

Petar Bojanić, Snežana Vesnić

ENDLESS CHANGE

Three phrases from John Ruskin, “Desire of Change,” “Love of Change,” and “Perpetual Change,” serve to orient and give conceptual background to what we call—never fully understanding it—*change*. We have selected “change,” transgressing the limits of a concept that is more than just a concept or even modal concept, but is the necessary part of any possible and future concept. We mark *change* in new ways, insisting on its infinite creative capacity to determine any potential architectural or philosophical act as such. It is ultimately an imperative and the mission of our engagement in reconstructing bonds and relations between architecture and philosophy. When we say Change or Changing, it is not just a noun or verb, not a description of something that is “instant” (change) or product (an end state) or process of production or actualization (of change), nor even a chain of events—rather, it is an imperative, order, and call to all to act, do something, create, to perpetually affirm the new. When we say CHANGE, we doubly bind the architect and the philosopher: as agents of various actions that necessarily have as their consequence some change, as well as initiators of the creative potential of change as such. Regardless of the complicated histories of failure and lack of thematization of this “protocol” (a word that also fits well with everything to do with *change*), our intention is to determine as closely as possible the direction in which the unfolding and presence of *change* is not an obstacle or resistance to the revealing of novelty (newness or precedent), but its unconditional condition. What would comprise the basic elements of a possible prolegomena or introduction into the theory of change? Or conversely, what needs to be immediately rejected as unacceptable in the construction of a continuous concrete change or continuum of myriad changes? Change begins with a glut of activity, with swift and urgent exchange of various actions, with repetition and exchange of actions and agents, with their interchange and effacement. Such is the origin of change. The number of actions or amount of activity provides the introduction for

any future construction of the concept of change. Aside from time (as it is a continuum), the exchange and quick transition of activities is an introduction into the connection between movement and change (in Aristotle, the words *metabolē* [change] and *kinēsis* [movement] stand in a complex symmetry or synonymy; Latin will take over these difficulties through *mutatio*, *alteratio*, etc.); further, it leads to endless shades of change (not all cut of the same cloth: substantial, incidental, relative, relational, proper, incomplete, accidental, etc.); it leads to the myth of invisibility of change, which is to say, negation and erasure of acts in the name of something as yet unachieved new or even (im)possible (the eternal *noch nicht*). We would like to assume and propose a few axioms of the “protocol of change” or “acts or facts of changing” that necessarily follow from the connection or from the “and” (in architecture *and* philosophy or architect *and* philosopher):

(a) “Change” can be classified as an “architectural” notion because it necessarily refers to movement, to “Spatial Relations: Place, Form, Size” (Carl Darling Buck).

(b) The architect and philosopher necessarily see not what is but what is yet to be or yet to be seen; at least three consequences follow: that what is real or actual is necessarily such as potential and in the process of becoming (as Hermann Lotze writes, “change must find its way to the inside of being”); what is actual is amended and corrected, erased and varied to better fit the concept that intervenes and produces the actual; the expression of the concept (a manifestation of the projective mind) is announced, noted, and visible.

(c) Change is verifiable, it is necessarily present and objective, it can be thought and perceived (in opposition to Henri Bergson); finally, architecture does not exist without the concept of change because change is perpetual modification of the objectification of the concept.

(d) Change is thus substantive and corresponds to the fourth designation in Aristotle concerning the “creation and destruction of substances” (Richard Sorabji, Norman Kretzmann); this means that form is compatible with the concept, and that true change is two-way: creative—when matter becomes the statue, for example; or destructive—when matter is de-formed, losing its distinction from its surrounding, becoming a ruin.

(e) “Change” can thus never be *une notion vide et abstraite*, nor ever be substituted with “transformation” or “a system of transformation” (as Michel Foucault seeks to make it), which are no more than accidental

alterations or simple shifts (*phora*), and not movement or change (“actuality of that which potentially is”).

That this is change is clear from the following: when that which is buildable is in actuality, in the respect in which we call it such, it is being built, and this is the process of building; and similarly with learning and healing and rolling and jumping and maturing and growing old. (Aristotle, *Phys.* 209a 15–18, trans. E. Hussey)