Petar Bojanić, Snežana Vesnić

Positio(n)

(Dis)Connection

The second half of the twentieth century has seen dramatic changes in the discipline of architecture: the appearance of myriad new concepts, conceptions, and a sudden expansion of architectural curricula in schools of architecture. Architects and students of architecture are now expected to write, meticulously explain and justify what they do and are doing, publish academic texts about their activities, analyze the work of other architects, produce complicated and extensive doctoral theses. All this has created in architecture an overt need for theory or philosophy, which can be termed the turn to theory or philosophy in architecture. The task of the philosopher is threefold: to awaken the philosopher in the architect (or perhaps recognize the architect-philosopher), who will then be better capable to thematize their own or joint work with other architects; to produce, construct, and deconstruct, with other architects, a system (a register, order, protocol) of concepts that will in the future be architectonic, such as opening the possibility of an eminently architectural language or terminology; finally, to discipline or institutionalize architecture, to assist in the essential project of autonomy of the architect and architecture.

The task of the architect is to always guard the distance, that is, the conjunction AND or AND *(&; \cdot; ^) between architecture and philosophy as the interval of the third or third space that gives birth to novelty. Further, their task is to examine the geometry of connections and relations, which means to bind the two fields, to reprogram the AND, to be the coordinator between the two – to preserve the uncertainty of the coordinating conjunction.*

1. By choosing the verb χωρεῖν (go forward, advance, move, be in motion, grow), and not the noun, χώρα, we wished to emphasize the importance of the act and activity in the construction of social reality, including of course the architectural reality around us.

2. 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).

3. As positio *AND is a conjecture of position, a phase in the advancement towards non-position, the letting down (dejection) of position, which always vanishes in the new.*

4. Architecture AND Philosophy (AND is really a moving AND or AND) 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.

5. AND is infinite. That which inclines never falls and is never erased in drawing closer and equating architecture ^ philosophy, text ^ object.

Χωρεῖν

Χώρα [*khōra*] is the word in the *Timaeus* (48a–53b) with which Plato introduces the reader into the exemplary world of aporias, where thought encounters a solution, often of the third kind (*τρίτον γένος*), on the border between two contradictions, in an area that remains stubbornly everyone's and no one's, escaping the logic of binarity usually so useful to philosophical argumentation. The Demiurge (so Plato tells us through *Timaeus*) created: the world of ideal models (*παραδείγματα*), which alone is intelligible; but also another, equivalent world of images (*εἰκόνες*), which remains sensory. One set of created beings is intelligible and ordered, while the other set is ruled by *ἀνάγκη* (necessity, force, constraint). It would seem that *χώρα*, like a parathesis, is written into the context of the *Timaeus* cosmology to preserve the coherence of the *λόγος*, speech, in which Plato has already elaborated all the oppositions between the intelligible and sensory world. *Χώρα* designates everything left in the shadow (which is always left in the shadow), present without presenting itself, which in Plato's words is "a kind invisible and formless" (*ἀνόρατον εἶδός τι καὶ ἄμορφον*; Pl. *Tim.* 51a) (beyond all understanding and order), that which never appears in the light of day, that which forces philosophers to acknowledge the existence of the third kind, as impossible to prove as it is to disprove. Aristotle radically reorients the interpretation of Plato's *χώρα*. Many centuries later, Aristotle's swerve allows the development of the idea in Jacques Derrida and Peter Eisenman that the

concept, which is not really concept (χώρα), can be presented, rendered visible, and indeed deformed.

The etymology of the word χώρα is entirely uncertain. Translated literally, χώρα is open space (place, spot, field, land, country, landed estate, country town, position) or setting (space *or* room in which a thing is, defined as partly occupied space). Our insistence on the verb χωρεῖν [*khōrein*] is a defense of the eternal motion that preserves the gap or "space between," which is really always infinite. Χωρεῖν is an act or set of acts that defend that which is between two or more entities or attributes. The movement of the between or space of the in between itself ensures opposition, closeness, autonomy, but also the eternal antagonism of various forms and bounded fields and objects.

Conject

We would like to position this word, "conject," as a very specific part of the architectural act. The task, then, is strictly epistemological in that we are attempting to defend or construct the existence of something called the "architectural act," which contains numerous sub-acts or operations that can be distinguished: concept, conception, platform, diagram, plan, project, program, etc. Among them, we are seeking a place and time for still one more facet of the architectural act, adding it here and calling it "conject."

We are making a few assumptions here: first, that there is a plurality of various acts that together potentially comprise the architectural act, which then has an author or subject (the architect); second, that there is yet another operation that could be part of the "architectural chain of acts," the "conject;" third, that "conject" is complementary or epistemologically symmetrical to the institution of what we designate as "city" (which is to say with the encounters, opinions, or imaginations of common life); and fourth, that it is possible to foresee the existence of a sort of regulative analogy that would harmonize the architectural act with the philosophical one (thus architecture and philosophy, with emphasis on the conjunction "and" in between). The last point, implying proximity to what we can for now leave to the attributes "architectural" and "philosophical," seems to us could be one of the more convincing hypotheses we are formulating here. Namely, the appearance of the city, and the connection between the city and conject ("city as a conject"), substantively grounds and harmoniously orders architecture and philosophy.

How might we correctly reconstruct this (dis)connection and show its importance? Indeed, even more important and urgent, how might we differentiate the layers within this connection, which in entirely divergent ways determine the strength of this or these connections?

Before we attempt to execute our main task of fixing the protocol we call "conject(ure)" within the "real" architectural act and show the unbreakable tie between "community" and "conject," to merely sketch a few problems that result from "city," which continuously binds the fields of architecture and philosophy, making them overlap, causing confusion. If we leave aside the production of concepts as one of the crucial characteristics of philosophy (from Aristotle, through Hegel, to Deleuze), and also leaving aside philosophy's role in clearing up conceptual confusion across various genres while at once also re-institutionalizing those genres (for which reason, some 50 years ago, some philosophers and some architects grew closer together, considering it the task of architecture to also produce "architectural concepts" and its autonomy) – "city" is a concept (a figure or protocol) which draws attention through its incompleteness. All we can say about what city "does" is that it draws attention and unease with its incompleteness and infinity.

The first problem here, or the first comment, is that the word or phenomenon or term "city" draws attention in the field of architecture and philosophy. The philosopher and architect are brought closer, or they can be recognized exclusively if they deal with the city or have the capacity to deal with the city (which is primarily a legal construction and juridical fiction) or announce and then thematize their own inability and incapacity to deal with the city. A philosopher or architect is by definition one attempting, wondering, and announcing their own task to do something with the city or with *présence* of the city (to think it, perceive it, experience it), and then abandon the task admitting their own impotence; or even one who never gives up, all the while knowing that the task is impossible.

Let us now attempt to translate this experience of encounter with community and surpassing the common as such into an imaginary interval within the architectural act by placing conject between the concept (the architectural concept) and the project (always a social construction that brings novelty and change to a city). Conject(ure) is a transitional category, but temporally clearly determined, characterized by uncertainty in magnitude or monstrosity of an entity, the multiplicity of elements and dependence on others (which are all consequences of the

seductiveness and resistance towards what we call "city"). Three consequences might arise as the product of this difficulty: restructuring and the art of restructuring elements before us (which always concerns future time; restructuring is the aspect of the concept that leads to conception and the aspect of the project that concerns the future); the production of new elements and addition of the novel into their existing order (restructuring produces excess, incorporating the external, the additional into the conceptual protocol); and finally, the preliminary production of bonds and ties (*conjunctur*) with others, collective readiness to alter (and restructure) the city and affirm the future and a new joint action (to conject[us], past participle of *conjicere*, to throw together).

AND

Why does AND not have an end? And why does AND, even when it bends, and curves, and quivers and ceaselessly moves, never end by melting into the other (into what precedes it – architecture, or in what supersedes it – philosophy)? Our urgent attempt to defend and nurture relations as well as (dis)connections between architecture and philosophy (of various genres, theoretical protocols and demonstrations that simultaneously justify the abstract and the real) has two goals: first, to prevent and infinitely delay the end of architecture and the end of philosophy – AND is the eternal absence and the eternal more; two or more disciplines mix, overlap, separate, change, and remain in motion towards the future; as ever-the-third, AND ensures the existence of innovation.

The status of "novelty" and the various figures of what belongs to the register of the "new," innovative, unclassified, unexpected, unrecognizable, etc., as well as the possibility of the "new," the creation and production of the "new," or its discovery – are profoundly tied to the conjunctor and separator AND.

Our aim is to think what is most difficult to reflect, because not present or not yet present, or else successfully evades all projection and thematization. Our intention is to identify, across scientific fields and disciplines (such as art, aesthetics, technology, technics, semiology), how something that has never appeared or perceived as extant is created, produced, and conceptualized. How is change possible, and how does the "new" manifest and present? Is the "new" ever really "new?"

What might be crucial in attempting to carefully consider the meaning of uncertainty and the quotation marks deployed around the "new"

("discovery," "invention," "event," "the present," or "now") is the role of a group or a group of experts that works together (this is the aim of the journal, as well as the various related schools and seminars on architecture and philosophy), constructs problems and resolves them in a unique way. Since the erection of the Tower of Babel, this monstrous project, the unconditional condition of the existence of a counter-institution was technological innovation and discovery of the new (material and concepts). Without AND, there can be no life together, and no better life and world.