policies for confining its citizens by means of collective traumas? And do memories only exist in individuals, as internalized traumatic processes? Does the crypt space only emerge in the topography of the mind of the individual, or could the cityscape become itself a crypt space? If so, how could trauma be ‘cypted’ in the city-space? How does the space carry traumatic capacities, and what is the role of spatiality in the production of traumatic processes?

Being located between East and West, Istanbul has always been a restless city with a rebellious soul and has witnessed endless struggles for power, revolts, breakthroughs and political conflicts. Unfailingly, all these struggles have contributed to the stratification of social traumas that have been carved into the memories of the city and its citizens. Indeed, the memories of some major breaking points still remain fresh in the minds of the citizens. These events involving extensive violence created numerous unrepairable traumas, generated spatio-temporal discontinuities and displacements in the cityscape, and also widened the cracks in the internal geographies of human psyches.
In this respect, departing from the relationship between human psyche and space this paper aims to unfold the transition of city-scape into a crypt-space or non-place by revisiting few maladaptive encounters that resulted in catatonic stages of people inside the city. In the sequence, I address the feeling and spatiality of confinement; the notion of trauma, the diverse capacities of memory; the traumatic capacities of space; as well as the spatio-temporal aspects of the creation of traumatized societies. In sum, this paper attempts to show how urban space transfigures itself into the collective spaces of psychic transformations, under the determinations of the contemporary politics for the creation of traumatized societies.
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diagram for tectonic thinking, 
a non-dualistic approach to tectonic expression 
in architecture

Udo Garritzmann
Aarhus School of Architecture

Tektōns and architektōnes

In The Fall of the Tektōn and The Rise of the Architect: On The Greek Origins of Architectural Craftsmanship Jonas Holst (2017) has elucidated the origins of the term tectonics and its relation to architecture. The term traces back to originally carpentry, but also to the other primordial crafts in the archaic period of Greek antiquity—all crafts were termed tektōns. The craftsmen or tektōnes with the highest skills did not only have knowledge about material, tools, procedures and the capacity to apply this knowledge, they were also aware of the larger context in which it was employed. The tektōnes were considered to reflect in their work the harmonious laws of the universe and were valued members of society whose order they helped to shape.

In the classical period of Greek antiquity, three to four centuries later, a shift occurs. While the tektōnes in general were assigned a lower rank in the societal hierarchy, it is the architektōnes who are now endowed with the all-encompassing knowledge, wisdom and status previously held by the highest skilled tektōnes. In the practical execution of the built work, however, the architektōnes are no longer involved as exemplified by the following assertion from a Socratic dialogue: ‘Every architect, too, is a ruler of workmen, not a workman himself.’ (Plato, The Statesman 259 e, quoted in Holst 2017)

In this short quote two dualism are installed. Firstly, the dualism between mental knowledge and manual labor; secondly, the dualism between those who are commanding and those who are commanded. To some extent Aristotle’s dualism between form and matter (aka hylomorphism) is preceded here. It implies, though unconsciously, a social stratification of the master commanding the slave to execute the technical operation of e.g. molding bricks (see: Deleuze and Guattari 1988, 408-409 incl. footnote 92 refering to Simondon).
It took until the middle of the 19th century that tectonics was introduced as an independent term in architectural theory, in the German speaking countries most importantly with Karl Bötticher’s *Die Tektonik der Hellenen* (1844). In his magnum opus Bötticher rationally expounds the ornamentation of ancient Greek architecture. Its idealist referent are the structural forces working in the core-forms, the necessary building elements of the loadbearing structure. The core-forms are dressed with art-forms, whose purpose it is to make the loadbearing forces perceptible, as well as to articulate the part to part and part to whole relations of the building element. Though Bötticher strongly argues that the architecture of Greek temples originated in pure stone construction, the actual materiality of both core-form and art-form are subordinate in his argument. While he reduces tectonics to the representation of loadbearing forces, the agency of material, tools, and procedures, as well as the associated crafts that bring core- and art-forms into being remain underexposed. The tectonics of loadbearing are singled out as the essence of architecture and turned into a moral cause.

In the 20th century the term tectonics disappeared from the dominant architectural discourse. Modernist architecture had developed a preference for ‘undressed’ volumes and ‘naked’ core-forms. It dismissed the style envelopes of the 19th century in whose context tectonics had been discussed. The term tectonics was revitalized since the 1980ies perhaps best-known with the writings of the British architectural historian/theorist Kenneth Frampton (1983; 1990; 1995). Intended as an antidote to the various guises of then current postmodern and deconstructivist architecture it proposes with tectonics a return to an “autonomous” aspect of the discipline, a concern with making, with construction, and with architecture as a craft. As it identifies tectonics with the poetic expression of a building’s loadbearing structure, it singles out carpentry as the prime craft of reference. Today this account of tectonics still represents the dominant discourse on the topic. In his effort to re-establish a craft-oriented concern in architecture Frampton engenders another dualism—tectonic
expression is associated with good architecture and opposed to scenographic or atectonic expression as implicitly bad. It adheres to an idealist essentialism—the essence of architecture resides in the expression of how construction deals with gravitational forces. In its discourse this position comingles descriptive uses of the term tectonics with assertions that imply a value judgement. Consequentially, it turns its own position into an exclusionary normative criterion. It judges architecture as morally good if it expresses the allegedly autonomous tectonics (of loadbearing), which are implicitly brought into position against the evils of consumer society / late capitalism. Forms of expression that do not comply with the preconceived loadbearing paradigm are relegated to a domain other than architecture. This also happens if expressions can be related to one of the other ancient crafts and their associated formal principles (e.g. ceramics or textile).

Diagram for Tectonic Thinking, an ethical position

As an alternative to the loadbearing tectonics I propose a broadened and differentiated understanding of tectonics which distinguishes a multitude of different kinds of tectonics without prioritizing any of them beforehand. This approach is descriptive and analytic, and conceives of tectonics in a non-dualistic and non-idealist way. It is critical of the loadbearing position, but it is also affirmative and inclusionary—it offers an alternative and includes loadbearing expressions as well. Such a broadening of tectonic thinking in a non-dualistic and non-idealist way contributes to an architecture that wishes to be able to produce the possibilities for multitudinous ways to live and to die. It affords multitudinous ways of becoming, a potential infinity of experience that also includes the possibility of a-tectonic expressions. Rather than autonomous, tectonic expressions should be considered as embedded in relational bonds to a multiplicity of others (human and non-human) whose well-being affects one’s own (see: Braidotti 2018).

To commence with a non-dualistic approach to tectonics, I have used the following definition of the term, which is freely adopted from the architect Hans Kollhoff (1993):
The term tectonics considers the seemingly antagonistic notions *construction* and *appearance*, *technique* and *aesthetics*, or *firmitas* and *venustas* as complementary.

With this definition in mind I have considered three constructional aspects—each with two contrasting, yet non-dualizing poles—that differentiate the field of technical-aesthetical expressions in architecture:

- *loadbearing construction* with the poles *loadbearing* and *non-loadbearing*
- *conjoining construction* with the poles *solid* and *filigree*
- *constructional expression* with the poles *tectonic* and *a-tectonic*

These constructional aspects should be understood as forces or vectors which, when related to each other, give a limited structure to a space of possibilities which holds infinite tectonic expressions; they form a Diagram for Tectonic Thinking.

In my poster presentation I will show a graphic version of this Diagram for Tectonic Thinking.
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an index of affective mechanisms_ deciphering the pre-subjective power of spatial assemblages
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This paper aims at establishing an index of design mechanisms - immanent in spatial objects - based on their capacity to affect and be affected. While spatial objects (design objects, buildings, urban configurations, etc.) are regarded as systems composed of interacting parts, within the premises of assemblage theory, their affective capacity has not yet been mapped or sufficiently explored. This capacity lies in an excess, a latent potentiality they contain, not transcendental but immanent in their pre-subjective aesthetic power. Spatial structures are theorized to be assemblages composed of heterogeneous parts able to enter into relationships with one another. And since all assemblages are parts of larger assemblages, their components' ability to engage is contingent. We thus point to this ability in order to unfold the mechanisms inherent in spatial assemblages that allow their constituent parts to perpetually enter into new assemblages.

To map spatial assemblage's affective ability, design objects are analyzed in two axes. The first axis focuses on the relations that their material and expressive components develop in order to enter the assemblages. The second axis records the processes known as a-signifying signs or a-signs, which are the triggering mechanisms that stabilize or destabilize (territorialize/deterritorialize) the assemblage and thus allow its parts to assemble anew. They are not entering the linguistic level and are expressed in terms of intensity fields: modulations, movements, speeds, rhythms, spasms, etc. They belong to a molecular level where they operate in the pre-subjective world of perceptions, affects, drives, and emotions. In this framework, a-signs are introduced intensities that transform the object beyond meaning, beyond fixed or known cognitive procedures. As a-signs cannot be isolated from matter, we thus point to affects as the result of the a-signs' capacity to trigger the territorialization or deterritorialization of spatial assemblages.
The affective mechanisms' index is composed of approximately 100 a-signs, documented via the analysis of numerous contemporary spatial objects of various scales, including works of art and installations. The heuristic mining techniques that were used in order to extract the mechanisms and create this index include - but are not limited to - the analysis of their descriptive texts, critiques and formal analysis. Thus, a table for each a-sign is created where the list of affects is noted, along with the paradigms that employ the a-sign, and an indicative photo. Within the index, the a-signs mechanisms are categorized in terms of their pre-subjective aesthetic power to affect and to be affected with reference to the general categories of form, structure, and surface. At the same time, each mechanism is correlated with the morphogenetic processes that generated it pointing them as its four zones of material contingency: exteriority, cohesion, integration, and differentiation. In this framework, the index points to specific mechanisms able to define extrovert or introvert spatial components, such as Affiliations, Borrowed Landscapes, Faciality, etc. But also mechanisms that refer to the processes of integration or demarcation such as Box-Within-Box, Dematerialization, Zero Degree, etc. Accordingly, mechanisms closely related to the intensity zone of cohesion like Applied Sign, Disorientation, and Transversality, etc. Finally, within the dimension of differentiation, one can find mechanisms that either point to homogeneity or heterogeneity such as Black Stuff, Clear Structure Strategy, Diagrid, etc. After the end of this process, A-signs will have been categorized in terms of their aesthetic power to affect and to be affected, themselves material techniques that point directly to the design objects' affective capacity.

Through the index, each a-sign is now connected to specific affects, the material elements it has the capacity to intensify - or destabilize -, and finally the techniques it uses to that end. Each a-sign is thus connected - within the premises of this index - with a specific list of affects it triggers and which thoroughly defines it. And vice versa, the same affect is interrelated to the different a-signs that can trigger it. That said we believe that through these a-signs mechanisms - and their resulting affects - we are able to observe design objects as they are allowed to lie in a perpetual state of becoming. While spatial structures are usually considered to be singular and closed, the index deciphers their capacity of enunciating a multiplicity of
formal variations while at the same time establishing a way to measure their continuous transformation. Through the affective mechanisms' index, we are now able to analyze and guide the design objects’ final form while at the same time establishing the means to measure its material contingency.
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