

THE ARCHITECTURAL COGITATIO: A PHENOMENOLOGICAL CRITICAL
REALIST CONTACT FOR THE ETHICO-POLITICAL PROGNOSIS OF THE
21ST CENTURY ARCHITECTURE THEORY

A THESIS SUBMITTED TO
THE GRADUATE SCHOOL OF NATURAL AND APPLIED SCIENCES
OF
MIDDLE EAST TECHNICAL UNIVERSITY

BY

GÜNCE EŞİNGEN KINAYOĞLU

IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS
FOR
THE DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY
IN
ARCHITECTURE

FEBRUARY 2022

Approval of the thesis:

**THE ARCHITECTURAL COGITATIO: A PHENOMENOLOGICAL
CRITICAL REALIST CONTACT FOR THE ETHICO-POLITICAL
PROGNOSIS OF THE 21ST CENTURY ARCHITECTURE THEORY**

submitted by **GÜNCE EŞİNGEN KINAYOĞLU** in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of **Doctor of Philosophy in Architecture, Middle East Technical University** by,

Prof. Dr. Halil Kalıpçılar
Dean, Graduate School of **Natural and Applied Sciences** _____

Prof. Dr. F. Cânâ Bilsel
Head of the Department, **Architecture** _____

Prof. Dr. İnci Basa
Supervisor, **Architecture, METU** _____

Examining Committee Members:

Prof. Dr. Güven Arif Sargın
Architecture, METU _____

Prof. Dr. İnci Basa
Architecture, METU _____

Prof. Dr. C. Abdi Güzer
Architecture, METU _____

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Bülent Batuman
Urban Design and Landscape Architecture, Bilkent University _____

Assist. Prof. Dr. Bilge İmamoğlu
Architecture, Ted University _____

Date: 07.02.2022

I hereby declare that all information in this document has been obtained and presented in accordance with academic rules and ethical conduct. I also declare that, as required by these rules and conduct, I have fully cited and referenced all material and results that are not original to this work.

Name Last name : Gnce Eingen Kınayođlu

Signature :

ABSTRACT

THE ARCHITECTURAL COGITATIO: A PHENOMENOLOGICAL CRITICAL REALIST CONTACT FOR THE ETHICO-POLITICAL PROGNOSIS OF THE 21ST CENTURY ARCHITECTURE THEORY

Eşingen Kınayoğlu, Günce
Doctor of Philosophy, Architecture
Supervisor: Prof. Dr. İnci Basa

February 2022, 156 pages

The thesis puts forward architecture as the perceptual object of its agency; and sees its totality as imagery derived from the contemporary discursive mechanisms at the turn of the millennium and the following two decades. Through the term cogitatio from Latin philosophy, the study covers the status of architecture between phenomenological brackets by articulating its disciplinary sphere as an object of its own reflexivity. It proposes a framework to weave the present and emergent diagnostic positions to cast architecture theory for the 21st century. This thesis aims to re-establish the foundational supremacy of philosophy in architectural thinking, first by examining how the perception of architecture becomes the content of its own consciousness, and later, the emerging shifts in intellectual thought inclined architecture into turmoil, and finally, the reorientation of discipline towards political and moral discourse. The thesis diagnoses the status of architecture as lodged between predicament and resurgence, portrays an aporia where its agency is in puzzlement of how to proceed, and asserts an alethic endeavor that sustains an incomplete search for a valid ontological approach. It introduces the potential to recast architecture over the individualist parrhesiastic communication with oneself, constituting moral uprightness. Based on the significance of intentionality, the study brings the conceptual and metalinguistic tools of both phenomenology and critical

realism into the architectural debate. Altogether, the thesis extends the contact area of critical realist metatheory and architecture theory to guide the philosophical account of contemporary architecture placed at the center of the politicization of critical discourse about the sociological and economic present.

Keywords: Architectural Theory, Architectural Philosophy, Reflexivity, Phenomenological Hermeneutics, Critical Realism.

ÖZ

MİMARİ COGITATIO: 21. YÜZYIL MİMARLIK KURAMININ ETİK-POLİTİK ÖNGÖRÜSÜNE YÖNELİK FENOMENOLOJİK ELEŞTİREL GERÇEKÇİ BİR TEMAS

Eşingen Kınayoğlu, Günce
Doktora, Mimarlık
Tez Yöneticisi: Prof. Dr. İnci Basa

Şubat 2022, 156 sayfa

Tez, mimarlığı, failliğinin algısal nesnesi olarak öne sürer; ve bütünlüğünü, binyılın başında ve onu takip eden yirmi yıldaki çağdaş söylemsel işleyişlerden türetilen bir imgelem olarak görür. Bu çalışma, Latin felsefesinden gelen cogitatio terimi aracılığıyla, disiplin alanını kendi düşünömselliğinin bir nesnesi olarak eklemleyerek, mimarlığın fenomenolojik parantez içindeki durumunu ele almaktadır. 21. Yüzyıl mimarlık kuramını biçimlendirmek adına mevcut ve yeni ortaya çıkmakta olan teşhis konumlarını dokuyacak bir çerçeve önermektedir. Bu tez, önce mimarlık algısının nasıl kendi bilincinin içeriği haline geldiğini, daha sonra mimarlığı kargaşaya sürükleyen entelektüel düşüncede ortaya çıkan kaymaları, ve son olarak da disiplinin politik ve ahlaki söyleme doğru yeniden yönlendirilmesini inceleyerek, felsefenin mimari düşüncedeki temel üstünlüğünü yeniden kurmayı amaçlamaktadır. Tez, mimarlığın çıkmazlar ve yeniden uyanışlar arasındaki durumunu teşhis etmekte, failliğinin nasıl ilerleyeceğine dair bilinmezlik içinde olduğu bir açmazı tasvir etmekte ve geçerli bir ontolojik yaklaşım için henüz tamamlanmamış bir araştırmayı sürdüren aletik çabayı ileri sürmektedir. Ahlaki dürüstlüğü kurarak, mimarlığı kişinin kendisiyle olan bireyci parrhesiastik iletişimi üzerinden yeniden biçimlendirme potansiyelini sunmaktadır. Yönelimselliğın öneminden hareketle, hem fenomenolojinin hem de eleştirel gerçekçiliğın kavramsal

ve üstdilsel araçlarını mimari tartışmaya dahil etmektedir. Bu tez, sosyolojik ve ekonomik şimdiki zamana ilişkin eleştirel söylemin siyasallaşmasının merkezine yerleştirilen çağdaş mimarlığın felsefi açıklamasına rehberlik etmek için eleştirel gerçekçi üstkuram ve mimarlık kuramının temas alanını genişletmektedir.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Mimarlık Kuramı, Mimarlık Felsefesi, Düşünümsellik, Fenomenolojik Yorumbilgisi, Eleştirel Gerçekçilik.

To the life ahead,

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Such a practice of writing spread over a long time matches the periodicity in which it is written. Especially the last three years of this process witnessed many transformations in my growth, oscillating between overjoying the life that I made and grieving over the life that I missed. Yet, I may say that I have let the indifference of life inspire me more than it weighs on as the sequel of this period has finally come. Therefore, I cannot think of the text I produced separately from the traces that remain fresh memories until an adequate amount of time passed to be weaved into nostalgia. Once for all, I hope for myself and those around me the strength and the competency to lead a life of contentment while reminding the transience of life until the end of it likewise arrives.

The philosophical expedition one may ground the self lasts along their confined journey. The refinement one sought on behalf of self sparks upon any practice executed. Hence, I hold for the search to conduce towards re-establishing the supremacy of philosophical grounding in architectural thinking that further unfolds itself and expect that the thesis hopefully finds a place within that exegesis.

First and foremost, I would like to express my deepest gratitude to Prof. Dr. İnci Basa, whose wisdom I may openheartedly portray as beyond academic supervision. Her insights indeed are for life and creatively girded on with reason, honesty, and warmth. I am grateful that I had the privilege to share her interest in linguistics, semiotics, and philosophy intersecting with architecture. Exceeding the disciplinary boundaries, I hope to keep her precious guidance and profound sincerity lifelong.

I am also indebted to the thesis monitoring committee members, Prof. Dr. Güven Arif Sargin and Assist. Prof. Dr. Bilge İmamoğlu for keeping track of the conceptual evolution and orienting it towards a decent philosophical depth. I would like to extend my thanks for their patience, support, and rigorous reviews in consecutive committees. I would like to acknowledge the constructive contributions of Prof. Abdi

Güzer and Assoc. Prof. Dr. Bülent Batuman offering critical frameworks to flare the dialogue in the thesis defense jury and their valuable time given. I want to thank my professors and colleagues at Hacettepe University for the convenience they provided, the emotional support they showed, and the feeling of togetherness they constituted, along with this study.

Outward of my scholarly circle, I want to give all my warmth and gratitude towards my devoted friends who will apprehend that they are the ones I am referring to without writing their names one by one. I consider myself fortunate as we let our genuine selves shine in years-long friendships with frankness fought against relations that touches on the superficial.

I owe my last thanks to my family; both my parents are the most virtuous person I have ever met in my entire life, and I wish to carry their perspicuity and the peace of our childhood home wherever I go. I'm lucky to find the resemblance of this tenderness in my nephews Rüzgar Deniz and Bora; their beings and the joy they brought to my life will turn into the best companionship I believe I will have. And for the one that I already had, my thanks go to my brother, Güray; our trust along with each other no matter what comes through life is beyond measure.

Last but not least, I cannot thank my partner, Gökhan, enough for his strength in undertaking the responsibilities when I am absent, seeing the bright side of every struggle when I am in the dark, and insisting on the serenity while I am concerned. I may say in all modesty that the uncertainties and contradictions brought by the fortune are worth living with all of you on the 'threshold' between complaining about the ordinary and celebrating the simplicity.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT	v
ÖZ.....	vii
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	x
TABLE OF CONTENTS	xii
CHAPTERS	
1 INTRODUCTION	1
2 DIAGNOSTIC POSITIONS TO CAST ARCHITECTURE FOR THE 21ST CENTURY	17
2.1 Discourse and Disclosure	17
2.2 Periodicity and Emergence.....	27
2.3 Value and Validation	36
2.4 The Intersubjective ‘Percept’ and its Ahistorical Essence	46
3 A DISCIPLINE MISCAST/OUTCAST: ARCHITECTURE LODGED IN BETWEEN PREDICAMENT AND RESURGENCE.....	51
3.1 Diagnosing the “Aporia”: Crisis in the Imagery of Architecture	51
3.2 Realization: Architecture’s Introspection and the “Immanent Critique”	65
3.3 The Scenography of Projectivism	71
4 A DISCIPLINE FORECAST: ARCHITECTURE SITUATED IN BETWEEN THE ACTUAL AND THE POSSIBLE	75
4.1 In pursuit of “Aletheia”: The Political Index of Architecture Theory.....	75
4.2 Speculation: Architecture’s Mirror-Self and the “Explanatory Critique” ...	86
4.3 Realist Fragmentation.....	90
5 A DISCIPLINE RECAST: THE INCOMPLETE ETHICO-POLITICAL PROJECT OF ARCHITECTURE THEORY	101

5.1	A Prospect for “Parrhesia”: The Ethical Index of Architecture Theory	101
5.2	Emancipation: Architecture’s Moral-Self and the “Emancipatory Critique” 112	
5.3	Learning from Critical Realism	119
6	CONCLUSION.....	135
	REFERENCES	145
	CURRICULUM VITAE.....	155

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Cogitatio is a term inherited from Latin philosophy that became well-known through Descartes's definition of "knowing act." The popular proposition, "*ego cogito, ergo sum*," meaning "*I am thinking, therefore I exist*," is indeed a point of origin of an onward philosophical riddle leveled to being and subjectivity. *Cogito* denoting thinking is a comprehensive definition of knowledge extended by doubt, which Descartes constructed explicitly in relation to consciousness:

"Thought [*cogitatio*]. I use this term to apply to all exists within us in such a way that we are immediately conscious of it... thus all the operations of the will, the intellect, the imagination and the senses are thoughts. (1641: 2.116 *Second Replies*)"¹

"By the term 'thought' I understand everything which we are aware of as happening within us, insofar as we have awareness of it. Hence, *thinking* is to be identified here not merely with understanding, willing and imagining, but also with sensory awareness. (1644, 1.195 *Principles* 9)"²

The thesis title puts forward an inherent practice of *cogitatio* illustrating the consciously knowing act under the totality of architecture. The term *cogitatio* expresses the contemporary phenomenon of architecture, the metaphysical reflection of its whole sphere on its agency, that the study has problematized, and that phenomenon (independent of judgment at this point) is directly related to the act of

¹ T. Bayne and M. Montague, *Cognitive Phenomenology* (OUP Oxford, 2011), 5.

² *Ibid.*

knowing of its own agency. While the existence of architecture in Cartesian thought is only possible with the knowledge that its own agency attributes to it at one point, architecture indeed continues to *be* outside of our interpretation in its most “absolute” state. Further, its absoluteness is at once the source for a turn to itself through its inevitable ties to criticism. Therefore, cogitatio is appropriated conceptually in that Architectural knowledge reinvents itself by articulating its disciplinary sphere as an object of its own reflexivity.

“Descartes' definitions of cogitatio, when properly understood, provide further support for the "intellectualistic" interpretation. For it turns out that, for Descartes, acts of will, etc., are cogitationes not qua acts of will, etc., but qua object of reflective awareness.”³

“Descartes is indeed the first who defined cogitatio as the principal attribute of incorporeal substance and extension as that of corporeal substance; better, he is the first who dared to define a substance on the basis of cogitatio, indeed to determine cogitatio itself as substance.”⁴

When the phenomenon of architecture stands for the “qua object of reflective awareness,” architecture regards itself as the substance of its own and stands under a genre of identification above the theory-criticism-history triad, thinking oneself. Far from cogitatio and way back from Descartes, the ontological correlation tied between thinking and being is, indeed, recognized by *noesis*, the act of thinking, in Aristotle's metaphysics; similarly, the *Nous* of architecture thinks of itself by becoming the object of thought:

“And *Nous* thinks on itself to the extent that it participates in the object of thought (noeton). It becomes the noeton when it touches

³ John Cottingham, "Descartes on 'Thought'," *The Philosophical Quarterly* (1950-) 28, no. 112 (1978): 211.

⁴ J.L. Marion and J.L. Kosky, *On Descartes' Metaphysical Prism: The Constitution and the Limits of onto-Theo-Logy in Cartesian Thought* (University of Chicago Press, 1999), 69.

and intuitively apprehends its objects so that noesis and the noeton are the same.”⁵

Besides the proposed political and ethical contextualization, the self-definition of architecture, *architecture thinking on architecture* is the commencing objective of the study. Therefore, the term cogitatio stands for a pretext for the conscious reception of discipline originating from its own discourse; the philosophical thinking embedded in the architecture; the endeavor to self-knowledge, which the thesis called for as the basis for the oncoming emergent architecture theory; in other words, the architectural diagnosis. While a “diagnosis” refers genuinely to an ill-being, architecture at the turn of the 21st century grapples with its own crisis taking place in the face of actuality's social, economic, and cultural struggles. However, the thesis's subject matter is not a limited set of architecture's discursive environment, namely, its so-called periodical theories. It is about how architecture in its disciplinary formation is engaged as the property of mind; indeed, Architecture-itself becomes the perceptual object, emergent imagery articulated in and through language besides the retrospective epistemic content. Hence rendering that kind of perceptual awareness demands a metatheoretical exploration, a philosophical agentic stance, which presupposes to empower congenerous architecture thinking to root into practice urged under emancipatory desires.

At this point, the equal attention to the philosophical context of cogitatio, as expanded later by the parallel frameworks by Locke, Brentano, and Husserl, transcended into phenomenology, is needed to be noted.⁶ The perception of architecture becomes the content of its own consciousness; expressly, the architecture's phenomenology constitutes the basis for the inquiry framed around politics and ethics of the 21st-century architecture theory. On account of architecture being in contact with oneself, the explanatory fragment on Husserl's cogitatio is

⁵ W. Marx, *The Meaning of Aristotle's 'Ontology'* (Springer Netherlands, 2012), 14.

⁶ Bayne and Montague, *Cognitive Phenomenology*.

worth quoting at length, drawn clearly by Patocka as the student of Husserl, to immerse the relationship between architecture and phenomenological hermeneutics:

“The fundamental thesis of Husserl's phenomenology is that access to the objects of any experience whatever can be studied only when we make that access itself and not permitting anything else to enter into and distort our study. We must set aside any belief concerning the object of experience. I can study the way experience approaches things without believing in the existence of its object. Even then experience remains objectival. But that means that consciousness (of objects; in Husserl, consciousness always has an object) is by its very nature independent of the existence of the world. That does not mean asserting that world does not exist. Husserl is only pointing out the superiority of consciousness in its very nature and in the full scope of its experience to the objectivity of which consciousness is conscious. Thus Husserl asserts that a (critical) examination of our experience, of its structures, of its verification (testing validity) is not independent of its thesis, of positing object, but that, if it is to be radical, the positing of an object must be suspended. Only that way can the inquirer reach pure experience, without any additions. At the same time, this mode of phenomenological study is supposed to set aside all possible prejudice, it is to be the foundation of philosophy as a science guided by an ideal of total responsibility -it must be able to take responsibility for anything it asserts, give reasons for every step, and that in the sense that it is supported by what alone is valid, by the experience of the thing itself, the thing as it itself presents itself. Since it presents itself in reflection, reflection is the final court of appeal- that is a Cartesian ground, ego cogito. On this ground cogitatio is itself an object - it is self-evident.”⁷

In this context, the consciousness claimed to have existed in the architectural agency takes the totality of architecture as its own object. Through a phenomenological study as grounded on the philosophy of science, architecture may be regarded “as

⁷ J. Patocka et al., *Body, Community, Language, World* (Open Court, 1998), 82-83.

the thing as it itself presents itself.” Thereupon, architectural cogitatio becomes an object of its own.

Even from the early stages of the study, there was an appetite for creating a diagnostic guide for the instabilities regarding architecture's relationship to the occurring world views. The research has started with the quest of how transnational economies have transformed the relationality of architecture into social life, material, cultural, and moral factors. However, later, it was ascertained that what the study problematized was not the position of architecture in between the past lines. It is about reading the period adjacent to now, while at the very moment, which leads the study to the concept of emergence. Therefore, the focus became the emergent relational transformation of the architectural diagnosis, the frequency of which turned out to be shorter in span compared to the last century. Within the new Millennium, there occurred multiple discursive fractions in diverse fields as for in architecture, and these dispersed theoretical concepts relate to one another in complexity and appear as a currency of the contemporary intellectual culture. So, what is embraced by the study is to trace this emerging shift in intellectual thought and connect the dots for supra-level constellations. Therefore, the position is beyond an illustration of a paradigmatic schema, since in architecture theory, the historiography tends to use periodicity to emphasize its thematic quality. The approach denotes a meta-criticism following the philosophical developments of the twentieth century on how the nature of knowledge acquisition has been understood until now.

After the turn of the 21st century, the discursive agenda of architecture has been engaged by diagnosing architecture's aporetic status responding with stagnation to the external crises, which further extended the self- crisis. Thematization and the epistemic plurality injected into architecture in the second half of the twentieth century have tear-off architecture from its philosophical grounding. It is contradictory because the theoretical surplus until the nineties has seemed to aim the adverse, and the counter-reaction to the excessive theorization has given the power to the mere primacy of practice, which later tuned with neoliberalist agenda. The

universal mind, the rationality, and the knowledge of commonsense, seeking reasoning and common good inspired by philosophy have turned upside down and the currencies of post-truth have put philosophy in the background. Therefore, this thesis aims to re-establish the foundational supremacy of philosophy in architectural thinking first by examining how the perception of architecture becomes the content of its own consciousness, and later the emerging shift in intellectual thought that inclined architecture into turmoil, and finally, the reorientation of discipline towards the political and moral discourse in the last twenty years. What the thesis stands for is to respond to the intellectual anxiety in architecture through a philosophical refinement by challenging the position of architectural discourse's agency about its own knowledge production. In those, it is asserted that this whole dissensus on the competence/ incompetence of architecture on its social and political role is not about the concurrent shift in architecture's epistemological bias. Nevertheless, the crux is asserted as its neglected ontology and its oblivious stance to its unbeknown search for reality. Therefore, it is suggested that immediate action is needed to reconnect architecture to reality; seeking answers to that, of course, first led the foci to the "realism" in philosophy. The foremost stop was realism's solely aesthetically established journey within the architectural milieu and its short-lasting discourse in the seventies. Yet, the lock to fit the key was not the "naïve realism." Therefore, the foci may have been the realist transition grounded deeply in several categories aforesaid in social sciences, in which architectural discourse already has its ties. These can be listed as social constructionism, structuration, aesthetic realism, moral realism, utopian realism as permeated from the realms of philosophy of perception, political philosophy, aesthetics, and ethics. Under the umbrella of realism, one branch reconciles the diversity of prior successor conceptual relativity as a general theory or a metatheory, which also pertains to the diagnosis regarding the status of architecture theory intersecting with the call on the political as well as the ethical in the early twenty-first century. Indeed, it was critical realism, a philosophical

movement initiated by Roy Bhaskar⁸ as an approach in the philosophy of natural sciences later streamed into the philosophy of social sciences “that seeks to underlabour for science and other ways of knowing in order to promote the cause of truth and freedom, hence the transformation of social structures and other constraints that impede that cause and their replacement with wanted and needed ones, or emancipation.”⁹ After the failed paradigmization of intellectual grounds and the fetishization of theory before the turn of the century, architecture theory aspires to a metatheory constituted over the components of sub-theories via a language that entails a metalanguage. The main concern of the study is to seek an answer to how the 21st-century theory should be constructed after such divergent transformations and displacements of theoretical grounds. The regained status of political discourse in architecture after the turn of the 21st century is propounded in search of a new reality bringing a novel metalanguage dispersed through diverse yet mutual disciplinary setting. After the re-introduction of the political, the following call on the idea of emancipation has started to form around new paradigmatic enunciations, yet lacks a comprehensive and integrative framework. Therefore, the study scrutinized its possibility based on individualist agentic intentions, aiming to construct a peculiar architecture phenomenon and a moral pronouncement in

⁸ The in-depth exegesis of the literature of critical realism is beyond the scope of this thesis, yet the prevailing metalanguage within the study is weaved covalently with the terminology constructed through the movement. For the treatise of critical realism commenced by Roy Bhaskar are as follows in the order of when they were written. Roy Bhaskar, *A Realist Theory of Science [1975]* (Taylor & Francis, 2013). *The Possibility of Naturalism: A Philosophical Critique of the Contemporary Human Sciences [1979]* (Taylor & Francis, 2013). *Scientific Realism and Human Emancipation [1986]* (Taylor & Francis, 2009). *Reclaiming Reality: A Critical Introduction to Contemporary Philosophy [1986]* (Taylor & Francis, 2011). *Philosophy and the Idea of Freedom [1991]* (Routledge, 2011). *Dialectic: The Pulse of Freedom [1993]* (Taylor & Francis, 2008). *Plato Etc: Problems of Philosophy and Their Resolution [1994]* (Taylor & Francis, 2010). *From Science to Emancipation: Alienation and the Actuality of Enlightenment [2002]* (Taylor & Francis, 2012). For the complete list of the collection please see; Mervyn Hartwig, *Dictionary of Critical Realism*, ed. M. Hartwig (Taylor & Francis, 2015), 503-06.

⁹ *Dictionary of Critical Realism*, 96.

practice. At this point, the significance of intentionality brought the conceptual tools of both phenomenology and critical realism. “The marrying of phenomenology and critical realism enables an inquirer to examine which are constitutive parts of a whole. That is, which parts are not dependent of the whole, but rather define the whole. In order to achieve the end of epoche, the entirety of action and subjective consciousness should be investigated.”¹⁰

The critical realist treatise as “the philosophical warrant for a new understanding for the social sciences,”¹¹ has influenced many studies in diverse disciplines to appropriate its metalinguistic conceptualization; such as sociology, semiology, political science and international relations, education, economics, Marxian studies, urban planning, and urban research as well as the social studies of built environments and its discourse.¹² However, the ethical impetus of critical realism still provides

¹⁰ John M. Budd, "Phenomenological Critical Realism: A Practical Method for Lis," *Journal of Education for Library and Information Science* 53, no. 1 (2012): 76.

¹¹ Philip S. Gorski, ""What Is Critical Realism? And Why Should You Care?," review of A Realist Theory of Science, Roy Bhaskar; The Possibility of Naturalism: A Philosophical Critique of the Contemporary Human Science, Roy Bhaskar; Scientific Realism and Human Emancipation, Roy Bhaskar; Reclaiming Reality: A Critical Introduction to Contemporary Philosophy, Roy Bhaskar; Philosophy and the Idea of Freedom, Roy Bhaskar; Dialectic: The Pulse of Freedom, Roy Bhaskar; Plato etc.: The Problems of Philosophy and Their Resolution, Roy Bhaskar; From East to West: Odyssey of a Soul, Roy Bhaskar; meta-Reality: The Philosophy of meta-Reality, Roy Bhaskar; Reflections on meta-Reality: Transcendence, Emancipation and Everyday Life, Roy Bhaskar; From Science to Emancipation: Alienation and the Actuality of Enlightenment, Roy Bhaskar; The Philosophy of MetaReality: Creativity, Love and Freedom, Roy Bhaskar; The Formation of Critical Realism, Roy Bhaskar, Mervyn Hartwig; Dictionary of Critical Realism, Mervyn Hartwig, *Contemporary Sociology* 42, no. 5 (2013).

¹² The supradisciplinary nature of critical realism offers open positions as a metatheory for many specializations; one may follow the pioneer names after Roy Bhaskar in different disciplines to figure out its complexity and comprehensive totality: Margaret Archer, Andrew Sayer, Bob Jessop, Tony Lawson, Steve Fleetwood, Heikki Patomäki, Milka Kurki, Colin Wight, Norman Fairclough, Petter Næss, and so on. For the divergent reflection of critical realism centered in the cognate fields of study spanning urban planning and urban studies, comparative urbanism, social studies of built environment and architectural discourse at both introductory and advanced levels, one may further look into the following studies; Petter Næss, "Critical Realism, Urban Planning and Urban Research," *European Planning Studies* 23, no. 6 (2015); Benjamin N. Vis, "Adapting a Critical Realist Research

uncharted geography for many disciplines; the hiatus of the definition of moral values and the constitution of value judgment in practical fields may be fulfilled through critical realist premises. Its initiation for the sphere of architecture may be voiced through this thesis as it marks the justification of morality.

Critical realism involves a methodological switch from epistemology to ontology. Within that ontology, there is a shift from events to mechanisms. It is an approach concerning the relationship between our knowledge and the world, and it challenges the postmodernist vogue of defining reality. In Bhaskar's words:

“The postmodernist says basically that reality is a social construct. Reality is a construct of discourse, the text, the conversation, or if you like, people, or even power relations. Therefore, the whole reality is conceptual, and it is a construct of people, or that is agentive. The critical realist position takes both poles and says, of course; social reality is concept dependent; of course, it is people dependent, but it is not concept exhaustive; it is not people exhaustive. It is not exhausted by the agency or discourse or the text.”¹³

Another thing about critical realism is that it takes dialectics a stage further. It rejects any reductionism, any equation of the social and the conceptual, or the social and the human. Critical realism criticizes the generalizing claims and dualism inherited in knowledge production because these reduce the reality only to the observable.

Process," in *Cities Made of Boundaries*, Mapping Social Life in Urban Form (UCL Press, 2018). For the diverse methodological implications of critical realism in the aforementioned fields, one may check the following unpublished theses; Kızıldere, D., “Are There Local Limits to Gentrification?: The Context of Tophane,” Ph.D. diss., ITU, 2018; Kananani, M. A., “Beyond (Post-)Critical Architecture A Realist Perspective,” M.Sc. thesis, ITU, 2018; Ünver Göçer, Ü.Ö., “Critical Realism Method Based Discussion of Land Value Variation Depending on Accessibility: Istanbul Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) System,” Ph.D. diss., Mimar Sinan Güzel Sanatlar Üniversitesi, 2021.

¹³ Roy Bhaskar Rom Harre, "How to Change Reality: Story V. Structure- a Debate between Rom Harre and Roy Bhaskar," in *After Postmodernism: An Introduction to Critical Realism*, ed. J. Lopez and G. Potter (Bloomsbury Publishing, 2005), 28.

Conceptualization is central for any scientific explanation, especially for social sciences, and conceptualization is through abstraction. When the social world is described, the explanation takes the form of modeling causal mechanisms. However, it is a common error that the real existing entities are confused with causal powers. The postmodernist vogue tends to believe that social structures are real existing things without causal powers; however, causality in the social world resides in individuals in the agency. Social action is understood as narratives in a way that agents organize their social world. For critical realism, Roy Bhaskar disputes the position and argues that social structures should indeed be thought of as having causal powers, as being "things" on their own; he maintains the social world is concept-dependent, arguing that the social world is also made up of non-discursive structures. "The statement is that the reality has an objective existence, but our knowledge of it is conceptually mediated: facts are theory-dependent, but they are not theory determined."¹⁴

Therefore, "one should not only attempt to change the existing narratives but also the non-discursive structures in which these narratives co-exist,"¹⁵ this stance delineates epistemic relativism and ontological realism. Furthermore, critical realism disapproves of another essential debate held in social sciences: the approaches and methodologies and their polar comparison, such as positivism vs. hermeneutics, qualitative vs. quantitative, universalism vs. particularism. This either-or approach is exchanged with the both-and approach since metatheories deal with ontological and epistemological issues, extending their potential in practice. The aporia diagnosed within the architecture theory of the 21st century, which is based on the rhetorical excess, can be superimposed onto what has been criticized by the critical realists for the production of social sciences. The problem of reification and the

¹⁴Berth Danermark, Mats Ekström, and Jan. Ch. Karlsson, *Explaining Society: Critical Realism in the Social Sciences* (Routledge, 2002), 15.

¹⁵J. Lopez and G. Potter, *After Postmodernism: An Introduction to Critical Realism* (Bloomsbury Publishing, 2005), 20.

diverse casual dualities given in that rhetoric, the mirror-fashioned relation between architecture and society, and architecture and politics underlies architecture's aporetic situation. To disclose the emergent properties of aporia, or further to step out of it, the alethic attempt demands the need for the theory-dependent facts, whereas, for the parrhesiastic effort, the events are needed that are not theory-determined but morally driven.

Textually, the thesis is composed of three parts, each constructed around a philosophical pretext. Each rationale meets the metaphysical projection of the proposed content, and they are epitomized as Aporia, Aletheia, and Parrhesia. Further, the overall content of the proposal is decomposed into four sections that are construed through prefix derived words of -cast, representing the subject matter in accordance. The root word *-cast* denotes the agentic consciousness towards Architecture, taking a new formation regarding the premises of the late century. With this in mind, *out-cast* architecture is meant the discarded status of architecture through the elaborations of the “end” discourses.¹⁶ *Mis-casting* the False-front revisits the role and the task that has been assigned on architecture considering postmodernist restructuring, which cost the aporetic diagnosis laid onto the contested traditions of modernity. The crisis-ridden climate that architecture has been in contention further evokes a wave of a disciplinary urge seeking the eventual transformation that will determine a possible conjecture towards an indefinite future, which is discussed under *fore-cast*. The thesis insists that any attempt to configure the reception and repercussion of complex socio-political phenomena to architecture and the concurrence of any feasible architectural reaction must have inevitably been accompanied by an ethical lens. Therefore, the last *-cast* derivative word *re-cast* stands for reconstructing an approach to the ethico-political project of architecture

¹⁶ For the diminishment of the subjects once directed the path of architecture theory; M. Carter et al., *Perspecta 38: Architecture after All : The Yale Architectural Journal* (MIT Press, 2006). And, for the discourses on architecture’s “all-overness;” E. Choi and M. Trotter, *Architecture Is All Over* (Columbia Books on Architecture and the City, 2017).

theory that is addressed as incomplete. While the content has been bearing on each of these *-cast* derivative matter, the parts are also constituted by a conceptual formation, advanced through a narrative strategy for a facilitative follow-up, consecutively as *diagnosis, prognosis, and resolution*. While the intended rhetorical order has its goal in extrapolating regard, the trilogy is aligned with the content of the thesis. The scheme behind this concept-formation trilogy of diagnosis, prognosis, and resolution has been coupled with the interpretation of the Foucauldian methodological principles known as archeology, genealogy, and ethics. Accordingly, the content of the thesis is embedded in those, as mentioned above, conceptual, and philosophical classifications, which are tied in with each other and with the methodological resources.

Architecture's self-definition with the ongoing external theoretical treatise in the wake of the second half of the twentieth century has established its own critical historiography, which is assembled under several anthologies¹⁷ in the nineties and the early Millennium. The turn of the new Millennium has subsided thematic contestation of the architecture of the previous century. Architecture's association with the latest economic and political supremacy has reached a point of compliance under the name of progressive or pragmatist practice, which has set off an opposing discursive production ascending under the name of unconventional disciplinary/professional dysphoria.¹⁸ Henceforth, the intellectual anxiety towards

¹⁷ The seminal anthologies that have covered the second half of the twentieth century architecture theory can be listed but not limited as follows: Kate Nesbitt, *Theorizing a New Agenda for Architecture: An Anthology of Architectural Theory 1965 - 1995* (Princeton Architectural Press, 1996). C. Jencks and K. Kropf, *Theories and Manifestoes of Contemporary Architecture* (Wiley, 2006). H.F. Mallgrave, *Architectural Theory: An Anthology from Vitruvius to 1870* (Wiley, 2006). A.K. Sykes and K.M. Hays, *Constructing a New Agenda: Architectural Theory 1993-2009* (Princeton Architectural Press, 2012).

¹⁸ Within this genre, it is possible to mention several publications, some of them are already listed in the text, but the followings are seminal to remark: Douglas Spencer, *The Architecture of Neoliberalism: How Contemporary Architecture Became an Instrument of Control and Compliance* (Bloomsbury Publishing, 2016). For another particular reframe portraying the discipline/ profession positions within the first decade of 2000s is framed

the so-called neoliberal remaking of the world strides down a new ideological path for the reconnection of politics and architecture. In that case, there has been an increase in the number of architecture books and articles on politics as extensive answers to the “post-political suspension.”¹⁹ This realignment with emergent currencies of the present continuous has intended to inform the architectural practice, and that as well has put reactive praxis in a position of emergence. Nonetheless, the withdrawal and the rebound of politics in architecture cannot be elucidated as if it is any other theme recognized as a pure theoretical paradigm with defined boundaries, yet it has strong blood ties with the Marxist paradigm. There has been concomitant discursive tension in pursuit of practical emancipatory reaction, and the endeavor has been enunciated around a collective political realignment of discipline through these publications in the last decade. The relationship of architecture with the real is already taking shape, and the frequency of this relational transformation is short in span in the twenty-first century as compared to the former. Therefore, the production of architectural knowledge peculiar to the emergent phenomena needs to be approached in avoidance of dualism and reduction, which may re-account for a causal explanation of the recent aporetic illustration of Architecture. The reintroduction of socio-political formulations to diagnose the status of architecture, I believe, is needed to be accompanied by an equivalent re-foundation of realism, which is already a materialist conjecture in tradition. “Critical realism indicates that the relation between the real world and the concepts we form of it is the focus of the research process.”²⁰ Following that, a framework for the research of the conjoined politics and architecture has to be informed by encompassing theoretical,

clearcut in: Gerard Reinmuth, "Relationality and Architecture: How Refocusing the Discipline Might Reverse the Profession's Seemingly Unstoppable Trajectory of Decline," *Architectural Theory Review* 21, no. 1 (2017).

¹⁹ Nadir Lahiji, *Architecture against the Post-Political: Essays in Reclaiming the Critical Project* (Taylor & Francis, 2014), 1.

²⁰ Berth Danermark, Mats Ekström, and Karlsson, *Explaining Society: Critical Realism in the Social Sciences*, 15.

philosophical, and practical grounds as pursued in dialectical materialism. And instead of making one of these three pillars of philosophy, theory, and practice more eminent, critical realism emphasizes the relationality between the three. By mapping Aporia, Aletheia, and Parrhesia as philosophical conceptions onto the theoretical content of the contemporary architecture as well as the pronouncement of a critical realist perspective, which is innately a comprehensive philosophy of science, the totality of the thesis establishes a basis for the first two pillars. For the third one, as for “the practical,” the thesis discusses that the (re)production of architecture is involved in the actual practice of the spatial and outreached reproductive structure through the demanded moral evaluation and value assessment. Moralism is not only a referral source for evaluating a work of architecture but for an Architecture that has been replaced in an emancipatory fabric. Therefore, the thesis aims to explore the relational ground of interventionist architecture on contemporary problems relating to both ethics and politics. By bringing into prominence to explore within the incomplete ethico-political project of architecture theory, this thesis contributes to hypothesize a point of view that is in contact with critical realist philosophy for an attempt to disentangle the current architectural aporia. All in all, Aporia is raised over the series of ‘crises’ associated in and around architecture and it might be a response to Frederic Jameson’s addressing in “From Metaphor to Allegory:” He questions: “The logic of crisis presupposes an order that has been thrown into stability for a longer or shorter period of time, if not indefinitely. But supposing one confronts a permanent instability, permanent chaos, from which a kind of order briefly emerges, only to vanish again. Can that still be called crisis?”²¹ Therefore, decoding architecture in response to its situated aporia requires a depth realism,²² which may introduce a comprehensive foundation for “Aletheia.” Since the state of

²¹ Fredric Jameson, "From Metaphor to Allegory," in *Anything*, ed. Cynthia C. Davidson (New York, Cambridge, London: Anyone Corp, MIT Press, 2001), 33.

²²Roy Bhaskar’s “depth realism” in Sean Creaven, “Materialism, Realism, Dialectics,” in A. Brown, S. Fleetwood, and M. Roberts, *Critical Realism and Marxism* (Routledge, 2002).

Aporia seems everlasting, there must be “something that is neither obscure nor hidden.” Therefore, the diagnostic attitude is overmore needed to be underpinned by explanatory criticism. Deepening the truth-claim/ diagnosis for the current state of architecture regards the necessity of radical criticism, which is, in itself, the desired pursuit of Parrhesia. Over the last two decades, the diagnostic framework of architecture may have ensued to that aletheic endeavor. Indeed, it may have already been called a parrhesiastic contribution. Yet, the transformative agency is only possible by claiming own moral pronouncement while articulating the definitions of architecture consciously in the strata of reality.

CHAPTER 2

DIAGNOSTIC POSITIONS TO CAST ARCHITECTURE FOR THE 21ST CENTURY

2.1 Discourse and Disclosure

The definition of architecture entails the semantic reconstruction of the term “architecture” in every other use since it is unwittingly displaced with its modes of production. The term “architecture,” within the broad spectrum of materiality can lead to the following connotations: any spatial practice, the built, the fictional that is yet built or will remain always-to-be-fictional, the term can also be used to substitute any architectural formation that is materialized through several mediums; texts, visual images, photographs, drawings. The multiple related denotations of architecture indicate a polysemy, yet, the ambiguity mostly denotes a fallacy: a way of the discipline (one way of building up this discipline) is put vis-à-vis the whole “*semiosphere* of architecture.”²³ While the term ‘architecture’ is used synonymously with its productions, ‘Architecture’ as capitalized usually stands for a discipline motivated by the creations of architecture portraying meaning, signification, and communication as layers synthesizing the diverse definitions into a coherent discursive agenda. This agenda emanates that ‘Architecture’ is “a mode of

²³ Unpublished M.Sc. Thesis in Architecture under the supervision of Prof. Dr. Ayşen Savaş. Günce Eşingen, "Textual Readings of Architecture: Orienting Semiosphere" (Middle East Technical University, 2014).

knowledge about and experience of society,”²⁴ which serves as the basis for this research.

The creation of such knowledge has sprung out of the analysis of the contemporary architectural discourse manifested in-between spaces of history, theory, and criticism. Discourse is a complex phenomenon that fits in several definitions in the same fashion as for architecture, none of which can be isolated and replaced with one another. Discourse dwells on an abstract structure, which certainly embodies a unity composed of scattered pieces in forms of language/ languages, whether spoken or unspoken. The realization of such a structure needs a spatial co-existence to able the constituents of discourse to expand and constitute new relations, such as the linguistic, technological, cultural, philosophical, or political treatises with respect to architecture. Within this sphere, discourse operates through its capacity to produce an infinite series of ‘proximity’ that redefines its existing boundaries. Through those interactions, the current strata of discourse have been revisited and introduced to several arbitrary propositions, through which discourse manifests itself in a constant reformation to keep pace with its status in fluidity.

Architecture as the mode of knowledge grows out of interpretation. In “Tulane Papers: The Politics of Contemporary Architectural Discourse,” in 1995, Mark Wigley proposed how this agenda has been constructed by an overlooked practice, which occupies a vital role in the architectural milieu. Wigley equated the capacity of architecture to its capacity of storytelling with a straightforward statement: “Architecture is only ever discourse about building.”²⁵ While he recontextualizes the practices of architecture, he introduces a new mode of practicing; as not been elaborated as its written counterpart, the interactional, social transaction of ideas

²⁴ K. Michael Hays, "Architecture Theory, Media, and the Question of Audience," *Assemblage*, no. 27 (1995): 43.

²⁵ Mark Wigley, ""Story-Time",," *ibid.* Tulane Papers: The Politics of Contemporary Architectural Discourse: 82.

initially grounds the physical object, the building itself. He states that: “The basic politics of discourse is determined by our shared commitment to the proposition that architecture is a unique kind of object in our culture because it in some way both precedes and enables discourse. When a building becomes architecture by talking – yes, that’s all architecture is, the talking building, or the idea of the talking building- this talk supposedly comes out of the building itself.”²⁶ The architect, the inhabitant, or the passenger, anyone who is touched in any sense by the outcomes of architecting can expand the limits of the *archive* of the building. While any production of architecture can be considered as a self-referential sign, it may have objected to individual inquiries and become a text to be read for the upcoming. Since the concrete *text* of a building is fixed, however, its *con-text* has been in constant change. While the intrinsic relationship between the building and its context marks a threshold for the discourse that emerges out of it, the discursive production surpasses the material object that has been founded on and becomes a distinct entity within the cumulative “unities of discourse.” Therewith, the literacy of the contemporary (architectural) discourses is mandatory for the provision of *the Architecture*.

How we know what we know regarding architecture extends back to the scientific inquiry²⁷ and the status of architecture and its contiguous relationship to social sciences. When “science” is applied to the human realm, the “social” challenges the positivist canon in the philosophy of science centering the possibility of production of solid knowledge under “social sciences.” Although already described in several debates on scientific knowledge, positivism is a theoretical perspective that fulfills an epistemological positioning that idealized the knowledge depending on the factual evidence and numerical data held by observation, measurement, and experiment as the core of scientific inquiry. It is committed to empiricism and logical analysis

²⁶ Ibid., 83-84.

²⁷ The further inquiry for the nature of scientific knowledge within the study has been opened up by introducing the philosophy of science within the graduate course, The ARCH615 Architectural Research, Methods and Ethics course instructed by Prof. Dr. Zeynep Mennan.

motivated by the logic of discovery. In this setting, positivism posits that object/subject relation must be in a polar position where the world is externalized and designated as deterministic. The determinate reality can only be attained by a unique method of a scientific approach, and it is observable, measurable, and verifiable in the natural and social world. Following that, the positivist approach has overlapped empiricism, as both share an anti-metaphysical stance and assure the existence of only what is experienced. While it has been generally referred to as the opposite of the stance of positivism, the subjectivist epistemology designates that there are multiple realities dependent on the subjects who are embedded in various contexts. Although it seems individual-oriented, it is collective since social reality is based on consensus; an agreement made between different mindsets of different people. Hence, social reality is active and open to change, considering the heterogeneity of multiple belief systems, perspectives, and interpretations. Therefore, knowledge is created rather than discovered and is relative and transitional rather than absolute and situational. In convergence with the post-positivist approach, subjectivism unites experience-based research with theoretical reasoning, recurses to scientific methodologies trying to answer the entangled relationship between the world and the mind.

Architectural knowledge is a spatial endeavor to reconcile exposition between world and mind and reproduce through a narrative method with a peculiar alliance with history. The unfolding complexity inhered within the formation of “discursiveness” of architecture is interwoven into the history of its own discourse. In this context, when the twenty-first-century architectural discourse and its status in emergence are the foci, then it is inevitable not to recall Michel Foucault's methodological approach to the treatise of the history of ideas, widely referred to as Archaeology. Its projection describes a way of addressing history, through which a particular metatheoretical excavation is introduced into the historical repository of knowledge.

The written counterpart of that repository for architecture is ordered in categories under the scholarly work of architecture as architectural history, architectural theory, and architectural criticism. While the history and theory of architecture were

constituted under distinct disciplinary boundaries through centuries, over the last century, the conventional understanding of their status has been changed. The status of the history of architecture as principally seeking the archival truth has been displaced by the plural architectural histories. Moreover, the tradition regarding the theory of architecture as primarily setting the normative protocols for the discipline has been discharged, and the architecture theory became rather outspoken by the external world and the unfolding knowledge of it.

Through the hermeneutic tradition rising over the linguistic paradigm, the two spheres of history and theory are evolved as not only entangled into each other but also cultivated through levels of in-depth criticism. Andrew Leach frames the specificity of architectural history and its alliance with theory in his book “What is Architectural History?” noting that starting from the 1960s, theory came to define the more extensive critic-historical analysis of architecture.²⁸ The three-partite whole of history, theory, criticism is recognized as an outcome of the new milieu of intellectual and institutional settings that resulted in the late seventies. The introduction of the Doctor of Philosophy degree under the title of History, Theory, and Criticism of Architecture-Art, which is primarily granted by the Massachusetts Institute of Technology and the subsequent American schools of architecture, indicated a systemic fraction within the scholarship.²⁹ While architectural discourse disseminates through a guided organization that has been influential on the imminent polarization of theory and practice, yet their synthesis followed hermeneutic pluralism that has eased the sharpened edges of discursive and non-discursive productions of Architecture. The hermeneutic tradition seized the liquidated frontiers of History-Theory-Criticism; through that, the discursive reproductive mechanisms reached out to the systems of thoughts external to the architectural intrinsic. Within

²⁸ Andrew Leach, *What Is Architectural History?* (Cambridge, UK Malden: MA: Polity, 2010), 118.

²⁹ *Ibid.*, 123.

that novel unitary character of architectural discourse, the disciplinary practice of the history of architecture is further reviewed beyond its traditional conventions.

Any definition for architectural history refers to the condition of being definite, distinct, or clearly outlined, which is also valid for determining disciplinary specificities. The inquiry into what architectural history might be within the changing premises of “disciplinarity” also cannot fulfill a single definition but manifold, which is aspired to cover diverse approaches shaping the current discursive formation of the discipline itself. The new focus on epistemological questions regarding architectural history desolates the fortified limits of its boundaries, which are policed by the discipline of history that aims to sustain itself by the rehearsal of what is already known. The critique towards the traditional boundaries of the field is put forward by Dianne Harris: “The formation of academic disciplines took place long ago, and their boundary formations – despite nearly forty years of claims to interdisciplinarity- remains fairly intractable.”³⁰ As her statement accounts for the steady nature of the academic disciplines as well as the contested autonomy of architectural history, the projection of “critical engagements”³¹ into the architectural history renders the field as it conveys a specific disciplinary particularity while proposing a constant fluidity.

Aruna D’Souza exemplifies the changeover in art history by pointing to the shift in scholarly manners, which were formerly “unconvinced that the disciplinary frame of art history can ever be genuinely transformed to accommodate the noncanonical.”³² Therefore, problematizing the universal narrative of history dismantles the foci on

³⁰ Dianne Harris, "That's Not Architectural History! Or What's a Discipline For?," *Journal of the Society of Architectural Historians* 70, no. 2 (2011): 150.

³¹ E Altan Ergut and B. Turan Özkaya, "Mapping Architectural Historiography," in *Rethinking Architectural Historiography*, ed. D. Arnold, E.A. Ergut, and B.T. Ozkaya (London New York: Taylor & Francis, 2006), 6.

³² Aruna D'Souza, "Introduction," in *Art History in the Wake of the Global Turn*, ed. Aruna D'Souza Jill H. Casid (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 2014), ix.

the grand history and the authority of the genius architect. The approach that is seeking beyond the boundaries has revalued the historian, who was neglected in the cyclical theory of architecture. Revisiting the transformation of the status of architectural history within its own intellectual milieu reorients the relation between the historian and his/her production.

The historian's access to the meaning of the work is construed in conjunction with the diverse narrative structures of historiography. Nevertheless, by nineteenth-century historians, the historian's access to truth was believed that it is restrained by "the factual information," which provides an "archival *truth*."³³ "The myth of truthful reality," as coincided in "The Historian's Task" of Wilhelm von Humboldt, reiterates the precedence of factual accuracy as well as the masculinist denotations of the historian.

"The historian's task is to present what actually happened. The more purely and completely he [note 'he'] achieves this, the more perfectly has he solved this problem. A simple presentation is at the same time the primary indispensable condition of his work and highest achievement he will be able to attain. Regarded in this way, he seems to be merely receptive and productive, not active and creative."³⁴

The 'objective' historical narrative addresses architectural history as a passive container of empirical information involved in universalizing the conception of the historian and 'his' production. This narrative of architectural history narrows the suggestive nature of meaning and leads to the homogenization of historical knowledge. Dana Arnold abandons objectivity by offering a fertile ground of plurality formulated by heterogeneous consciousness that situates historical knowledge and meaning compounded in "local, discursive, and/or subject positions."

³³ Dana Arnold, *Reading Architectural History* (London & New York: Routledge, 2003), 3.

³⁴ Ibid.

“One of the principal concerns when considering of the nature of history is the question of subjectivity. Now the human knowledge is no longer viewed as being a stable and immutable – a kind of humanistic or enlightenment vision of the subject knowing both the world and itself- we define subjectivity as a state of flux and change. History, as a part of human knowledge, cannot then be seen as a solid ever-expanding discourse developing along generally accepted trajectories. We have dissembled these categories in order to question established principles of knowledge upon which historical thought is based.”³⁵

Questionings of the conventional representation of historical knowledge raise new challenges for methodological frameworks of architectural historiography. The critical paradigm engaged by architectural history posits a theoretical agenda. In searching to revise the grounds of historical knowledge and identify the role of the architectural historian, it constructs a strong position of self-critical progress of the discipline. Departing from the disciplinary limitations of architectural historiography, “the task of producing a dialogue between past and present”³⁶ is placed under critical scrutiny. At the moment, the task of the historian has slipped from the implementation of an authoritative/authoritarian strategy to dismantling the stable status of the past.

Since the objective reality mounted in the past remains illusionary, the theoretical reflections on the reconceptualization of architectural history present the reconstruction of the author. Then, rethought on the architectural historian necessitates deconstructing the relation of the historian and the historian’s access to historical knowledge, the objects of study. This approach is central to understanding that there is a motile space between the historian and the subject. Then, an architectural historian steps out of the privileged status and redevelops an identity of a potential reader who reads the life of the inter-production of architecture and other

³⁵ Ibid., 1.

³⁶ Ibid.

disciplines. Architecture, higher than “the architectural form of the building itself,” manifests complex interrelations with diverse formatives which makes it open to innumerable readings. Hence, architecture is rethought as a cultural fragment engaged in a broader comprehension of cultural, social, and political practices and opened to interpretation based on references other than itself.

“If we accept architecture as a cultural artifact, then we must also see its histories as a text open to variety of readings. The process of locating ‘the text’ within its appropriate contexts is not merely to provide an historiography, it is to begin the process of interpretation.”³⁷

Interpretative potentialities validate historical thinking in flux and constitute a fluid discourse covering a wider understanding of in-between past and present. The process of interpretation then leads the architectural historian to inquire about the reading of the archive of knowledge. The act of reading does not search for a truth that is fixed in time nor the conventional architectural-historical discourse; it refrains focusing on the ‘masterpiece’ and the intentions of the ‘genius’ architect. However, it instead seeks to decipher the dispersed meanings unconcealed in the past, which is only possible by interpretation. Consequently, the production of historiography is not a mere ‘history’ but ‘histories’ which is outside the canonical configurations.

Considering architectural history in place of history of architecture, the archive open to reading serves a broader range of material scattered around the building. This so-called second archive formed by journals, diaries, household accounts, and more tied in any form to the discipline of architecture call attention to the interrelations between them.

“By reading architecture as a text we can identify ideological debates and issues that emerge in an interdisciplinary study through which we can

³⁷ Ibid., p.7.

understand the relationships between cultural practices and artifacts at various points in time.”³⁸

Regarding architecture’s interconnectedness with other disciplines, the role of a reader is to situate his/her interpretation firmly in an interdisciplinary ground and put across the relative values engaged with economic, social, and political contexts inside and outside of geographical boundaries. Therefore, multiculturalism and hybridization root in the basis of such interrogations of transcultural genealogies.

Reading the context tangled to architectural objects ensures intersections of different narratives, which are made explicit and central. The reconceptualization of what architectural history means sheds light on “propositions- things offered for consideration, points to be discussed, statements that can be believed, doubled, or denied, issues to be addressed, prompts that motivate practice”³⁹ as Aruna D’Souza characterized. Nancy Stieber points out in parallel in her introduction to “Learning from Interdisciplinarity,” “the objective of an interdisciplinary yet autonomous architectural history is to *reveal* the often unarticulated ways that architecture embodies how people have lived, thought and worked.”⁴⁰

The latent values that are present but unrevealed are at the foci of elucidation within the reformation of architectural historiography. Within the fragments of history, notions such as ethnicity, race, and gender as well as globalism, transnationality, locality, geopolitical hierarchies are situated in subject positions and foregrounded in specific discursive contexts. However, they are not, above all, considered as inert materials that are added to the existent of architectural history. To illustrate, the debates of such reflections on postcolonial challenges to architectural history designates a particular connection to reinterpreting the discourse. Thus, it is not a

³⁸ Ibid.

³⁹ D’Souza, "Introduction," xxi.

⁴⁰ Nancy Stieber, "Introduction," *Journal of the Society of Architectural Historians* 64, no. 4 (2005): 418.

revisionist project as Dana Arnold indicates, not the revision of canon by widening its concerns. Therefore, reconceptualizations of architectural history arouse questioning around unattended discourses by orienting critical consciousness. It is not about finding new objects of analysis embedded in the rewriting of histories, as Dana Arnold underlines. The indifference with rewriting history with simple attachments of the forgotten or repressed contributions of ‘the others’ is retheorizing history by a new awareness that simultaneously leads to new grounds.⁴¹

2.2 Periodicity and Emergence

When Foucault introduces the ancient “certain Chinese Encyclopedia” as a pretext for the introductory part of the preface of *Order of Things*, he refers to the ever-expanding boundaries of imagination and how the discursive constituents somehow fit into particular classification and taxonomy disclosing the hidden web of correlations.

“In the wonderment of this taxonomy, the thing we apprehend in one great leap, the thing that, by means of the fable, is demonstrated as the exotic charm of another system of thought, is the limitation of our own, the stark impossibility of thinking that.”⁴²

⁴¹ Reframing the disciplinarity of architectural history has been argued through the scholarly background attained from the graduate course offered in the program of History of Architecture, The AH601 Critical Review in Architectural History, instructed by Prof. Dr. Belgin Turan Özkaya.

⁴² Michel Foucault, *The Order of Things* (Taylor & Francis, 2018), xvi.

Taxonomy then is seen as a device that solidifies our endless imagination into a system of thought, which becomes measurable in comparison to the incommensurability of the mind.

“In every culture, between the use of what one might call the ordering codes and reflections upon order itself, there is the pure order experience of order and its modes of being.”⁴³

The propinquity sought within the sites of Chinese knowledge makes sure that order exists through cultural formations as well. The constitution of the order between the same and the other brings forward the inquiries of scientific and philosophical knowledge and the possibility to produce new knowledge out of the ones that seem irrelevant, representing them in philological means, which actually leads to an expansion in the discourse.

“The monstrous quality that runs through Borges’s enumeration consists, on the contrary, in the fact that the common ground on which such meetings are possible has itself been destroyed. What is impossible is not the propinquity of the things listed, but the very site on which their propinquity would be possible.”⁴⁴

This site can be represented to architecture as its totality, which the built environment has erected amidst the propinquity of causes other than itself. Making things visible through the power of language also can create illusions, even order illusions. Therefore, for “architectural knowledge,” the overall discursive structure is needed to be sieved through a logical coherency, which refines the multiplicity of signs involved in the cyclical mechanism of hermeneutic production and reproduction. Stanford Anderson, in his 1984 dated article, “Architectural design as a system of

⁴³ Ibid.

⁴⁴ Ibid.

research programmes,” asserted: “If we are to conduct ‘design research’, it seems we must seek to reveal the orderliness which we can be brought to human action.”⁴⁵

“Order is, at one and the same time, that which is given in things as their inner law, the hidden network that determines the way they confront one another, and also that which has no existence except in the grid created by a glance, an examination, a language; and it is only in the blank spaces of this grid that order manifests itself in depth as though already there, waiting in silence for the moment of its expression.”⁴⁶

The definition of order can be projected onto what is underlying discourse. In parallel to Foucault's portrayal of the grid as a potential guide to embark the representative capacity of its formation, discourse can analogically denote a constellation projected onto the celestial sphere. It is an imaginary/abstract sphere of infinite extent onto which cosmic objects are projected and depicted in mythological narration. Discourse can be framed as a constellation of words and texts corresponding with the Foucauldian grid, which are open to the readership to unfold into imagery. Hence, a discourse has been determined by the particular connection of its pieces pursued in continuity and coherency and an emerging specificity. The coherence within the revisionary nature of discourse advances the construction of new meanings. The meanings and objects are welded seamlessly into the existing order, which is synchronously decomposed and recomposed by opening them to subjective positions. Therefore, the position of scholarly research for architecture is to constitute a restructured totality ordered out of a myriad of matters expressed in diverse mediums that are dispersed in the infinite sphere of language. Any research reaches significance only if this relational network is patterned and proposed for the interlocutor newly as a base for the ever-expanding dialogue, which entails a precise

⁴⁵ Stanford Anderson, "Architectural Design as a System of Research Programmes," *Design Studies* 5, no. 3 (1984): 146.

⁴⁶ Foucault, *The Order of Things*, xxi.

selection and repositioning of the preceding arguments. In “The order of things: an archaeology of the human sciences,” Michel Foucault straightforwardly proposed that:

“to show that discourse is not a slender surface of contact, or confrontation, between a reality and a language (langue), the intrication of a lexicon and an experience; I would like to show with precise examples that in analyzing discourses themselves, one sees the loosening of the embrace, apparently so tight, of words and things, and that emergence of a group of rules proper to discursive practice . . . A task that consists of not – of no longer- treating discourses as groups of signs (signifying elements referring to contents or representations) but as practices that systemically form the objects of which they speak. Of course discourses are composed of signs; but what they do is more than use these signs to designate things.”⁴⁷

The sphere of architecture read as a “text” has multiple surfaces of contact between its sub-disciplinary constituents roughly sketched as discursive and non-discursive practices. Nevertheless, its unitary discourse turns into the architecture materialized scholarly as a “text” only through “enunciation.” “The enunciative function” is the theoretical construction that a set of signs has evolved into a statement defined in a capacity, which itself constitutes a relation under the name of an author.

The first thing to underline is the analytical approach held for “discursive structures” established in his seminal book *The Archaeology of Knowledge*. Through his method, Foucault validates inquiries regarding what makes a particular group of statements/ enunciations/ spoken or unspoken formations of discourse as unified; what extent things can be involved; what kind of decision mechanisms have been exercised; or how a body of knowledge can be pulled out of an endless accumulation

⁴⁷ *The Archaeology of Knowledge and the Discourse on Language*, trans. A. M. Sheridan Smith (New York: Pantheon Books, 1972), 48-49.

in the field. The approach presents a prescriptive inquiry into the history of knowledge by seeking certain events in the accumulation of time. These events have discursively been compiled within the conceptual boundaries of “discontinuity, rupture, threshold, limit, series, and transformation.”⁴⁸ However, before that, Foucault offers "a negative work" to be realized; that approach initially construes the theme of continuity and leaves the subject of discontinuity in suspense by deciphering the phenomenon of the same to isolate the differences, distinctions, and divisions accurately within the discourse to be tracked down among similarities. This expedition into the history of architectural discourse brings out notions of periodicity and emergence concerning the theorization of architecture's engagement with the past and the present.

Sanford Kwinter, in his book *Architectures of Time: toward a theory of the event in modernist culture*, noted the comprehension of “time problem” and the complexities of contemporary thought and its incommensurable premises and guided an awareness towards the up to date and its processes behind.⁴⁹

“We might say that novelty is simply a modality, a vehicle, by or through which something new appears in the world. It is that ever-fresh endowment that affirms a radical incommensurability between what happens at any given instant and what follows. ... all change is change over time; no novelty appears without becoming, and no becoming without novelty. But more important, setting out to think about novelty, or “the new,” might provide a way to revive our presently atrophied capacities of acting -practically, ethically, and politically- in this world, a world whose scope and complexity have effectively passed beyond grasp and measure. It is, in other words, our capacity actively to engage the *processes* of contemporary reality, a capacity that by most accounts is today so menacingly at stake, that

⁴⁸ Ibid., 21.

⁴⁹ Sanford Kwinter, *Architectures of Time: Toward a Theory of the Event in Modernist Culture* (MIT Press, 2002), 5.

might itself brought into relief here, grasped, interrogated, and perhaps transformed.”⁵⁰

Therefore, it is crucial to discern the current “period eye,” the premises of a new world, which is more porous, less bounded, less fixed, addressing the global premises. However, what do “the global processes of contemporary reality” mean for the architectural domain? The drastic change in scale of the worldwide web of things brought fundamental transformations into the program of life, the roots of which dwell in space as Foucault suggests: “Space is fundamental in any form of communal life; space is fundamental in any exercise of power.”⁵¹ Can Architecture confront the realities that are restructured in the era of the annihilated boundaries, destabilized hierarchies, and the new mechanisms of exercising power not only by solitary theoretical anxiety but also through its bodily existence dominating the urban space? Or does Architecture need another critical distance stagnant to the emergent, situated in periodicity?

Concerning the change in the method approaching history, it is essential to note that architectural knowledge also expands through its own historiography. When the excavation is taken into *the history of Architecture’s own discourse*, the theoretical specificity within architectural knowledge rises to prominence. The scholarly work in architecture seeks concentric frames to articulate genuine statements and propositions, which are voiced over the plenary archive of the discourse. The last three decades of architectural theory have been put forward as a correspondent, witnessing the professional crisis unraveling one after the other. The historiography regarding the architecture theory has become available through the anthologies published in sequence following the 1990s onwards. Specifically, the last half of the

⁵⁰ Ibid.

⁵¹ Michel Foucault, ““Space Knowledge and Power” Interview by Paul Rabinow in Skyline,” Rizzoli Communications, Inc., <https://foucault.info/documents/foucault.spaceKnowledgePower/>.

nineties has gestated two seminal anthologies mapping that period from the turning point of the sixties till the new millennium. Those are 1996 dated “Theorizing a New Agenda for Architecture: An Anthology of Architectural Theory 1965 – 1995” edited by Kate Nesbitt and the 1998 dated “Architecture |Theory | since 1968” edited by K. Michael Hays. At the same time, the sixties initiated the new reign of theory over practice, the *postmodern* critique mosaicking over modernism has provided a great repertoire of reflections on the state of discipline. “Theory” became a procedure instating thematic oration.

Moreover, through their textual position towards the subject matter, the anthologies constructed the reception of discipline over periodic imageries. Then, how the diagnosis peculiar to the present time regarding the architectural sphere can be established beyond the paradigmatic historical renderings? The continuum and change in the content have been tied with an indissoluble bond; hence the historical analysis is indispensable for meaning-making and its multivalent expedition. In “Notes on Narrative Method in Historical Interpretation,” Hays defined history as “the black hole you can never see but which nevertheless controls the wobbles and trajectories of all the things (like buildings and texts and cities and landscapes) that we historians and theorists care about.”⁵² He sees periodization as a method, a referral source for the epistemic contact in historical disparities of a condition that makes connecting the similar or the discontinuous possible.⁵³ The contrast of change and continuity being innate in any historical process is likewise a settled context for architectural diagnosis. Nevertheless, thinking and writing on Architecture again need to follow an inferential course on the nature of periodicity and emergence already discussed in philosophy other than architecture. To describe reality in terms of historical interpretation, one needs to be literate of the rate of change, discerning

⁵² K. Michael Hays, "Notes on Narrative Method in Historical Interpretation," *Footprint*, no. Trans-disciplinary (Autumn 2007): 23.

⁵³ *Ibid.*, 27.

the deviations from the sameness that stands for continuity, as Gerschenkon illustrated the notion of continuity as a set of tools for the historian:

“What makes continuity as periodicity a worthwhile tool of historical analysis is manageable length of the periods and also the fact that periodicity requires abstraction and generalization: a certain complex of phenomena must be pared out from the mass of kindred historical tissue. It is precisely the finding of similarities amidst the differences, of recurrences amidst the novelties, that requires the historian in each case to explore the limits separating the former from the latter. So viewed periodicity in history is an object of very unmonotonous study.”⁵⁴

The symptomology of architecture is needed to be recognized to deal with the unmonotonous study, not by just reading the margins of the agenda but contending with the methods and concepts elaborated. In the early 2000s, the anthologies of the previous decade set the base for further articles and publications to present general explications and inferences about architecture's current dispositions and its ties with time and its interdisciplinarity in change. Beyond the timely thematization, in other words, periodization, the plurality of methods and approaches presented over themes embedded in periodicities opened up further arguments on the contemporary accounts of how architecture theory is conditioned, which pursued the metatheoretical cartography. The conceptual pluralism that has invaded the theoretical discourse gave rise to a bilateral reaction for both the dissolution and the consolidation of architecture. The renewed lenses triggering hermeneutic circle within architectural writing under the postmodern category brought out mistrust regarding the interdisciplinary conceptualization of architecture, which initiated an idiosyncratic identity crisis imprinted on different levels of history and theory of architecture. The responses to that constitute another unity of discourse on the description of disciplinary signifiers. In “Architecture: Theory, Interdisciplinarity,

⁵⁴ Alexander Gerschenkron, "On the Concept of Continuity in History," *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society* 106, no. 3 (1962): 202.

and Methodological Eclecticism,” Mario Carpo calls the readers attention to Manfredo Tafuri's stance regarding the perpetual methodological correction: “to those who would accuse us of methodological eclecticism, we would answer that they are incapable of accepting the transitional (and thus ambiguous) role that even today is assumed by a discipline as multiform and disorganized as architecture.”⁵⁵ The heterogeneity in Architecture is still valid that the crisis rhetoric on the shores of discipline has never been left. The question of how we proceed with architecture theory is still now in place.

“Dialectical interpretation is always retrospective, always tells the necessity of an event, why it had to happen the way it did. To do that, the event must have already come to an end. ... The past has to be written as the determinant of the present so that the present can also be a past for a future.”⁵⁶

Defining emergent discursive enunciation within a timely manner requires hard work as compared to any conceptual frame drawn outside, entailing a lively connection with the present more than even the recent past. Therefore, expanding the philosophical identification of the concept of emergence can enlighten an alternative in taking a position for the currencies and dependencies of the architecture sphere.

“Emergence has been "defined in philosophy in terms of three characteristics, (1) that some substance, entity, property or system β is dependent for its existence upon some other substance, entity, property or system α ; (2) that dependency implies some form of covariance where fundamental changes in α mean fundamental changes in β ; and (3) that the form, operation and consequences of β cannot be reduced to α . Thus, though (1) and (2) imply some form of relation that may perhaps be conceptualised as non-constant conjunction, or irregular, and/or multiply realisable causation, (3)

⁵⁵ Mario Carpo, "Architecture: Theory, Interdisciplinarity, and Methodological Eclecticism," *Journal of the Society of Architectural Historians* 64, no. 4 (2005): 426.

⁵⁶ Hays, "Notes on Narrative Method in Historical Interpretation," 24.

makes the form of disjuncture between α or β such that β cannot be translated, explained or predicted from α alone.”⁵⁷

Accordingly, the task of a researcher or historian has a critical role in distinguishing the true relationalities dispersed on the spectrum of temporal critical distance and momentary emergence. For architecture theory, rather than seeking an approach of critical distance manifested in discursive analyses, one may follow the circumstances that can be articulated in the time of its occurrence as Foucault suggests: “discourse must not be referred to the distant presence of origin, but treated as and when it occurs.”⁵⁸

2.3 Value and Validation⁵⁹

The debate on “matter,” initially a philosophical phenomenon, has its own intellectual historiography crossing the borders of artistic and architectural practices at times. The “matter” straddles the line between *materia* and *idea*, the significance of which is context-dependent and diachronic. Correspondingly, a paradigm shift regarding the “matter” becomes visible through the mutual appropriation of any possible metamorphism concerning both *materia* and *idea*. For art and architecture of the last century, a discursive fracture or, to put in another way, a theoretical consciousness was hinged to the transmutation of the modes of conventional

⁵⁷“ Emergence,” in Hartwig, *Dictionary of Critical Realism*, 166.

⁵⁸ Foucault, *The Archaeology of Knowledge and the Discourse on Language*, 25.

⁵⁹Günce Eşingen Kınayoğlu, “Towards the Relata of Art|Architecture|Theory: ‘Contemporary’ Matters In-Between Value and Validation,” in the book; Abbas, GM.; Acar, S.; Bancı, S.; Çağlar, N.; Ruhi-Sipahioğlu, I.; Yılmaz, B. (eds.); (2020). *MateriART: Architectural Design, Research, and Technology*, Lisbon: Caleidoscopio. (ISBN: 978-989-658-668-3 (Accepted to be published, yet publication postponed due to Covid measures.)

production, which the part aims to highlight by period-specific portrayals. These involve a depth of analysis towards “what really matters,” concentrating on the relationality between value and validation projected onto “*relāta*,” a Latin word denoting to the objects related by a relationship, and their transcendence into the theoretical contours of art and architecture in general.

The work of contemporary theorists relies on the relationality between the production of art|architecture and the trajectory of an ongoing worldview. The intellectual shift and its transformative potential circulate and become solid through a new discursive formation following a closure of indefinite enunciative struggle to identify the dormant orientations within the materiality of art|architecture. The rupture from dominant modes of *māteria*, *idea*, or both have articulated within a peculiarly isolated discourse, which found itself a place as "turns" or "paradigms" in disciplinary authorities such as the cases for the linguistic turn, the postmodern turn, the digital turn, etc. These evolutionary cycles immediately reproduce themselves through the theoretical challenges underlying de-reification. De-reification is a constitutive conceptual apparatus for this study, which suggests the disentanglement of any relationship into its *relāta* that assigns the current value and validity to the milieu of art|architecture. In other words, what matters is confined through the dialectics between the changed features of *relāta*.

Following the discursive shifts that have occurred parallel in art|architecture theory, this study aims to focus on the causal exploration behind the ontological recognition of art|architecture. Through the displacements of the *relāta* and its discharged validation, the quest on "value" produces an expanding material for the art|architectural criticism and theory. Consequently, any scholarly endeavor necessitates historical contextualization to read the non-discursive cartographies through a critical distance. K. Michael Hays, in “Notes on Narrative Method in Historical Interpretation,” highlights the intrigue relation between theory and history since both have inherited the inert substances of each other to accord the reality. He states:

“Theory takes history as its subject matter, and there can be no writing of history without theory. The more theory, the more access to history. Theory is the practice that produces concepts and categories to map the Real of History. So the practice of theory will ultimately have to deal with some versions of the Imaginary and the Symbolic, since in this schema, these are the orders that attempt to manage and make sense of the Real.”⁶⁰

Therefore, the 1990s is approached as a coherent historical period in which there had been conceived parallel trajectories. Beyond the distinct conventional biases that were established to validate the matter of art, architecture, and architecture theory, these detours have indeed redrawn the disciplinary boundaries for each.

Thus, mapped respectively through art|architecture|theory, the intention in this triangulation is to identify the common ontological convergence over the quest on what matter is and what it matters. As the first node, the altered relationship of art and its object has been proposed as in the case that has been grounded by the art philosopher and critic Arthur C. Danto and his three-decade-long investigation on art over Andy Warhol’s 1964 dated exhibition. In 1964, Andy Warhol truly replicated the original packaging of a box of Brillo Soap Pads by screenprinting ink onto the wood and exhibited towering the boxes of ‘much the same’ supermarket cartons at the Stable Gallery in New York. “Brillo Box is a work of art, unlike the Brillo box in the store, which looks essentially similar.”⁶¹ The exhibition gained vast attention in the art world and kept busy the agendas of art critics in a long period questioning how to locate the mimicked Brillo Boxes within acute criticism crossing over the established art history. Arthur C. Danto situated a radical perspective over boxes with consumer product logos printed on, suggesting a philosophical inquiry

⁶⁰ Hays, "Notes on Narrative Method in Historical Interpretation," 23.

⁶¹ David Carrier, "Arthur Danto on Andy Warhol's Brillo Box," <http://www.warhol.org/arthur-danto-on-andy-warhols-brillo-box/>.

above the criticism's mainstream, asking what made it art? What was the matter? And in 1964, just after the exhibition, in *The Journal of Philosophy*, Danto had a prelude for "The Artworld:"

"What in the end makes the difference between a Brillo box and a work of art consisting of a Brillo box is a certain theory of art. It is theory that takes it up into the world of art, and keeps it from collapsing into the real object which it is. [Warhol's Brillo boxes] could not have been art fifty years ago. The world has to be ready for certain things, the artworld no less than the real one. It is the role of artistic theories, these days as always, to make the artworld, and art, possible."⁶²

However, what Brillo Box has signaled constituted Danto's investigation on art for the following thirty years since the relata of art, and its percept has irreversibly changed. A fundamental question towards the very definition of art is occupied the core in his famous book published in 1997, *After the End of Art*. That search for re-identification of art has turned out a very outstanding thesis stating anything could be art, which fulfills the artistic freedom that ceased from any historical validation. The original mattered for centuries has been discharged for the identical, which in turn has afflicted the very ground matter of art. He declared the shifted status of art as "the Post-Historical Period of Art" and believed that "*there is no reason for it to come to an end*. Art can be externally dictated to, in terms either of fashion or of politics, but internal dictation by the pulse of its own history is now a thing of the past."⁶³ His statement commenced a break-out of art's very own containment, yet the very end of art.

Danto has his theory of the end of art superimposed on Hegels' End of Art thesis, which was constituted in the early nineteenth century. In Hegel's philosophy, art's

⁶² Arthur C. Danto, "The Artworld," *The Journal of Philosophy* 61, no. 19 (1964): 581.

⁶³ *Beyond the Brillo Box: The Visual Arts in Post-Historical Perspective* (University of California Press, 1998), 9.

death has been postulated over the deviation of the Romanticist narration of art towards the conception of Reason. The supra-status of art over philosophy is withered away; the formal law of art once seen as the only condition for the aesthetic has dissolved into a state of freedom. Eventually, artists have become liberated from the preset roles and constraints of art practice inherited through Romanticism⁶⁴ and lost their heroic characterization depicted within art history. Now, flown through the spirit of the time, “the whole internal logic of the history of art culminates in an absolute artistic freedom.”⁶⁵ In Hegel's moment, what has been transformed through the epoch was the relationship between “the vehicle of art and its meaning.”⁶⁶ Yet, for the artworld posterior a century, art has almost lost its vehicle and equated to its essence, the philosophy. “All there is at the end is theory, art having finally become vaporized in a dazzle of pure thought about itself, and remaining, as it were, solely as the object of its own theoretical consciousness.”⁶⁷

The end of art thesis situated within the nineties coexisted with a fraction in art's decent mode of production; that radically contested the ontology of art and the understanding behind its aesthetic value. The echoes of Brillo Box have been placed alongside the conflict of original versus identical; Andy Warhol brought pressure to the ontological boundaries of art even destroyed its ontological content. Brillo Box became the capitalist conquest of mechanical reproduction over uniqueness, originality, and authenticity, which were nothing, but the premises of the aesthetic value drawn within art history treatise.⁶⁸ The breach of art indeed embodied the

⁶⁴ "Hegel's End-of-Art Thesis (1999)," in *A New History of German Literature*, ed. Anton Kaes Hans Ulrich Gumbrecht, Joseph Leo Koerner, Dorothea E. von Mücke (Cambridge, Massachusetts; London, England: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2014).

⁶⁵ Ibid.

⁶⁶ Ibid.

⁶⁷ “The End of Art”, in *The Philosophical Disenfranchisement of Art* (Columbia University Press, 1986), 110-11.

⁶⁸ Ali Artun, "Sanatın Sınırları" (paper presented at the 12. Ulusal Sanat Sempozyumu: Değişen Paradigmalar ve Sanatta Sınır Deneyimler, Ankara, 2018).

breach of history, and it was a way beyond the declaration of artistic freedom. The slippery ground has been put within what Danto has underlined, as “the definition [of art] itself had become attenuated to the point where pretty much anything could be a work of art.”⁶⁹ He further exemplified his argument: “Once art had ended, you could be an abstractionist, a realist, an allegorist, a metaphysical painter, a surrealist, a landscapist, or a painter of still life or nudes. You could be a decorative artist, a literary artist, an anecdotalist, a religious painter, a pornographer.”⁷⁰

What Danto further embraced points out a demarcation from determinism on form. What has been brought with the end of art narration through the nineties was beyond the conception of style or an expression of the spirit of the age. It was so powerful that it constructed its discourse as the end of cycles; indeed, what has been pointed at was an age of relative values, which forced the ontological core of art to be disentangled; hence it could be reconstructed beyond being paradigm-bound. He depicted the art world after the end of art as stated: “If everyone goes off in different directions, there is no longer a direction toward which a narrative can point. It is a wholesale case of living happily ever after. And that, have claimed, is the state of art world after the end of art.”⁷¹

Parallel to the debate intersecting art with philosophy, architecture has also already been dealing in a period liberated from its historical ties; the post-historical era of architecture perched right on the binary opposition of modernism/ postmodernism. In the meantime, when Danto wrote defending essays on his theory of the end of art on how artistic practice lost its own progressive ideology, architecture was just on the verge of the digital revolution searching the contours of its technical lore. Mario Carpo, in his book *The Alphabet and the Algorithm*, addresses the shifted status of

⁶⁹ Danto, *Beyond the Brillo Box: The Visual Arts in Post-Historical Perspective*, 40.

⁷⁰ *Ibid.*, 9.

⁷¹ "The End of Art: A Philosophical Defense," *History and Theory* 37, no. 4 (1998): 128.

architecture as: “Any revolution, even a technical one, by definition changes the course of history, but this one had no clearly identifiable, preexisting course of history to refer or call into question... it had no preset destination: no target, as it were, and *almost no end in mind*.”⁷² Carpo’s rendering of architecture, as its digital turn has no historical referees, is analogous to what has been advocated for the post-historical period of art and its continuum.

The liberation from the existing modes of practice of designing and building through emerging technologies has challenged the architect’s relationship with time since any possible number of outputs for one single architectural task can be produced. Architecture has stepped into the endless number of variable prescriptions, while only one could be executed in the real world. “The modern power of identical has come to an end with the rise of digital technologies.”⁷³ Therefore, architecture has come to the point that its conventional *relāta*, the identical, now has been substituted with the variable. The unfolded virtual technologies imposed new visions on contemporary practice that made possible formal freedom beyond any technical validation.

To illustrate, Ben van Berkel and Caroline Bos, the founders of the well-known Netherland architectural office, UN Studio, in their book *Move: Imagination*, outline their contemporary practice evolving around the invention of new operative design technics. Moreover, that has made the traditional debate on form much more contested than ever and nullified the probe of form as Berkel and Boss stated: “to redefine organizational structures means that if the information on which a building is based possess proportions that sounds right, it can take any form; blob or box – it doesn’t matter anymore,”⁷⁴ which opens up a quest on prospect aesthetic value.

⁷² Mario Carpo, *The Alphabet and the Algorithm* (MIT Press, 2011), 110-11.

⁷³ *Ibid.*, x.

⁷⁴ B. & Bos Berkel, C. , *Move* (Amsterdam: UN Studio & Goose Press, 1999).

While the materialized engagement of technology in architecture is seemed to challenge the traditional understanding of style, indeed, it proposed an emergent mode of production accompanying a co-emergent aesthetic. The interchanged form has initiated further inquiries for the theoretical causation underlying, which was undermining through the priority attached to form. Nevertheless, the contested status of the aesthetic value has challenged the ontological identification of architecture in the same way rendered for art. In this foreground, Lebbeus Woods points out the immateriality undermining behind the infinite formal exploration through the digital turn in his article "After Form." Woods reveals the disassociation of architecture into its mere materiality; as he states: "When anything is possible and built or imagined forms can be posited, distorted, combined and recombined ad infinitum, the idea of form itself is devalued. In that case, it is in its making no longer a discipline uniting thought, feeling, aspiration, and modes of social construction, but a manufacture of commodities, to be bought and traded as products."⁷⁵ The queried status of value and validation on artistic|architectural relata has inquiries on the ontological substance of fields, and as for the search of architecture beyond digital, the discursive formation around it once again ascertains the totality of architecture as Woods' concluding statement in his article: "After forms, we might say, comes architecture."⁷⁶ Architecture must revise the historical connection once established with the identical, now with the variable. The contemporary architecture was at the edge of a fracture that has rewritten the technical logic beneath its roots, and contemporary discourse again turned back the fundamentals of architecture to intuit any symptoms that will possibly reconstruct the nature of architecture's very own being. The change within the architectural profession in the early 1990s has been put by Carpo around that seminal problematic whether it is a "paradigm shift." And of it is, which

⁷⁵ Lebbeus Woods, "After Forms," *Perspecta* 38 (2006): 131.

⁷⁶ *Ibid.*, 132.

architectural paradigm is shifting?⁷⁷ The articulated discourse is now solidified on the problematic of ontological identification of architecture.

Coextending the subject of this study to the third node of triangulation Art|Architecture|Theory, concurrent with the former two, the seminal anthology of architecture theory, *Architecture | Theory since 1968*, as edited by K. Michael Hays, has been published just in 1998. Described as a “reconstruction of the history of architecture theory,”⁷⁸ it has reviewed the extended field of architecture and mapped architecture’s encounter and engagement with different discourses in relation. The book has drawn out the lines of the intellectual history of architecture and uncovered a period when the textual productions of architecture have become prominent as theory has been put in place of practice. Hays explains the shift in architectural production as: “theory is an appetite for modifying and expanding reality, a desire to organize a new vision of a world perceived as unsatisfactory or incomplete.” The discursive expedition that architecture took since the 1960s onwards nourished speculative research on architecture not only through authored expatiation but also through organizing intelligentsia. An influential representative of an architectural agency, Anyone Corporation, an architectural think-tank established in New York, has contributed to the Anglo-American architectural discourse between 1991-2000. The intellectual milieu pursued the strong sense of an architectural community and consolidated their agency with international conferences and exhibitions but, more importantly, with circulated publications, the annual ANY books, and the bi-monthly magazine ANY. The intention to disseminate the critical approach onto architecture during the nineties has been associated with former intellectual movements of the twentieth century, which is remembered by their organizational collectivity and their will to share their “new” statements to the public. Reminiscent of 1910s’ Futurists,

⁷⁷ Carpo, *The Alphabet and the Algorithm*, ix.

⁷⁸ K. Michael Hays, *Architecture Theory since 1968* (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2000), xii.

1920s' CIAM; OSA, 1930s' Razionalismo Italiano, 1950s' Team X, 1960s' Archigram; Metabolists; Tendenza, it was 1990s' ANY. Each year, in different locations around the world, they held themed conferences as the core of Anyone project, which later turned into ten annual volumes of a book series titled as one of the any- words of the English lexicon; *anytime, anyone, anywhere...* However, ANY completed their decade-long association announcing of the tenth and final volume, which has been ironically named as *Anything*; quoting from overview of the book: "At a time when the fragmented ideas and styles in architecture make it seem as if 'anything goes,' Anything asks whether there are constraints to thought and action that change 'anything' to 'the thing.'" ⁷⁹ In that terms, as this study postulates, for the third node of triangulation – for the absolute discourse as well- the *relāta* of architecture theory has become everchanging. Therefore, architecture theory has freely ceased an intrinsic validation, and its expanding territories have no end.

What is intrinsic to architecture has been dislocated by what is extrinsic to the discipline, which unsettled the inherited disciplinary value and validation, *de novo*, the ontology of architecture. "Matter" re-informs the problem of contextualization and reification in art and architecture theory since "matter" expands in-between *māteria* and *idea*. "Contemporary" matters are emerged out of turbulence by the displacement of *relāta* and its correlation to value and validation. Their contested status draws a mutual ontological identification spanning the portrayals of art|architecture|theory. The mutual transformation of both *māteria* and *idea* coexist with paradigm shifts unfolding in response to the prospective restructuring of the fields, these portrayals inquiries about what matters ontologically.

⁷⁹ From the MIT Press overview on the book *Anything* edited by Cynthia C. Davidson (2001). Retrieved February 19, 2020, from <https://mitpress.mit.edu/books/anything>

2.4 The Intersubjective ‘Percept’ and its Ahistorical Essence

Architectural discourse in unceasing ramifications is a reservoir of endless "percept" of Architecture. The contemporary scholarly work of architecture as the field of architectural thinking and research subjectifies "architecture" as a mental construct.

However, until the second half of the twentieth century, architecture was illustrated systemically as a material construct right from the outset of classical antiquity significantly through The Western architecture theory, as marked by well-known architecture treatises; foremost, Vitruvius's Ten Books on Architecture and Alberti's On Architecture. These definitive seminal ventures determined Architecture through standards, principles, prescriptions, and directives. The given clear-cut definitions specified the work of architecture, scripted the role of the architect, hence guided the premises of the practice. The existent pursuit of the relation between philosophy and architecture is cultivated by inheritance from that philosophical foundationalist origin innated within those primary sources on architecture. The pioneer intellectual context equated the caliber of architecture with its scientificity resourced as reasoning and causation. As the very concrete example of that origin, Vitruvius presented the reassurance of architecture as in the following statement:

“In all matters, but particularly in architecture, there are these two points:—the thing signified, and that which gives it its significance. That which is signified is the subject of which we may be speaking; and that which gives significance is a demonstration on scientific principles.”⁸⁰

The architecture's key treatises proposed a determinist constitution regarding the very corporeal of architecture and construed a comprehensive map of

⁸⁰ V. Pollio and M.H. Morgan, *Vitruvius: The Ten Books on Architecture* (Dover Publications, 1960).

commensurable definitions, leaning its back against science. However, by the 18th century, the core of the quest on what constitutes architecture has been hauled off the mere materiality and practicality by the introduction of Etienne- Louis Boullée's pioneering highlight on the *idea*:

"What is architecture? Shall I join Vitruvius in defining it as the art of building? Indeed, no, for there is a flagrant erroring this definition. Vitruvius mistakes the effect for the cause. In order to execute, it is first necessary to conceive... It is this product of the mind, this process of creation, that constitutes architecture..."⁸¹

Through Boullée's query, the architectural scholarship has lighted to refer to architecture as a conceptual whole. This totalistic imagery over architecture has become the milieu unifying its subsets of pursuit as the materialistic profession and the conceptual discipline. Further, the reception of this conceptual universal set of Architecture has varied in emergence yet situated around an "intersubjective" stance recurring in periodicity.

This shared subjectivity on architecture denotes the common understanding and apprehension of architecture's status re-situated in social, cultural, economic, or political constraints in a historicity-oriented framework. The sphere of architecture read as a text underlines a phenomenal orientation and assesses the limits of our knowledge on/of architecture. However, how architectural knowledge has been engendered advances an epistemic approach, which folds into the cognitive quest on how its own agency implies perceiving architecture concerning the external world and determines the perceptual beliefs on the architectural domain's currencies. In "The Predigreed Domain of Architecture: A View from the Cultural Margin," Nasser Rabbat underlines that "among the professional disciplines today, architecture is one

⁸¹ John Haldane, "Form, Meaning and Value: A History of the Philosophy of Architecture," *The Journal of Architecture* 4, no. 1 (1999): 10.

of the most dependent on an authoritative historical narrative for its self-definition.”⁸²

The knowledge of/on architecture is biased to the phenomenological specificity of making/experiencing architecture and elaborated in and recognized through architecture theory. The content of architectural theory deviates from the mere history and the criticism of architecture, so that theory augments the self-referential intervention on the state of architecture’s disciplinary association. Doubtlessly, the contemporary architecture theory has become the ground that orders the discursive treatise consonant to the seeking of positions regarding the specialties of discipline and the erratic reasoning- causation underlying. Yet, as Hanno Walter Kruft traces back to that resourceful contact between architecture and architecture theory in *A History of Architecture Theory from Vitruvius to Present* by claiming that “there is no simple causal relationship between architecture and architectural theory.”⁸³ In his article “Constructing Architecture Theory,” Samir Younes points out that classificatory thinking was initiated through Kant’s critiques of pure reason, practical reason, and judgment; however, architecture theory cannot amply counterpoise the systemic thinking constitutional in philosophy yet appropriates its contextuality. Younes states that the twenty-first-century reader envisages similar systemic thought of philosophy within architecture theory yet gets disappointed. “This is because much in architectural theory, especially since the eighteenth century is a polemic rather than a system of thought.”⁸⁴ The Interpretative impulse is so dominant that the content of architecture theory becomes explorative; natively, it traverses and plays within inconsistencies. That is the reason why the contemporary architecture theory has established its discursive regime inherently

⁸² Nasser Rabbat, "The Pedigreed Domain of Architecture: A View from the Cultural Margin," *Perspecta* 44 (2011): 6.

⁸³H.W. Kruft et al., *History of Architectural Theory* (Princeton Architectural Press, 1994), 17.

⁸⁴ Samir Younés, "Constructing Architectural Theory," *Philosophy* 78, no. 304 (2003): 245.

articulated with speculative thoughts. This framework recalls what Giorgio Agamben defines “experimentum linguae.” “Agamben proposes the necessity of an ‘experimentum linguae’ in which what is experienced is language itself, and the limits of language become apparent not in the relation of language to a referent outside of it, but in the experience of language as pure self-reference.”⁸⁵ The experience of language is compulsory for Architecture rather than its absolute object; therefore, hermeneutics does not seek that essence because the hermeneutical motive itself is the ahistorical essence. “Hermeneutics does not seek to find some pure, eternal *ahistorical essence* but rather to tap into the deepest roots of our inherited historical existence.”⁸⁶ Beneath its relative periodic theorizations for architecture, the “ahistorical essence” that retains must be the presence of philosophical reasoning biased to “architecture itself” in a historically changing world. In “Hermeneutics as Discourse in Design,” Alberto Pérez-Gómez also stresses the human determinant:

“If there is an ahistorical essence of architecture, it cannot be simply deduced from a collection of objectified buildings, theories, or drawings. The reality of architecture is infinitely more complex, both shifting with history and culture, and also remaining the same. It’s analogous to the human condition which demands that we address the same basic questions to come to terms with mortality and the possibility of transcendence opened up by language, while expecting diverse answers which are appropriate to specific times and places.”⁸⁷

The knowledge production in architecture, the construction of architecture theory, then depends on the intentionality of its agency about its conscious capacity, referring

⁸⁵ Catherine Mills, "Giorgio Agamben (1942–)," The Internet Encyclopedia of Philosophy, <https://iep.utm.edu/agamben/>.

⁸⁶ John D. Caputo, *Hermeneutics: Facts and Interpretation in the Age of Information* (Penguin Books, 2018), 37.

⁸⁷ Alberto Pérez-Gómez, "Hermeneutics as Discourse in Design," *Design Issues* 15, no. 2 (1999): 71.

architectural sphere as a unitary phenomenon. Then, the essence is admitted to the Hegelian definition: “The distinction Hegel made between essence and existence was a crucial one. Where existence referred to what actually exists, essence referred to what might yet come into being, a potentiality.”⁸⁸ The ahistorical essence is the “intersubjective percept” of architecture that does not reside in the past, but in the future, that does not dwell on what has been built retrospective but delves for what might have prospective.

⁸⁸ Alan How, *Critical Theory* (Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan, 2003), 4.

CHAPTER 3

A DISCIPLINE MISCAST/OUTCAST: ARCHITECTURE LODGED IN BETWEEN PREDICAMENT AND RESURGENCE

3.1 Diagnosing the “Aporia”: Crisis in the Imagery of Architecture

“to criticize means to call into crisis.”⁸⁹

“Philosophy becomes ‘political’ when it embraces aporia or the quandary proper to politics.”⁹⁰

The disciplinary relocation of architecture occurs reactively at times of crisis when the repositions regarding the present fundamentals of any institutional, political, social, cultural, or economic structures challenges to surface the implicit fallacies. When architecture status is questioned regarding those changing landscapes, architectural thinking and its critical capacity are way ahead as to reaction compared to the practice of building as the dominant mode of architectural production. Since the building practice as an object of everyday reality cannot advance *pari passu* with architectural thinking, an ideological crisis in the form of a self-critique transpires inevitably. The urgent call for a rethinking of architecture becomes a mediatory ground for understanding the complexities in which architecture is situated and solidifies its place within architecture theory as a constant theme that allows for valuable autogenous production in the discipline. Hence, the scholarly work of architecture displays specific definitional patterns posing an ever-relevant inquiry

⁸⁹ Roland Barthes, "Writers, Intellectuals, Teachers [1971] " in *A Roland Barthes Reader*, ed. Susan Sontag (London: Vintage, 1982), 379.

⁹⁰ Jacques Rancière, *Disagreement: Politics and Philosophy* (University of Minnesota Press, 1999), ix.

into architecture's current state. These cyclic renderings, divorced of their periodicities, share a common meta-ground introduced under the name of architecture diagnosis.

Diagnosis, a medical term indeed, is explained as “determination of the nature of a diseased condition; identification of a disease by careful investigation of its symptoms and history; also, the opinion (formally stated) resulting from such investigation.”⁹¹ Architecture diagnosis, then, is a close follow-up of any indication of what has been going wrong in every sphere that architecture has been cast to. However, in recurrence with every problematization that appeared inside architectural discourse, diagnosis, a steady-state itself, has been recently associated with the "contemporary" theory and the concurrent ill-state architecture. In “Some Thoughts on the Pathology of Architecture,” Michael Hays emphasized an approach for the post-contemporary:

“The work of the contemporary historian and contemporary theorist should be a kind of symptomology- a diagnosis of architecture as a complex response to or manifestation of some underlying social and historical condition...The symptomologist of architecture must deal with the unrepresented and even unrepresentable material that is outside the field of consciousness as well as the artifact itself.”⁹²

Every diagnostic scheme up to now is born into the medium of architecture writing and plotted under standpoint theories and themes when evaluated from a cosmic perspective. As has been noted before, the anthologies published in the last two decades undertook that task and mapped the conceptual correlations retrospectively.

⁹¹ “diagnosis.” OED Online. Oxford University Press, December 2021. Web.

⁹² K. Michael Hays, "Some Thoughts on the Pathology of Architecture," in *Architecture Is All Over*, ed. E. Choi and M. Trotter (Columbia Books on Architecture and the City, 2017), 31.

However, dealing with the uncertainties of the present and depicting an emerging phenomenon, in other terms diagnosing the live symptoms entails a task of sensing the changing trail in architecture characteristics responding to the external determinants, which is quite tricky; since the contemporary writer's path has not been single-track but twisted at junctions. The analytical procedure is needed to be determined whether in which track of the crossroad it is featured- the spatiality of the social relations or the socio-cultural readings of architectural formation. Even adequate of both, the architect-writer can only restructure the existing discourse by conceiving a unique intertextual addressee that disarticulates what has always been present yet uncharted.

While the desire to crystalize the intertextual portraiture of the socio-spatial has never been outdated in architectural discourse since 1968, when the celebration of theory over practice has once sown its seeds, it is the leaven that is on which philosophy may outgrow.

The already-there disciplinary crisis in architecture inherited from the bond with modernism has re-formulated in academia over theory's dissolution. The chronic crisis climate of discipline has interwoven into the new world's complexities, which are more porous, less bounded, and less fixed. Consequently, the disappointment ingrained in architectural thinking has once again intensified in framing the present. The quest for reasoning on the downfall has started to displace its focal depth from intangibles to tangibles— from the non-architectural to the architectural. The climax now indicates not the end of architecture's projected imageries but the end of its very being, which induced a lingual amendment in architectural discourse. The shift in addressing the disciplinary impasse has co-occurred a new crisis lexicon, introducing trauma, paralysis, pathology, and death. That transition indicates reasonably *the demise of "the demise of turns"* in architecture, a brand-new polemical project.

“Architecture is not an aesthetic and aesthetical ideality derived analogously to the concept of autonomous modern work of art. Architecture is an instrument and effect of instrumentalization of constituting the plural (according to Jean-Louis Lyotard), ideologically

reality between political censures and unconscious (according to Louis Althusser). Architecture is an event of specific critical social practices (theory of signifying practice according to subjectivity and rationality (psychoanalytical theories in Jacques Lacan tradition). Architecture is a material symptom of constituting the social-political (according to Frederic Jameson, Martin Jay, Slavoj Žižek, Boris Groys), sexual (diverse Freudian and Lacanian Traditions, cultural studies), customary (theorizing of archeology of knowledge according to Michel Foucault), technological (according to Jean Baudrillard, Paul Virilio, Felix Guattari) or artistic (according to Victor Burgin) discourse. Architecture is also polygonal of establishing relative cultural positions between civilization centers and margins (from Derrida's deconstruction of metaphysics to postcolonial critique studies by Edward Said.)"⁹³

“The reconstruction of the history of architecture theory” has opened the extended field of architecture to map its encounter and engagement with different discourses in relation. By drawing out the lines of architecture's intellectual history, theory has been put as a practice as, in the words of Hays' as aforementioned, “an appetite for modifying and expanding reality, a desire to organize a new vision of a world perceived as unsatisfactory or incomplete.”⁹⁴

However, the debate on the theoretical overproduction has exceeded the nineties' loci, recently Douglas Spencer, in the subchapter entitled “Architectural Theory From May 68 to the Real of the Market,” in his book “*Architecture of Neoliberalism: how contemporary architecture became the instrument of control and compliance*” debates theory's supremacy. The *demonic quality of theory*, in Spencer's words, is fused into the margins of contemporary architecture practice, which uses theory to

⁹³ Miško Šuvaković, "Architecture and Philosophy: Relations, Potentialities and Critical Points," *SAJ 4* (2012): 161.

⁹⁴ Hays, *Architecture Theory since 1968*, p.xiv.

legitimize its implicit neoliberal bias.⁹⁵ He constructs his argument on Francois Cusset's portrayal of "the madness of theory" of the late twentieth century. According to Cusset, "Theory as we most often understand it today is the name given by the English-speaking intellectual community to a certain type of contemporary Continental (largely French) philosophy."⁹⁶ It is the discourse on theory, which is heavily manipulated by seizing the bits and pieces of philosophy by any means to fit within diverse disciplinary and political grounds to pave the way for an odd transdisciplinary fashion.⁹⁷ Yet, "theory" has been dissociated from its Continental roots and became attached within the English and American intellectual dialogue; it survived outside the original as a "surrogate philosophy." Theory has escaped from its predefined outline, desisted being reasonable and being meant something. And at the end, to Cusset, theory turned crazy. In parallel to Cusset's retrospective problem of *theory* in general humanities, architecture theory has belatedly had its share of that 'surrogate philosophy' 1970s' onwards. Michael Speaks illustrated theory's voyage in the United States from French, German, and Italian intellectual territories with an analogical approach by giving Colin Rowe's narration on modern architecture's travel to the United States from Europe across the Atlantic Ocean. Speaks recounts how the alliance of form and ideology of modern architecture has been decomposed on their way; while form has transpassed the oceanfront, ideology lost its way.⁹⁸ He frames theory's depiction as "fast-philosophy," not taking over the liability involved through political and intellectual coherence. Cusset's diagnosis of the last four decades of crazy *theory* infected contemporary architecture as well. The demonic

⁹⁵ Spencer, *The Architecture of Neoliberalism: How Contemporary Architecture Became an Instrument of Control and Compliance*, 49.

⁹⁶ François Cusset, "Theory (Madness of)," *Radical Philosophy* (May/June 2011), no. 167 (2011): 24.

⁹⁷ Ibid.

⁹⁸ Michael Speaks, "Theory Was Interesting... but Now We Have Work: No Hope No Fear," *Architectural Research Quarterly* 6, no. 3 (2002).

quality of theory in Spencer's words is fused into the margins of architecture theory, which can be surveyed through the consecutively published anthologies starting from the mid-90s. Spencer illustrated the atmosphere of theory by accrediting Hays' voice for the core of his anthology: "From Marxism to semiotics to psychoanalysis and rhizomatics, architecture theory has freely and contentiously set about opening up architecture to what is thinkable and sayable in other codes, and, in turn, rewriting systems of thought assumed to be properly extrinsic or irrelevant into architecture's own idiolect."⁹⁹ In that terms, architecture theory has freely lost "architectural" approval.

Nevertheless, the plea for a specific conception of architecture was a repeated agenda until very recently. The propositions of the architectural realm starting from the late 1960s until the beginning of the century were achieved in allocation with distinct contextures, which celebrated the production of knowledge based on postmodern premises. While new inquiries in time conceptualized architecture within a sound understanding, the insurmountable gap between the methodological and the conceptual rendering of architectural phenomena quickly displaced the position that once architecture has been assigned. Although the construction of specific theories probed architecture's relation with the intellectual currents, as of the new millennial, the themes and paradigms are undertaken from a retrospective view, which refers to the whole era under a totalizing strategy that is no more in vogue. Notably, postmodernity has started to dissipate when there have been few conceptual spaces left unreproduced. Henceforth, the condition is epidemically accurate for the architectural milieu puzzled through the deprivation of any possible un-folding.

⁹⁹ Hays, *Architecture Theory since 1968*, p.xii. in the book Spencer, *The Architecture of Neoliberalism: How Contemporary Architecture Became an Instrument of Control and Compliance*, 49.

In parallel to the ramification of architectural discourse, the pretext behind the binary position of theory and practice has also rooted in the 1960s as Ashley Schafer points out the generation of architects as they “appropriated cultural theory to re-vitalize what was perceived as a profession subsumed by an anti-intellectual and disengaged practice.”¹⁰⁰ The celebration of theory over design reframed intellectual thinking within the borders of material practice in architecture, in the following decades, which became something desired and translated onto and through design, and this new tendency is paired as “theoretical anxiety.”¹⁰¹ However, the ‘linear cause and effect model’ has drawn away from the mingling of those modes of production and consolidated the schism, the motive of which has also been dated back as well to the 1960s by Joan Ockman. She associated the groundings of the binary with the foundation of architectural institutes and the pressed journals, as well as the politicized agency of architects and architectural students. However, she calls attention to the goal of theory and illustrates the binary as follows: “During the following decades, the aphasia between architectural theory and practice intensified as ‘theory’ became and increasingly autonomous and often arcane field of specialization within the schools and media, preoccupied with debates taking place in philosophy and literary criticism but ironically enough (given its beginnings) distanced from everyday problems of the built environment.”¹⁰² While Ockman in “Pragmatism/ Architecture: The Idea of the Workshop Project,” extended philosophical discourse in architecture proposing pragmatism in relation to new architectural strategies in the making, by which she is after an “after-theory.” Following Ockman, Schafer states that: “Theory functioned either as a generator of

¹⁰⁰ Ashley Schafer, "Theory after (after-Theory)," *Perspecta* 38, no. Architecture after All (2006): 109.

¹⁰¹ J.R. Moneo, *Theoretical Anxiety and Design Strategies in the Work of Eight Contemporary Architects* (MIT Press, 2004).

¹⁰² Joan Ockman, "Pragmatism/ Architecture: The Idea of the Workshop Project," in *The Pragmatist Imagination: Thinking About Things in the Making* (New York: Princeton Architectural Press, 2000), 16.

form or as legitimator of form, but one clearly precedes the other. That is, theory was either implicated as an a priori idea to be formally expressed or reified in design or a posteriori as a means to legitimize or post-rationalize practice, which only further reinforced their mutual enervation.”¹⁰³ Her point can be illustrated by the theoretical speculation, which inserted Eisenman’s early classical piece of Wexner Center into his later engagement of deconstructivist discourse in architecture, while he explained that “I doubt whether I had read one page of Jacques Derrida when I designed [the Wexner Center in 1983].”¹⁰⁴ Hence, following Ockman’s examination of “after-theory,”¹⁰⁵ can we re-posit her question a decade after being conscious of the drastically changed conventions, on which architecture has stood: “By liberating theory from the need to be instrumentalized in practice, can it be appropriated and used to inform the way we work, rather than to dictate what we make?”¹⁰⁶ Is it possible to configure a transformation for traditional architectural discourse, which does not solely reread and rewrite theories one on each other once fashionable in their own scholarly context? Can architectural discourse move beyond the confines of introverted referential strategies in producing architectural knowledge? Can it be manifolded through a new category of analysis that makes it possible to read all together with the architecture of the past, the present and the future? Following Jorge Silvetti’s account in his speech in “The Politics of Contemporary Architectural Discourse,” “the task of repositioning architecture has not yet begun in the

¹⁰³ Schafer, "Theory after (after-Theory)."

¹⁰⁴ Thomas Patin, "From Deep Structure to an Architecture in Suspense: Peter Eisenman, Structuralism, and Deconstruction," *Journal of Architectural Education* 47, no. 2 (1993): 100.

¹⁰⁵ “There is hardly any real architectural theory to be found, despite the diversity of practices at work today, and despite a hugely expanded volume of architectural publications. There is only after-theory.” “Diagrams-Interactive Instruments in Operation” Ben van Berkel and Caroline Bos, ANY 23, 1998, 19.

¹⁰⁶Schafer, "Theory after (after-Theory)," 110.

theoretical discourse but it is nonetheless already decided in the real world.”¹⁰⁷ Hence, confronting the realities of architecture sieved from the ideals of *Architecture* has the capacity to orient architectural discourse through a new agenda.

Starting through the post-historical grounding that paves the way for a declaration of discipline’s obsolescence weaved through the contradictions situated along with neoliberal thought, the enunciated discourse has put forward the relations produced through the political engagement with the contemporary world and has expressed itself merely as a form of radical critique: the researches in this context, have approached the comprehensive umbrella of architectural thought and practice through an *aporetic method*; “*raising problems without providing solutions.*”¹⁰⁸

“There is no theory or set of rules that will solve the difficult problems facing architecture today: the overwhelming size and complexity of large-scale structures, especially the urban environment itself (e.g. Koolhaas’s ‘Bigness’); the nostalgia for a sense of lost identity as a result of ‘fragmentation of communities’; confronting how little autonomy or control the architect has in dealing with large and largely immovable political, economic and social forces; the logistical complexities in the co-ordination of so many professionals and skilled workers in the design and manufacture of buildings; the disorientation resulting from the digital dematerialization of buildings as new technologies transforms walls into image-screens and virtual spaces seamlessly integrate with physical space; and the threat posed by design software and smart apps in the design and functioning of buildings.”¹⁰⁹

¹⁰⁷ Jorge Silvetti, "After Words," *Assemblage*, no. 27 (1995): 77.

¹⁰⁸ “*aporia.*” Simon Blackburn, *The Oxford Dictionary of Philosophy* (Oxford University Press, 2016), 25.

¹⁰⁹ David Macarthur, "Reflections on Pragmatism as a Philosophy of Architecture," *Foorprint Analytic Philosophy and Architecture: Approaching Things from the Other Side* no. 20 (Spring / Summer 2017): 109.

As Macarthur indexed, the spheres problematized within architecture follow under the scope of architecture's extended interdisciplinarity. The contemporary emergencies of architecture are in constant turbulence regarding this named-few, uncountable precarious context. Architecture in (self-) crisis now alone produces an *aporetic monologue* that only confirms the current status of architecture under the margins of "diagnosis."

In "Architecture, Crisis and Resuscitation: The Reproduction of Post-Fordism in late-twentieth-century architecture," Tahl Kaminer also embraces the present architectural condition in this aporetic framework: "The crisis of architecture encouraged soul-searching and self-critique; it caused widespread anxiety and uncertainty within the discipline. In reaction to this aporia, architecture withdrew into itself, into a form of regressive resistance or escapism, succeeding in identifying many of the discipline's 'ailments' but lacking a remedy, often ignoring the wider social transformations and centering its attention on its own production."¹¹⁰ Architecture in the identity crisis has an incomplete engagement with the ongoing socio-political climate and growing intellectual pessimism towards the role of architectural practice for the resolution of the internal and external aporia. Architecture theory has also been denoted inadequate to respond to the inconsistencies that have set off architectural practices as impoverished in a state of Cul-de-Sac.

In order to break the aporetic cycle of architecture in explaining itself today, "Aporia" needs to be understood as it is traditionally examined in philosophy, as seen as an essential step for the progress in any inquiry. Entailed initially in ancient philosophy, Aporia is a "state of mind," presenting an intellectual complexity, which is a necessity for a substantial inquiry, later centralized in Aristotle's *Metaphysics*

¹¹⁰Tahl Kaminer, *Architecture, Crisis and Resuscitation: The Reproduction of Post-Fordism in Late-Twentieth-Century Architecture* (New York: Routledge: Taylor & Francis, 2011), 21.

Beta, a condition that is caused by “equality of opposite reasoning.”¹¹¹ “An aporia is, essentially, a point of impasse where there is puzzlement or perplexity about how to proceed... One might describe aporia, more basically, as a point where one does not know how to respond to what it said.”¹¹²

“Aporia is not only a mental state of puzzlement but is indeed a puzzle about the matter of inquiry. The essential property of such a puzzle is the co-existence of two-sides, seemingly opposed. The apparent contradiction is present in aporia when two propositions both seem to be true but are mutually exclusive. Apparently, when two propositions are contradictory, at least one of them must be false. This is precisely what constitutes aporia -seeming logical impossibility. The decisive move then, in order to resolve aporia, consists in searching for the possibility to eliminate contradiction.”¹¹³

Derrida also named aporia “as a single duty that recurrently duplicates itself interminably, fissures itself, and contradicts itself without remaining the same, that is, concerning the only and single ‘double, contradictory imperative’.”¹¹⁴ The diagnosis of architecture in the twenty-first century acts itself as this “*double, contradictory imperative*.” However, philosophically, aporia is a must to process a probe, which allows sorting contradictions allegedly.

In the book *Mapping Controversies in Architecture*, 2012, Albena Yaneva introduces bifurcations or, in other words, the divides of contemporary architecture. By quoting from Latour, she asserted that modern epistemologies had been reduced to cause and effect without giving credit to their relational conceptualization. As she

¹¹¹ G. Karamanolis and V. Politis, *The Aporetic Tradition in Ancient Philosophy* (Cambridge University Press, 2018), 229.

¹¹² *Ibid.*, 9.

¹¹³ Alexandar Kostic, "Aporia in Architectural Design," *Architecture Philosophy* 3, no. 2 (2018): 140.

¹¹⁴ Jacques Derrida, *Aporias: Dying--Awaiting (One Another at) the "Limits of Truth" (Mourir--S'attendre Aux "Limites De La Vérité")* (Stanford University Press, 1993), 16.

asserted: “This divides the world into two sets: one of the causes and the other is affects; one of the architecture (understood as form, size, location, disposition, and materiality) and the other society (that causes buildings to vary, flourish or perish.)”¹¹⁵ The antagonism between the subject and the object, which is a modernist account according to Albena, has incapacitated the architectural theory.

“Commonly, architectural theory either takes society (its factors and influences) as a source of explaining architecture. Else, architecture is a mechanism for exercising control and shaping the social. In the first case, buildings mirror societal change and reflect economic factors, broader macrocosmic organization and cultural frameworks. In the second case, buildings are instruments that are imbued with the power to transform society and to affect social practices. In both instances, what is kept is the bifurcation between the big construct of ‘architecture’ and ‘society’.”¹¹⁶

This “divisive fallacy” in her expression is apparent in “the art of describing” architectural objects and rules the research explaining architecture. The way “social” is produced and reproduced in architecture has emerged as those two-way studies ‘Society > Architecture and Architecture > Society’ stand for.¹¹⁷ Both traditions may be credited as “the equality of opposite reasoning,” in terms of Aristotle, which clues in the margins of an aporia.

“There is an inherent contradiction in trying to explain the development of building forms and architectural styles with the resources of the social sciences; architecture uses a reservoir of notions, which do not always translate easily into the social. Moreover, as Bruno Latour (1988) argues

¹¹⁵ Albena Yaneva, *Mapping Controversies in Architecture* (Ashgate Publishing Limited, 2013), 1.

¹¹⁶ *Ibid.*, 2.

¹¹⁷ *Ibid.*, 33.

the social sciences are part and parcel of the activities that we want to study; they are part of our problem, not the solution.”¹¹⁸

This ‘*divisive fallacy*’ has imposed an *agentic* status for architecture in theorizing sociospatial relations. The way Albena Yaneva introduces the mirrored image of society|architecture shows some similarities in terms of Margaret Archer's critical realist theorizing agency. Margaret Archer, following the school of critical realism, begins her article entitled “Realism and the problem of agency” directly with a parallel problem notice. She proposed: “The central problem of theorizing agency is how to conceptualize the human agent as someone who is both partly formed by their sociality, but also has the capacity partly to transform their society. The difficulty is that social theorizing has oscillated between these two extremes.”¹¹⁹ Archer epitomized these two folded reflections as anthropocentric and sociocentric models of agency. While the former denotes the centrality of the self, the latter gives priority to what social discourse makes of the self. For both approaches, she highlights an underlying *epistemic fallacy*, since for both stances, “where what reality is taken to be, courtesy of our instrumental rationality or social discourse, is substitutes for what the world really is.”¹²⁰ Comparably, when architecture is cast in an *agentic* role instating *the social*, it also shares the problem as mentioned above; what we know as architecturally has been put in place of a macro-scale social reality. The interpretation of architecture has mirrored the epistemic fallacy defined in this realist perspective, arguing that “we cannot reduce the realm of things which exist, to those things that we have knowledge of.”¹²¹ This incomplete correlation of object to subject resonates with the fundamental philosophical discussion “the subject-object relation,” and it is needed to be brought along into architectural theorizing of

¹¹⁸ Ibid.

¹¹⁹ Margaret Archer, "Realism and the Problem of Agency," *Alethia* 5, no. 1 (2002): 11.

¹²⁰ Ibid., 12.

¹²¹ Lopez and Potter, *After Postmodernism: An Introduction to Critical Realism*, 75.

the socio-spatial in these terms. Therefore, the controversies of contemporary architecture tracing an aporia might be addressed as they have embodied in-between relations of subject to object, epistemology to ontology, hence knowledge to reality, which are the inquiries raised once for all by philosophy.

“Realism can never endorse the 'epistemic fallacy', and, in this connection, it must necessarily insist that how the world is has regulatory effect upon what we make of it, in turn, what it makes of us. These effects are independent of our full discursive penetration, just as gravity influenced us, and the projects we could entertain, long before we conceptualised it.”¹²²

Architectural inquiry in its critical historiography has privileged intellectual movements originally derived in social sciences and humanities. Therefore, it is necessarily needed to be constructed outside the fragmentary contextualization of architecture theory and its narrative mechanisms that defines and declares the so-called crisis. The diagnosis of architecture in the twenty-first century addresses architecture's ubiquity, narrating obsolescence, dilution, attenuation, saturation, and even nullification of architecture's conservatory. The description of an aporia is needed to be articulated into the realities beyond what is generalized as a mere percept. In order to transcend the fallacies underneath the reproduction of architecture, which is, by nature, a social science enterprise, there is a need for a method of disclosure investigating the architectural phenomenon and its relation to the real. While the aporetic status of architecture is reasoned as a philosophical issue, the way to reconnect with reality must also be held as philosophical.

¹²² Archer, "Realism and the Problem of Agency," 12.

3.2 Realization: Architecture's Introspection and the "Immanent Critique"

"Introspection, as the term is used in contemporary philosophy of mind, is a means of learning about one's own currently ongoing, or perhaps very recently past, mental states or processes."¹²³ The architectural sphere is humanized as the representative of the collective minds of its agency; therefore, the transformation of disciplinary valorization has been seen as strongly tied to the agentic apparatus. Architecture's introspection relies upon the received knowledge of what architecture is and the inner dialogue that is constituted within its own agency. While it seems retrospective, it has its sights in the means of the architectural sphere's ongoing imagery reflected onto oneself. Introspection is a constitution of knowledge, premediated by the drive of cogitatio, settling out the intentions and proclamations. Its genre is unapologetically political, opening the questions on self-knowledge concerned with the intervention of the present for an invention of the future.

"The sphere of political is the sphere in which a part, a groups of individuals, acquires knowledge of itself in the form of knowing what it is, what it ought to be, what it wants, and what it does not want. The political is an attitude (to act in relationship to something); it consists of knowledge (knowing who, and what, to counterpose), and indicates a task (to transform conflict into coexistence without exaggerating, or denying, the reasons for the conflict itself.) The political cannot be reduced to the conflict per se; it indicates the possibility of conflict and as such calls for its solution."¹²⁴

The diagnostic frameworks that invaded the contemporary architectural discourse represent a form of realization. While architectural discourse's own introspection is

¹²³ Eric Schwitzberg, "Introspection," <https://plato.stanford.edu/archives/win2019/entries/introspection/>.

¹²⁴ Pier Vittorio Aureli, *The Possibility of an Absolute Architecture* (MIT Press, 2011), 29.

constructed over the voices of aporias, the criticism indeed strives for an ideal recovery from the malaise expanded in disciplinary roots. Aureli's portrayal of the political sphere stands for the critical distinction that the political cannot be lessened only to the aporetic rendering but the belief of resolution ingrown within disjunctions. The political index of architecture starts when the aporia has been left behind to make that realization function. The political, then implies the potential diverged from the collective negative thought, which is only evoked by critique that is immanent. "At its most basic meaning, immanent means internal, one type of immanent critique measures a given society against the ideals and aspirations internal to that society."¹²⁵ While the aporia has seemed to bring the conflicting conceptions of architecture into discourse, it indeed serves to prompt an immanent escape to govern the constitution of knowledge and task adhered to the definition of architecture once again. "To criticize immanently is to criticize an object 'on its own terms'."¹²⁶ The argument here is two-folded; first, criticizing Architecture is the reorientation of situatedness taken for granted as immanent. Second, the intention is immanent by nature since the totality of architecture has been criticized as an object 'on its own terms'. Therefore, the expedition to determine the immanent is an invitation to choose architecture.

Moreover, before setting forth what specifically critical realist immanent critique is called forth, it is essential to realize how the hermeneutic immanent critique is constructed as an action:

"Immanent critique, ..., is a form of social practice in which people use speech acts to disclose what they take to be reasons for others to change their practices. Critique proceeds immanently

¹²⁵ Mary V. Wrenn, "Immanent Critique, Enabling Myths, and the Neoliberal Narrative," *Review of Radical Political Economics* 48, no. 3 (2015): 453.

¹²⁶ James Gordon Finlayson, "Hegel, Adorno and the Origins of Immanent Criticism," *British Journal for the History of Philosophy* 22, no. 6 (2014): 1143.

when it refers to immanent potentials in the self-understanding or practices of those to whom it is addressed.”¹²⁷

Immanence is an important index that underlies what has been differentiated as internal to the "architectural," an account of prescription that the associates can only give. Such unity is also affiliated to the disciplinary alignment and closes the ranks between the positions of mere critics and mere architects. Then, the coalescence of the agency takes part in articulating the diverse positions, which coexist yet support the task indicated under an immanent fabric for the discipline. Then, how can the domain of architecture through its agency provide a solid hermeneutic model to transform the aporia into self-understanding? Returning to the statement of Aureli's definition of political, “the political is an attitude; it consists of knowledge (knowing who, and what, to counterpose),”¹²⁸ critique, against the whole post-critical milieu, is needed to be coherently incorporated into a form of social practice, that is aimed to be exercised by not the licensed architects but with the society, whom architects addressed. Unless that, it misses the potentia for being the transformative knowledge yet sustains as a form of mere practical wisdom distinctive for the privileges of architects who only legitimized the changing epistemic currencies. Therefore, the literary circle of architecture may extend outside Architecture, illustrating its account of immanence transcending to the domain of society. “The Interpretive Imperative” is vital for Architecture to make sense outside of its intrinsic intuition.

Sandy Isenstadt constructs her argument on the endurance of architecture both materially and symbolically by manifesting the relationship between memory and architecture through that phrase, the “interpretative imperative,” deepening it in her statement:

“We come prepared with knowledge and ready to voice convictions,
that we ask our buildings to remain a forum for both language and

¹²⁷ Titus Stahl, *Immanent Critique* (Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, 2021), 33.

¹²⁸ Aureli, *The Possibility of an Absolute Architecture*, 29.

action and, as a result, a space for the formation of identities. If anything, an interpretive imperative is located in the relationship between buildings and the people who question how and why they came to be.”¹²⁹

“If architecture speaks, then it speaks in the second person: everything is waiting for ‘you.’ We fail our buildings when we fail to answer the fundamental question of the cursor: What now? Symbolic persistence in architecture, then, is less a matter of finding a universally understood symbol than of continuing to inspire interpretation. The interpretive imperative is architecture’s contribution to remembrance in an age of perfectible memory.”¹³⁰

Isenstadt’s interpretative framework is a mediation between the built work and people; the architectural ‘sign’ has that innate capacity to drive us to be present in time through its spatiality and voiced over. However, when the interpretation is detached from its architectural engagement, the dissensus on architectural criticism’s hermeneutic purpose has become apparent; regarding the scope, there is a developing discursive formation through the new millennium that suspects “the Interpretive Imperative” in architecture. In “Against the Interpretation of Architecture,” Johannes Albrecht remonstrates the loss of coherence in constructing a theory. When interpretation is filled with borrowed intellectuality as opposed to an experience of building, it neglects the space itself, which is the primal trait of architecture.¹³¹ In parallel, Richard Anderson, in “Tired of Meaning,” analyzed the opposite positions that left mark on architectural discourse; the Whiting and Somols’ projective architecture with Hays and Eisenman’s architecture on signification. By reminding Geoffrey Scott’s theory of architecture, the “antipathy to architecture as reading,”

¹²⁹ Sandy Isenstadt, "The Interpretive Imperative," *Harvard Design Magazine* Durability and Ephemerality, plus Books on History and Theory, no. 3 (Fall 1997).

¹³⁰ Ibid.

¹³¹ Johannes Albrecht, "Against the Interpretation of Architecture," *Journal of Architectural Education* 55, no. 3 (2002).

“neglects the fact that in literature meaning, or fixed association, is the universal term, while in architecture the universal term is the sensuous experience of substance and form.”¹³² Following “Metaphors for Nothing,” Bryan E. Norwood begins his article frankly stating: “That architectural theory should deal with real architecture seems exceedingly obvious.”¹³³

The positions under the rubric of interpretation rendered Architecture lodged between predicament and resurgence. It is considered constructive as well as incapable as far as the ontological points of view diverged. The approaches to meaning-making are circumscribed accordingly to where the architectural object stands within the interpretation. However, the interpretation itself does not grind architecture to a halt, but responsibility through interpretation can. The never-ending course of interpretability must lead the architectural agency to ponder the exact task shouldered via language. A stance like that deploys to cover what "immanence" is in the name of Architecture.

In “Immanent Critique as the Core of Critical Theory: Its Origins and Developments in Hegel, Marx and Contemporary Thought,” Robert J. Antonio examines the genealogy that “immanent critique” has. While he excavates the roots of immanent critique in primarily Hegelian, Marxian, and following in the critical theory primarily. As drawn under critical realist understanding, “a criticism or critique is immanent if it is on the basis of a theory’s own assumptions, and transcendent if it deploys external criteria.”¹³⁴ In *Scientific Realism and Human Emancipation*, Roy Bhaskar introduces a form of “intra-discursive criticism,” meaning “criticism of other actually or possibly believed theories, hypotheses etc.”¹³⁵ As we think of the

¹³² Richard Anderson, "Tired of Meaning," *Log*, no. 7 (2006): 13.

¹³³ Bryan E. Norwood, "Metaphors for Nothing," *ibid.*, no. 33 (2015): 107.

¹³⁴ Hartwig, *Dictionary of Critical Realism*, 254.

¹³⁵ Bhaskar, *Scientific Realism and Human Emancipation [1986]*, 183.

definition of intra-discursive criticism instrumentally for architecture, its capacity can only be imagined if that form of criticism is applied outside the limits drawn.

“All the sciences make judgements of truth or falsity on beliefs about their object domains. But the human sciences, in virtue of the distinctive feature of their domain, that it includes, inter alia, beliefs about their social objects, also make (or at least entail) judgements of truth or falsity on (aspects of) that domain. And such belief/ object correspondence, or lack of it, appears immediately as a legitimate object of social scientific explanation.”¹³⁶

In the article “Can Architecture Lie? On Truth, Knowledge and Contemporary Architectural Theory” Adam Sharr dialectically constitutes an argument on the truth of architecture by facing its adverse; the falsehood of architecture. While concentrating on “authority” and “actuality,” Sharr refers to the argumentative persuasion regarding the architectural design; the authority stands for the claims made to convince the audience to admit the verity that the built form is based upon.¹³⁷ “Actuality” is the pure “dumb” presence of a building confined within limits given through the material and physical qualities that are only possible.¹³⁸ While “architectural lies” may dwell on authoritative portrayals, the “actual” architecture is prone to be on the side of “truthness.” Concerning that corporeality, architecture can never deceive. The architectural theory, for Sharr, is set upon the given division; nevertheless, it seems deviant to lose “actuality” for “authority.”¹³⁹ On that, the discursiveness may be established on the extradiscursive, affirming the “architectural” driven for architectural criticism by only ascertaining the real detained in the built form. However, extending the previously mentioned Bhkaskar’s

¹³⁶ Ibid., 183-84.

¹³⁷ Adam Sharr, "Can Architecture Lie? On Truth, Knowledge and Contemporary Architectural Theory," *Architectural Theory Review* 8, no. 2 (2003): 165.

¹³⁸ Ibid.

¹³⁹ Ibid.

point, “the judgments of truth or falsity on beliefs about the object” are pretty different from “the judgments of truth or falsity on beliefs about the object domain.” When the whole architecture domain becomes the object of criticism, it is no longer an “architectural” criticism; it resurrects as “an object of social scientific explanation.”

3.3 The Scenography of Projectivism

A projectivist approach is discussed for the means of architecture that has endorsed relativity within the discipline, accompanying a vast repertoire of theoretical exploration and truth claims, which legitimized itself through discourse as projected onto the corporeality of architecture as if they are the real property of it. Then, scenography implies the representative capacity that the narratives may instantiate something other than themselves; in other words, the persona that architecture has been vested. The nature of architecture's projective ground allows an extensive medium regarding the post-truth era conspiring on the discursive mediation of reality, initially capturing postmodernism as the leading trend. In “After Postmodernism: An Introduction to Critical Realism,” Potter and Lopez encapsulated the characteristic built-in postmodernism as “it was an intellectual current which seriously bruised the self-confidence to which reason, objectivity and knowledge had become accustomed.”¹⁴⁰ Then, Architecture gets its share of postmodern prose by its inability to sort out the eminently plural intentions. As for the domain of architecture, the dissonant relationship with interpretation is postulated in brief in the seminal article by Mary McLeod: “postmodern practitioners and critics have tended

¹⁴⁰ Lopez and Potter, *After Postmodernism: An Introduction to Critical Realism*, 3.

to seek ideological justification, not in program, function, or structure, but in *meaning*.”¹⁴¹ The lost validation for what is intrinsic for Architecture loosens the disciplinary ground on which every claim is accorded in relativism. “Truth is relative to be sure but there is still both truth and error (as well as lies!)”¹⁴² The projection of subjective values through architecture into the world is indeed a claim about knowledge that is architectural, and it becomes problematic when any projection is represented as if they pursue an objective order, leaning the causal mechanisms underlying on subjectivities. Namely, an account of anti-realism is defined as “a version of ‘projectivism,’ according to which, in making such statements, one is not seeking to correctly describe features of a mind-independent world but is merely projecting one’s own responses and attitudes onto it.”¹⁴³

The representation of design practices is a slippery slope for expressivist renderings. Douglas Spencer demonstrates the ease of the management of architectural discourse through an example given by the following anecdote:

“Alejandro Zaero-Polo, in the essay “the Hokusai Wave” recounts the moment at which he realized that the conceptual vocabulary in which his practice, Foreign Office Architects (FOA) had typically traded – one of ‘material organization’, ‘artificial ecologies’ and ‘circulation diagrams’ – was ineffective in communicating with non-specialist audience. .. In a ‘burst of inspiration’, he writes, ‘we terminated the factual process narrative to conclude that what really inspired us was the image of the Hokusai Wave.’”¹⁴⁴

Reductive strategies in representing the properties of “real” projects instantiated a portrayal of projectivism named figurative. While creative allusions are vital initial

¹⁴¹ Mary McLeod, "Architecture and Politics in the Reagan Era: From Postmodernism to Deconstructivism," *Assemblage*, no. 8 (1989): 24.

¹⁴² Lopez and Potter, *After Postmodernism: An Introduction to Critical Realism*, 9.

¹⁴³ Bob Hale, ""Realism", " <https://www.britannica.com/topic/realism-philosophy>.

¹⁴⁴ Spencer, *The Architecture of Neoliberalism: How Contemporary Architecture Became an Instrument of Control and Compliance*, 48.

points for design processes, their usage as “an apparatus of managerialism” unleashed an argument on causation and its reception. Architecture is remodeled into a stage where reason is subjectified by reducing the complexities of architecting to a figurative deal, which may be assumed as a caricature of figurative projectivism, which Sydney Shoemaker defines as follows:

“Figurative projectivism: it’s not that these properties are instantiated somewhere else, but they are not instantiated at all.”¹⁴⁵

“On a different version, which Sydney Shoemaker calls figurative projectivism, we mistakenly attribute to objects properties that they don’t really have, but that we only represent them as having as a result of our own interests, mental features, or constitution.”¹⁴⁶

To sort out the real aporia from inside of figurative projections, the architectural agency may take the immanent critique as the form of response to the discourse-reductive approaches to its own discipline and the social world addressed.

“A study of discourse adds an important dimension to social analysis by drawing our attention to those mechanisms at work in constructing and maintaining subjectivities within particular social contexts. Occasionally these constructed subjectivities entails an epistemological distortion about the intransitive ordering of society which works in the interests of a specific social group. If this epistemological distortion serves to conceal relations of exploration and power then we can say that discourse in question has 'ideological effects'.”¹⁴⁷

“While discourse theory highlights effectively how subjectivities are produced through discursive representations, it is less clear about how these representations helps to reproduce underlying generative mechanism, structures and contradictions on a daily basis. The use

¹⁴⁵ U. Kriegel, *Current Controversies in Philosophy of Mind* (Taylor & Francis, 2013), 121.

¹⁴⁶ *Ibid.*, 144.

¹⁴⁷ J. Joseph and J.M. Roberts, *Realism Discourse and Deconstruction* (Routledge, 2004), 4.

of ideology-critique ... supplies this missing aspect because it prompts us to explore how certain ideas are internally related to the 'unobservable'. Though ontologically real, level and how these ideas reproduce and distort this level. Ideology-critique thereby, 'directs' discourse to the level of the ontologically real."¹⁴⁸

The object of criticism, then, is genuinely required to be redefined in immanence and refined whether it belongs to discourse or ideology critique.

¹⁴⁸ Ibid., 5.

CHAPTER 4

A DISCIPLINE FORECAST: ARCHITECTURE SITUATED IN BETWEEN THE ACTUAL AND THE POSSIBLE

4.1 In pursuit of “Aletheia”: The Political Index of Architecture Theory

“Philosophy cannot emerge from the clouds of its controversies into the clear light of truth until it can state in unambiguous, intelligible language a perspicuous, consistent, and tenable doctrine of the relation that is most appropriate to philosophical discussion, the relation of the subject to the object, the relation of knowledge to reality.”¹⁴⁹

The aporia of architecture's conflicted status has been cast in contact with the political economy.¹⁵⁰ This leitmotif has constituted an initial point of departure for the research, especially for the period starting from the new millennium, since architecture theory's critical historiography has been re-intersecting with the terrain of politics more than ever. In addressing contemporary architecture regarding the past two decades, “the political” has kept architectural discourse's agenda busy over time, yet the tactile practice of architecture has pursued none of that anxiety towards professionalism. Moreover, it advanced within an opponent mainstream to justify an account that installed oneself between money and power, which has been incompatible with the reflective modes of criticism inherited from the intellectual milieu grown out of the events of May 1968.

Architecture confined within the mobilization of economic capital on the global scale has succumbed to the by-products of globalization. The production mechanisms of

¹⁴⁹ Henry E. Bliss, "The Subject-Object Relation," *The Philosophical Review* 26, no. 4 (1917): 396.

¹⁵⁰ The Graduate course, ARCH526 Politics and Space, METU, conducted by Prof. Dr. Güven Arif Sargın, must be stressed as mentoring the study to recourse for further theoretical context and conceptual tools.

architectural practices have been affected along with those transnational economies and taken a position to serve as a rewarding market in the global sphere. The end-product of such monetary, the built work, which inherently functions as a medium of representation, is mounted in a “capital-invested [global] landscape” to supersede the economic and political power prominently. The potential practical branches of “the global shift” that might nurture the social background of Architecture have been further assimilated in the interest of contemporary capitalist grounds. This current grounding substitutes the disciplinary profession in a position of a market-driven business, which consolidates the first recognition of the profession in the eighties announcing that architecture has “abdicated their own artistic convictions and independence to elite demands and commercial interest.”¹⁵¹

Within the neoliberal conjecture of the late twenty years, the apparent deviation regarding the unity and stability of Architecture have brought along a crisis and herewith a pursuit of emancipation. That impact-response has been visible as a twofold undertaking; while in one way it is framed around problematizing the disciplinary premises of architecture aspiring to the heydays of a profession that seems in diminishment, the other is the quest whether the capacity to politicize architecture to rule the socio-spatial order enough to salvage the bounds of the post-truth era.

While those approaches emerging within the current architectural discourse mirror a revival of the projective trajectory driven by the 1970s’ politico-philosophical left, the urge to contest today’s neoliberal agenda in architectural intellectualism entails confronting the newly growing idiosyncratic complexities rooted between the political and the economic. Hence, that inquiry depends not only upon the close readings on the conventional dialogue between architecture and politico-economic agenda but also upon deciphering the present continuous reality that is still turning

¹⁵¹ Judith Blau, *Architects and Firms*, 1987, cited in Donald McNeill, "Globalization and the Ethics of Architectural Design," *City* 10, no. 1 (2006): 14.

into explicit imagery. For this reason, the endeavor is a field of perception seeking the current transition that architecture is struggling with, a quest for certainty on what embodies the source and the aftermath regarding the dislocation of Architecture. The self-questioning of architecture is a matter of symptomology which strives to indicate whatsoever architecture is and yet to become. Inherently, the diagnosis of Architecture is constituted primarily through critical rhetoric, which is, by nature, political.

It cannot be a coincidence that just in the last few years, there has been an increasing number of publications¹⁵² in architecture scholarship that centralize “how we are, of our being in the world,”¹⁵³ expanding the diagnosis on architecture in the twenty-first century:

“The Project of Autonomy: Politics and Architecture Within and Against Architecture (2008),
The Architecture of Neoliberalism: How contemporary architecture became an instrument of control and compliance (2016),

¹⁵² Pier Vittorio Aureli, *The Project of Autonomy: Politics and Architecture within and against Capitalism* (Princeton Architectural Press, 2008); Spencer, *The Architecture of Neoliberalism: How Contemporary Architecture Became an Instrument of Control and Compliance*; Nadir Lahiji, *Can Architecture Be an Emancipatory Project?: Dialogues on Architecture and the Left* (John Hunt Publishing, 2016); *The Political Unconscious of Architecture: Re-Opening Jameson's Narrative* (Taylor & Francis, 2016); Daniel Grincer, *Architecture as Cultural and Political Discourse: Case Studies of Conceptual Norms and Aesthetic Practices* (Taylor & Francis, 2016); Alben Yaneva, *Five Ways to Make Architecture Political: An Introduction to the Politics of Design Practice* (Bloomsbury Publishing, 2017); Tahl Kaminer, *The Efficacy of Architecture: Political Contestation and Agency* (Taylor & Francis, 2016); D. Petrescu and K. Trogal, *The Social (Re)Production of Architecture: Politics, Values and Actions in Contemporary Practice* (Taylor & Francis, 2017); Choi and Trotter, *Architecture Is All Over*; T. Stoppani, G. Ponzio, and G. Themistokleous, *This Thing Called Theory* (Taylor & Francis, 2016); *Positions on Emancipation Architecture between Aesthetics and Politics*, ed. Florian Hertweck and co-edited by Nikos Katsikis (Germany: Lars Müller Publishers / University of Luxembourg, 2018); Nadir Lahiji, *An Architecture Manifesto: Critical Reason and Theories of a Failed Practice* (Taylor & Francis, 2019); Mark Foster Gage, *Aesthetics Equals Politics: New Discourses across Art, Architecture, and Philosophy* (MIT Press, 2019).

¹⁵³ Hays, "Some Thoughts on the Pathology of Architecture," p.33.

Can Architecture Be An Emancipatory Project?: Dialogues On Architecture
 And The Left (2016),
 The Political Unconscious of Architecture: Re-opening Jameson's
 Narrative(2016),
 Architecture as Cultural and Political Discourse: Case Studies of Conceptual
 Norms and Aesthetic Practices(2016),
 Five Ways to Make Architecture Political: An Introduction to the Politics of
 Design Practice (2017),
 The Efficacy of Architecture: Political Contestation and Agency (2017),
 The Social (Re)Production of Architecture: Politics, Values, and Actions in
 Contemporary Practice(2017),
 Architecture Is All Over (2017),
 This Thing Called Theory (2017),
 Positions on Emancipation Architecture between Aesthetics and Politics (2018),
 An Architecture Manifesto Critical Reason and Theories of a Failed Practice
 (2019),
 Aesthetics Equals Politics: New Discourses across Art, Architecture, and
 Philosophy (2019)”

These are the books that have been published consecutively within a timely manner,
 constituting a periodic connotation. The diagnostic venture that lasted in the twenty-
 first century is articulated around the politics of design and architectural practice,
 motivated by a re-animation of political philosophy within the way architecture is
 defined today. So, that intellectual harmony that has not been around for a long time,
 now, can testify a will of resistance to “the profession’s seemingly unstoppable
 trajectory of decline,”¹⁵⁴ architecture in crisis. Therefore, the recent discursive
 productions studying architecture’s politics also constitute a framework for the
 politics of representing architectural practice/ architectural milieu in general. Thus,
 these efforts for the political reception of the discipline of architecture deepen the
 already-there discursive dimension, but they act as an ideology-critique. And, the
 question is, how can this stream be directed to place firmly back on the agenda

¹⁵⁴ Reinmuth, "Relationality and Architecture: How Refocusing the Discipline Might
 Reverse the Profession’s Seemingly Unstoppable Trajectory of Decline."

without dissolving by another pragmatist venture around the corner beyond the repetition of its history?

After all, driven by situated accumulations of knowledge towards the changing premises of the world, the intellectual milieu of architecture succeeding among the social sciences reviews its subjective position to coordinate with the objective world. Since the architectural material, as both activity and inquiry, exists only together with its contingencies to complete a social practice, any architectural undertaking leads to an extensive examination about the *presumptions* of the architectural field, about the nature of the socioeconomic environment and socio-cultural life compounded. Therefore, to canalize empirical research within the field, it must further involve and represent an understanding of *reality*, which has solidified around dynamic subjective positions constituted and received by its agencies as well as unarticulated objective circumstances surrounded. Any architectural inquiry inevitably needs to infuse into the fabric of frontier discourses to comprehend the reality among its guises. Within this endeavor, while trying to be contained within the boundaries of the ‘architectural’ debate, any attempt to explore external discourses necessitates an architecturally academic refinement for the situated discussions as well as the ones already spreading beyond disciplinary boundaries. However, in the end, many reviews are left unmediated, and along with that, many complexities are eliminated unintentionally.

“Mediating among different discourses has sponsored a rich literature that addresses itself to a whole range of practical issues...which connoisseurs of unmediated form nevertheless regard as an occultation of architecture’s original object and seekers of a certainty find maddeningly frustrating.”¹⁵⁵

The disappointment within architectural discourse is concerned around the inadequacy of architectural prescriptions to act in response to the dark atmosphere

¹⁵⁵ Hays, *Architecture Theory since 1968*, xii.

of the extensive external literature, yet sought for empowerment to reclaim a reality for itself, which yields a constant urge of self-reassurance.

Finding a way to reestablish its refuges, architectural discourse advances certain intellectual dominants to constitute an organic framework to fortify its existence. Those principles are developed not as self-defined but transcribed, usually from humanities and social sciences, parallel to the shift in their epistemological bias. The consecutive turns (linguistic turn, cultural turn, spatial turn) propose various diagnostic manifestations for their ongoing or retrospective universal problematics. Motivated by those dynamic intellectual movements, architectural discourse has been driven to engender new theoretical strategies to resolve internalized uncertainties of its time. In architecture, as in social sciences and humanities, this instrumental approach shares the same administrative intention, the same ideal beneath their differences; a desirous exploration projected onto itself to understand and order the total. While reforming its field accordingly, in any periodic architectural inquiry, diverse intellectual dominants have been privileged in place of its own research perspective, consonant to its paradigm that will be sooner or later displaced. The ongoing repositioning of architecture under the pressure of changing premises ensues discursive fractures, which are motivated by the search for an ideological hegemony in architecture. There have been several upheavals in architectural discourse to read the self-reflection of the discipline as a way of probing the prospect to reassemble its status parallel to an external crisis, which results in an architectural one. As Kahl Kaminer states: “The architectural crisis, as an explosion of disillusionment, despair and uncertainty, was brewing for a significant time before becoming explicit.”¹⁵⁶ The introspection entails critical distance to render close examination for the current condition that architecture is situated in. The means of learning about architecture’s own currently ongoing situation mirror its evaluations

¹⁵⁶Kaminer, *Architecture, Crisis and Resuscitation: The Reproduction of Post-Fordism in Late-Twentieth-Century Architecture*, 25.

and intentions on roughly reserved architectural spheres such as education, academe, and profession. However, such “critical practice” is given voice and sustained mostly in academe as opposed to what Kaminer defines architecture’s contest with a broader socio-economic crisis as follows: “While the social and economic crisis of the era was being assessed and analyzed by sociologists, economists, politicians, and journalists, the architectural crisis seemed to take place in a distant realm, confined to the discipline. Its origins in the broader socio-economic crisis remained opaque to most practitioners and theorists in the field.”¹⁵⁷ When an architectural crisis becomes explicit, it advances a revisionist stance to be cultivated on the palimpsest of architectural discourse. The following inferences as to the object of knowledge somehow replace architecture’s former contradictions, which were once declared as ‘the’ condition, by then denoted passé. The contemporary subject of the architectural discourse is receded in these crises, in its very own criticality, which I will address as a predicament. Following the words of Gilles Deleuze in his conversation with Michel Foucault: “A theory does not totalize; it is an instrument for multiplication, and it also multiplies itself... As soon as a theory is enmeshed in a particular point, we realize that it will never possess the slightest practical importance unless it can erupt in a totally different area.”¹⁵⁸ In the architectural realm, the breakout after a predicament shatters, which is once seen complete into bits and pieces. Every scattered idea has the potency to bear its point of departure to bridge the delusion, which advances to restructure the totality or devise a new formation. It is this new conjecture that paves the way for a resurgence after a predicament, the utopian tendencies inherited in architectural discourse evoke a return to utopia, which makes a resurgence as a possible choice to prosper self-containment within disciplinary boundaries. These consecutive declines and rises are how architecture has been produced within itself and among its intersecting spheres, denoting a discipline

¹⁵⁷ Ibid.

¹⁵⁸ M. Foucault and D.F. Bouchard, *Language, Counter-Memory, Practice: Selected Essays and Interviews* (Cornell University Press, 1980), 208.

lodged in-between predicaments and resurgences and trapped in extreme criticality while trying to apart the real. This anxiety behind the disciplinary specificity of architecture reifies in architectural discourse as *disorientation*, puzzled between the abandoned and reclaimed projects of architecture, since Architecture has been trying to fill the knowledge gap in the name of social sciences.

The engagement of architecture with the external communal, global, environmental, social, or political intervention demands an alliance for its diverse modes of practice to fully internalize a distinct novel theoretical position. Relating architecture's ever-expanding field to the other spacious domains entails a specific ontological position tailored for each idiolect. Various - projects, post- projects, against post-projects denote that architectural discourse indeed sustains an incomplete search for a valid ontological approach rather than an epistemological one. In an interview with Scott Lash, titled "Agency and Architecture: How to be Critical?", he is asked: "Can we conceive of forms for critique that do not resort to the notion of distance, and that thus entail a different relation between theory and practice?"¹⁵⁹ He has situated criticality in a Kantian way, stating: "When he explains enlightenment, it means asking 'what can I know?', 'what should I do?', and 'what can I hope for?'. The 'what can I know?' is the first critique, it is knowledge; 'what should I do?' is the second critique, it's ethics. But that's not yet critique! Critique is the third one, the 'what can I hope for?', which entails utopian and messianic: that's where critique is. And it works out of the ontological."¹⁶⁰

The contemporary architectural practices, theoretical or otherwise, are entangled into the shifted state of symbolic, imaginary, and real; which Lash clearly put forward: "We can no longer think of the symbolic, real, and imaginary as being ordered on

¹⁵⁹ Scott Lash and Antoine Picon. In conversation with Kenny Cupers and Isabelle Doucet. and Comments by Margaret Crawford., "Agency and Architecture: How to Be Critical?," *Footprint* 4, no. Agency in Architecture: Reframing Criticality in Theory and Practice (2009): 13.

¹⁶⁰Ibid., 14.

different levels: they are on the same level; they are manipulated, and are malleable.”¹⁶¹ However, I think ‘what can I hope for?’ is still the anticipation of architecture’s desire, yearning for an emancipatory role to order the complexities of social space, which is not idealistic but deeply ideological. Beyond the dissensus on criticality in the architectural sphere; starting from the introduction of critical theory on architectural practices, later following a rejection as a post-critical approach, and then turning towards radical criticism which queries architecture’s capacity to be critical again; architecture must revise its ontological bias to “critique” to deal with symbolic, imaginary, real trilogy without a breakdown into an unattainable matter. Mario Gandelonas in his seminal article, “Linguistics in Architecture,” 1973, underlined an apriority for a valid architecture theory, he stated: “The dialectical relationship between theory and ideology is a problem to any science and for that reason should be redefined in the specific case of architecture before any theoretical work may begin.”¹⁶² His conjecture is needed to be revisited since the vast mobilization of cultural, social, symbolic, and notably, economic capital on a global scale has affected the architectural sphere and its practices right through a trajectory of decline. The by-products of globalization, “the third-wave technology-communications, informatics, computerization, etc.”¹⁶³ as well as the transnational social transformation and its mechanisms of power have already transformed the customs, productions, and processes behind the way the built environment is realized. Beyond the relatively inert practice of architecture, they altered architecture’s engaged agencies, institutions, norms, and values of its integrating polities, along with the radical change in social structure they gave rise to -post projects in architecture by simply adapting architectural agencies primarily in the

¹⁶¹ Ibid.

¹⁶² Mario Gandelonas, "Linguistics in Architecture [1973]," in *Architecture Theory since 1968*, ed. K. Michael Hays (MIT Press, 2000), 114.

¹⁶³ W.I. Robinson, *Transnational Conflicts: Central America, Social Change and Globalization*. Verso, 2003, p.12.

interest of contemporary capitalist grounds, dissipated within the strains of economic globalization. Within the rhetoric of the global age, sieving out the ideological “knowledge” in architecture could make it possible to seek resolutions for nonideal situations instead of running into circles to find social and political relevance in a delusion of the ideal. “It is a dangerous temptation for architecture to believe that it has the key to ending conflict rather than revealing its true nature.”¹⁶⁴ Following Jorge Silvetti’s account in his speech in “The Politics of Contemporary Architectural Discourse,” “the task of repositioning architecture has not yet begun in the theoretical discourse, but it is nonetheless already decided in the real world.”¹⁶⁵ Hence, confronting the realities of (a)rchitecture that are filtered from the ideals of (A)rchitecture will enhance architectural discourse to be reified as ‘the intrication of lexicon and experience’ rather than a mere execution of langue. However, this new agenda is already out of the game for some scholars starting from the early twenty-first century following the contemporary crisis on representing the (architectural) practice, which is beyond the status of the epistemic content of architecture, cast in between predicament and resurgence. There is a robust tendency to reject the very “being” of architecture, which I call “disowning the discipline.” When the already-there disciplinary crisis represented in the academe underlying the margins of practice and theory has met the current crisis of this new world, it has abdicated its previous predicaments that were indeed the echoes of epistemic fallacies. Architecture has been left to pay for what has been miscast for its false front.

It is rather interesting that the period when the architectural sphere disclaimed its promises matches the time when there has been a rising interest in social sciences on spatial perspectives that attributes critical power to space to resolve their disciplinary conflicts. This whole dissent outline drawn for the status of architecture points out a

¹⁶⁴ Antoine Picon, "Learning from Utopia: Contemporary Architecture and the Quest for Political and Social Relevance," *Journal of Architectural Education* 67, no. 1 (2013): 21.

¹⁶⁵ Silvetti, "After Words," 77.

need for surprisingly non-different strategy; urgent(!) attention on not the role or task of architectural agencies, but synoptically on the necessity of a new ontology for architecture to be able to bridge between the content of architectural discourse (epistemology) and the intent behind (ethics), which will eventually share some metatheory. To reverse the exertion of criticality only as of the aftermath, which precludes the imaginary institution of architecture from coinciding with its realistic reflection and adopting a philosophy that we could genuinely take action. Between two extremes of utopian and dystopian tendencies loaded with negativity towards the very being of architecture, a new ontology can be set to understand and describe the underlying structures that cause the “architectural” presumptions and judgments about anything in that architecture has been embedded. It could be possible only as of the agency of architecture pre-accepts that architecture is one of the countless consociates in the urban setting, apart from its deliberate needs of self-reassurance. It could be further practical through being collectively intelligent about the “spatial” inscriptions tailored for spatial problems, which are already the augmented consequences of urban socio-economic register. Hence, before cutting off the disciplinary ties and disowning architecture like a real “idealist,” the mediatory function of theory is needed to be brought back in architectural discourse. Since then, it has become attainable to its agencies to concentrate on “enabling” a multistakeholder initiative and participate in dialogue with social sciences on “space” by desisting its superficial approaches as if what has been dealt with is a “well-ordered society under favorable circumstances.” Transdisciplinary interest on space is so powerful that architecture as well has been put in a position as if it needed to rediscover space in its very own traditions. The novel ontological stance is neither about rediscovering the perfect institution of architecture nor its original object. It is about achieving reasonable conduct in real complexities, the recuperation of which depends on architectural resolutions as well. In this regard, “Realism imbricates two

contradictory claims, one aesthetic and one epistemological.”¹⁶⁶ Nonetheless, critical realism extends along to a third one, knowing what is adequate for both.

4.2 Speculation: Architecture’s Mirror-Self and the “Explanatory Critique”

The demise of modernist architecture has been followed up through subsequent periodicities of akin atrophies. For the "Architecture" that is muted yet in synchrony with the plausible echoes within capitalism, any position taken towards the stream refers to an act of philosophical speculation.

“Where Modernism merged utility and art resulting in a sense of earnest conviction, Postmodernism liberated each from the other: architects were happy to frolic carefree in the realm of art and aesthetics; they shook off burdensome morality, leaving it for the politicians. Mistrust of earnestness was one of Postmodernism's defining characteristics, with cynicism following close behind. Humanism put man at the core: and where Modernism promoted function, and Postmodernism, form; humanism favoured balance between them. Post-humanist, Deconstructivist architecture then removed the human from the centre, banished form and function and focused purely on the creation of the object rather than on its effect on mankind.”¹⁶⁷

The disappointment burdened by the loss of Modernism has relapsed through the crisis of neoliberalism, which exploits each promise that architecture has once

¹⁶⁶ Hays, K.M. “Introduction: Formalism-Realism,” *Architecture Theory since 1968*. MIT Press, 2000, pp.254-255.

¹⁶⁷ Charlotte Skene Catling, "The Naked Truth Architecture or Revolution," *The Architectural Review*, no. 1412 (October 2014): 97.

undertaken. Since the precarious ancestor of 21st-century architecture, the new portraits that architecture has been mounted onwards has received precautionary advent. Nevertheless, the objectives remained unresolved, puzzled, and up over amassed. Now, every problem that architecture faces seem urgent, and every lingering catastrophe has ever been deteriorating. Yet, architecture has ubiquitously continued to "be," while being entombed within the inherent criticality that perseveres facing the disharmony on the betweenness of its applied and situated knowledge.

While the periodicities and their idiosyncratic premises and denials have been ceased away, or maybe "rejected prematurely" as Habermas disputed, criticality has ever remained. Its ahistorical status and supradisciplinarity has irradiated the preceding but more importantly the forthcoming. "Speculation" was a constant for the practice of thinking architecture and eugenic for its disciplinarity.

However, conceptually rewinding "speculation" may sound as if it alludes to Architecture's redounding projects. Nonetheless, the present context differs since the real orbit of architecture has seemed lost but perished within the post-truths' insecurities. The criticality embedded in the discipline of architecture has advanced with genuineness within the last two decades compared to the one embedded within the crisis of modernity that has been convoluted into the malaise neoliberalism has. Herewith, it has brought genuine complexities and contradictions. Therefore, the context of thinking-architecture once again comprises to enact with the old-school critical theory.

The correlation between criticality and speculation has been hereditary for Critical Theory. The practice of thinking architecture has the same lineage as 'speculative' knowledge too. Within this thesis's scope, my intention still searches for architecture that can possess its own 'reality,' eluding among the 'hoaxes,' which are cited as 'truth' within the situated post-truth dilemma.

In the book *Critical Theory*, Alan How proposes 'speculation' as the constitutive of reason by underlining its Latin derivation 'speculum;' "the mirror that reflects

something else.”¹⁶⁸ “Further, Alan How continues: “When we understand something we reflect or mirror its image. This reflection has no being of its own but is what appears to us at that point. The speculative person is one who does not dogmatically accept this or that appearance as being all there is, but recognises that appearances mirror a particular historical relation between subject and object.”¹⁶⁹ As it is for *theoria*, speculation also origins back in relation “to see.” Therefore, criticality is the contact medium of *duality*, mandating the margin between reality and appearance.

Granted on the crisis within the contemporary architecture theory, it is inevitable to affirm that the field of architecture has many many mirrors, and architecture theory within postmodernity has become exploitative even for its own reflections. Therefore, against the numerous appearances, architecture must testify its own being behind the mirrors of any wider means. The problem lying under the contemporary architecture theory crisis is that while architecture theory is voiced as it has emerged as a crisis proclaim, it has become stagnant. It became so occupied to conceive architecture as hypnotized in front of the kaleidoscope of everchanging appearances and realities; architecture theory has looked away for any other sign while deterring architecture from itself.

The relation between reality and appearance is a prior track for philosophy. Articulating the corresponding association into the scope of heading out contemporary architecture theory may sound trivial compared to the grand venture of philosophy orienting such a relationship. Any pronouncement for architecture befits the idea of the ‘reality’ of architecture. Though, the reality of architecture has confined itself within the conceptions of architecture. The ‘reality’ of architecture is declared or otherwise deceived regarding how architecture's own agency - intentional discourse- states what architecture is or is not. In this regard, what pure

¹⁶⁸ How, *Critical Theory*, 3.

¹⁶⁹ *Ibid.*

philosophy beholds for the duality of reality and appearance may adhere to the lost track of architecture reality. Nicholas Rescher follows a tradition of inquiry into the profundity of reality|appearance, driven since classical antiquity. He outlines the contra-relation between reality and appearance as such:

“(1) The real contrasts with the merely apparent. (2) Experience is our only gateway to the real, but the reality always transcends the limits of the experiential status quo. (3) In the long historical tradition of distinguishing reality from appearance there is often a misleading conflation of epistemic and ontological consideration. (4) Properly construed, the idea of reality pivots on the contrast between what actually is so and what is merely- and perhaps mistakenly- thought to be so.”¹⁷⁰

To overcome the architecture theory crisis, the intricacy to be disentangled is to distinguish “what is merely- and perhaps mistakenly- thought to be so” and speculate its own reality amongst the authentic imagery encompassing the realities and the overflow appearances. For this reason, if architecture can admit itself as the mirror, it can distinguish what is external to it and how it makes the extrinsic apparent. After that, architecture's real intrinsic can react and lead act, exposing a moral premise to sight. Right action can only be achieved if abided thoroughly by reality; that is, what will be ever-present is that of coherence, which seeks to complete an ethico-political project of architecture. Being sure of that coherence is a moral charge for architecture, as Rescher emphasizes the actions taken towards alienation: “Distinguishing between what we do actually think about something (thoughts), what we would think about it if our information were really adequate (true thoughts or facts), is critical for the distinction between reality and appearance, between what there is and what we think about it.”¹⁷¹

¹⁷⁰ “Reality vs. Appearance,” in Nicholas Rescher, *Reality and Its Appearance* (Bloomsbury Publishing, 2011).

¹⁷¹ “Truth and Reality,” *ibid.*

4.3 Realist Fragmentation

Realism has been exercised in diverse disciplines within their specific historicity. It has been defined and debated according to different perspectives characterized broadly under two main theoretical categories, philosophical and aesthetic. While the types of realism are diverse, they also branch out into varying conceptual schemes within each disciplinary outline under such following subject sub-matters; philosophy of science, epistemology, ethics, political philosophy, philosophy of perception, art, and architectural history, yet the multiplicity regarding realism shares meta-theoretical integrity.

While realism's repercussions have projected onto the very being of architecture and the way architecture is produced, the field of architecture as well have recourse to realism to deepen architecture's epistemological endeavor for achieving a critical will that can be conveyed as mutual. Realism has been seen as potentially emancipatory in the purview of architecture, and the architectural vocation for realism has its own historical and geographical expeditions. Starting in the late nineteenth century, the architectural debates in England have inquired on what is "real" for Christian architecture and searched discrete answers for the true nature of intention, function, structure, and material. Following the early thirties of the twentieth century, the influence of the first congress of Soviet writers in Moscow in 1934, realism has been seeped down to architectural landscapes, but its application was seen as problematic.¹⁷² As pushed to the semantic gap between the aesthetic plea and the ideological search, socialist realism first prompted social constructivism and

¹⁷² Bernard Huet, "Formalism – Realism [1977]," in *Architecture Theory since 1968*, ed. K. Michael Hays (Cambridge: MIT Press, 2000), 257. The original article was published as "Formalisme-Realisme," in *L'Architecture d'Aujourd'hui* 190 in 1977, and it is translated for that anthology.

the partial relation of art and architecture to society. However, radical functionalism could not achieve to bring them together.

The conjugated drive on both the aesthetic and epistemic pole brought the problematization of representation and meaning as well as ideology and political idealism, which open new critical capacities to be questioned in the long run. The emerging contradictions are sprung up in Europe after the Second World War under the umbrella of realism as a reaction to the ongoing avant-garde utopia and modernity, which has been epitomized at the 15th Triennale di Milano in 1973 entitled as *Architettura Razionale*, curated by Aldo Rossi. The search for a social reality commenced on the Soviet shore has induced the pursuit of the lost historical reality of the Continent.

However, the claim of reality as history has relied on “architectural” codes, which became the collected imagery of the past introduced under the populist postmodern / anti-modern tendencies. On the other hand, the other approach to reality under the “neo-rationalist” method again idealized historical architecture by setting forth its discursive context; however, it never superseded the desire for autonomy. The loosened connection to its theoretical background brought the architectural manifestation of realism an accusation of mere functionalism and formalism.¹⁷³ Following that, starting onwards *Tendenza* and its aftermath until the beginning of the 1990s, the issue of realism has been broadly discussed concerning social constructivism, utopianism, typology, and urban form.

Unfortunately, the transformative capacity of realism has fallen behind those formalist charges, and its potency has been overlooked as a groundwork of possible phenomenological strategies. Hays explained the contradictions underlying realism as a problem of value. “The “real” represented by architectural realism is a real that

¹⁷³ Ibid.

architecture itself has produced, so its “verification” becomes even more complex.”¹⁷⁴

Bernard Huet, in his article, 1977, concludes: “Formalism is technocratic. The mechanical application of technology to reality masks the latter and transforms it into abstraction. Any architecture which is reduced to a series of financial, distributive, or constructive techniques is “formalist.” Finally, formalism is irrational. The architects who seek architecture’s own rationality outside architecture (in sociology, contentism, etc.) run the serious risk of formalism.”¹⁷⁵ Further, he restates: “Any conception which privileges content to the detriment of aesthetics (contentism, sociology, functionalism), or which lingers over a purely formal play with language or figurative abstraction, will, therefore, be called “formalist.”¹⁷⁶ Huet put forward the symptoms for the extremities of realism; he diagnosed them but did not give the prescription corresponding to the realism hypothesis of architecture. Henceforth, architecture has been shut in between what is intrinsic and what is extrinsic to itself. Realism’s will could not reach out to the realization of the collective reason and turned out *an impasse situated on the dialectic between content and form*.

The debate of realism proposed to recapture the reproductive mechanisms of space could not have been deduced to a single “reality,” hence proliferated to architecture as formal realism, socialist realism, historical realism, utopian realism, and so on. Though, the architectural artifact is miscast to all extents and failed to bring the relational nature of emerging properties of idealism, ideology, and the changed status of history into being.

¹⁷⁴ K. Michael Hays, *Introduction* for “Formalism – Realism,” *Architecture Theory Since 1968*, MIT Press, Cambridge, MA, 2000, p.254.

¹⁷⁵ Huet, "Formalism – Realism [1977]," 259.

¹⁷⁶ *Ibid.*, 257.

As explained earlier, in “Some Thoughts on the Pathology of Architecture,” 2017, Michael Hays portrays the symptomologist of architecture.¹⁷⁷ The symptomologist is the one who works through what is latent and even unrepresentable in undiscovered territory. However, his illustration for “a kind of symptomology – a diagnosis of architecture as a complex response or manifestation of some underlying social and historical contradiction”¹⁷⁸ is more than a mere declaration through the artifact but a reoccupation of the premises of architectural/disciplinary signifier. Therefore, the role of a symptomologist of the architectural discourse is to reveal a game of signification that blurred its referent.

The failure of architecture in the realist agenda ended up as if architectural discourse cannot compromise between the dematerialized utopia and architecture’s own means of matter, which has been cast as a problem of reification. The Oxford Dictionary of Sociology defines reification as “the error of regarding an abstraction as a material thing and attributing causal powers to it—in other words, the fallacy of misplaced concreteness.”¹⁷⁹ The flaw was isolated over the problem of “how language cannot represent, or correspond to, non-language.”¹⁸⁰ “Reification just is the pathology of modernism” is a very brief outline of Michael Hays’s remark of Manfredo Tafuri, Jameson, and T.J. Clark’s analysis and their conclusion, which sets the truth-claims for mediating architectural discourse of the 1970s as well as the following decade.¹⁸¹ Furthermore, reification was inferred as a consequential predicament of capitalist expansion for the architectural agency of that time. However, since neoliberalism and its authority on the post-truth cultural and aesthetic discourse are evolved over

¹⁷⁷ Hays, "Some Thoughts on the Pathology of Architecture," 33.

¹⁷⁸ Ibid.

¹⁷⁹ “reification.” In J. Scott and G. Marshall, *A Dictionary of Sociology* (Oxford University Press, 2009), 641.

¹⁸⁰ Justin Cruickshank, *Critical Realism: The Difference It Makes* (Taylor & Francis, 2003), 5.

¹⁸¹ Hays, "Some Thoughts on the Pathology of Architecture," 32-33.

that expansion, reification undeniably has never left the agenda. Hays, in the article that appeared in *Architecture is All Over*, covered how the contemporary architectural agency compromised the problemata of reification by exemplifying over the Lacanian desire and drive duality:

“The metonymy of desire is the transfer of the failure to find the lost object, or to fill the void- the transfer of that failure onto an endless arranging of partial objects, small-other objects, all of which are unsatisfactory; so we get fixated on the objects. Whereas the drive is satisfied with its endless circulation around its object without ever reaching its destination; it doesn’t get anxious or fixated. Drive is the fixation.¹⁸²

Hence, whether what is desired is empowered through pure formalism, or pure socialism, in the end, what the agency can reify becomes the drive. However, such reason attaches importance to the agency, yet overemphasizing agency can never bring practical resolutions deprived of emphasizing the structure. Moreover, even overemphasizing both is not adequate unless they are linked to the emergent properties.¹⁸³ Hays also characterized the awareness of the emerging practices on their way of being, or in other words, their world-views: The following passage has evoked such question whether a sense of agency -not as in individual sense but in a collective formation -can be in the presence within the re-engagement of the discipline, which indeed enables another stratum entangled within the discourse that is cognitive.

“Students and young architects don’t seem to accept that they are part of a discourse or an intellectual continuity which stretches behind them and in front of them and which sets the conditions for practicing architecture, that there is an archive which must be disrupted. Without acknowledging the archive and its necessary transgression, then the decision to do

¹⁸² Ibid.

¹⁸³ Cruickshank, *Critical Realism: The Difference It Makes*, 3.

architecture, to begin an architectural project, becomes purely practical, rather than a theoretical problem.”¹⁸⁴

In 2016, Zaero-Polo published a map of young practices and their adjacencies in specific political categories titled “Architecture’s Political Compass,” via seven broad political positions; activists, populists, new historicists, skeptics, material fundamentalists, austerity chic and techno-critical. As a result of that taxonomy, he indicated a common indecisive position to take an ideological statement and pointed out that even they avoided Pragmatism, while many young practices requested “Pragmatic” as a choice.¹⁸⁵ In that case, that sort of portrayal of practices cannot be evened the course that originated right after realism’s demise of the 1990s’ detachment of theory, which has been seen as helpless and a pseudo-intellectuality. “It is not in the dreaming; it is in the doing” framework is instead the very end-product of that escape and unfortunately yielded into pure pleasures of the economy. Still, even right before the 1970s, Manfredo Tafuri had already diagnosed the ideology of consumption right at the center between utopianism and realism. He encapsulated in such prose:

“The decline of social utopianism confirmed ideology’s surrender to the politics of things created by the laws of profit. Architectural ideology, in both its artistic and urban forms, was left with the utopia of form as a project for recuperating the human Totality in the ideal Synthesis, as a way of mastering Disorder through Order. Architecture, therefore, insofar as it was directly linked to the reality of production, was not only the first discipline to accept, with rigorous lucidity, the consequences of its already realized commodification. Starting from problems specific to itself, modern architecture, as a whole, was able to create, even before the mechanisms and theories of Political Economy had created the

¹⁸⁴ Hays, "Some Thoughts on the Pathology of Architecture," 33.

¹⁸⁵ Alejandro Zaera-Polo & Guillermo Fernandez Abascal. "Architecture's "Political Compass": A Taxonomy of Emerging Architecture in One Diagram" 16 Dec 2016. ArchDaily. Accessed 20 Dec 2018. <https://www.archdaily.com/801641/architectures-political-compass-a-taxonomy-of-emerging-architecture-in-one-diagram/>> ISSN 0719-8884

instruments for it, an ideological climate for fully integrating design, at all levels, into a comprehensive Project aimed at the reorganization of production, distribution and consumption within the capitalist city.”¹⁸⁶

What marks Tafuri’s statement *de facto* even in the succeeding fifty years and probably fifty more is that the turn towards the dematerialized Utopia within the material manifestation of form. However, when a similar crisis is readdressed as the object of contemporary architectural discourse in relation to a totally new period, called post-truth, what is expected in the conclusions of any analytical dialogue between architectural and politico-philosophical inquiry must draw a more cultivated perspective compared to that of the 1970s, even it is a recurring agenda. The discourse starting through the millennium, which was diagnosed and probed architecture’s mediatic relationship with itself concerning neoliberal truths, has proposed two mainstream strategies to reclaim architecture’s dignity. First has highlighted an absolute nihilism for architecture as a discipline and practice; the other proposed a resistance that the reification of architecture in neoliberal conditions lies entirely within “the necessity of critique.”¹⁸⁷ However, what is needed must be somehow more than the avant-garde modes of criticality. The truth-claim of today’s diagnosis should have presented an architecture that does not just reproduce that avant-garde tradition but produces an original statement and associated modes of making.

The architectural ideology, as criticized for being accorded to market rationalities and depleted from what is societal in the 1970s, is reclaimed in our twenty-first-

¹⁸⁶ Manfredo Tafuri, "Towards a Critique of Architectural Ideology [1969]," in *Architecture Theory since 1968*, ed. K. Michael Hays (Cambridge: The MIT Press, 2000), 15.

The original article was published as “Per una critica dell’ideologia architettonica,” *Contrapiano* 1, 1969.

¹⁸⁷ The book; Spencer, D. *The Architecture of Neoliberalism: How Contemporary Architecture Became an Instrument of Control and Compliance*. Bloomsbury Publishing, 2016, concludes with the statement of critical necessity.

century politics and economic structure mostly called neoliberalism post-truth / post-reality era. What has been put forward as emancipatory for the reiterated ideological transition of architecture is to return to politics, to promote strong negation known as negative criticism, which might have been highlighted as a nostalgia for the avant-garde.

“It has been acknowledged on numerous occasions: modernity configured itself as a culture of promise. Its notions of value were installed in a more or less distant future as a strategy for giving them enough historical credit and, by extension, for encouraging the modern subject to accept the condition of suffering patiently. Happiness would then come within our reach one day soon if we applied ourselves diligently to doing as we were told. The modern story was thus articulated within a time that was abstract, deferred and planned.”¹⁸⁸

Considering the current framework of architecture’s status in neoliberal turn, what architectural ideology has been broken down to is a sole matter as if when the realism debate was at the center of the architectural agenda. Mediatization marks off a survival kit for architects underlining that there is no way out of the situated market imperatives if they want to find a chance to practice; an architect can only survive reproducing the existing matter. Then, the contradictions under the critique of realism have been reiterated for Architecture that is to be actualized. It sounded like a false note; the architectural practice has seemed to have no chance to exist unless it gets real, which is a prerequisite for its auto reflexivity. Moreover, to deny the reproductive capacity of global capital reigned through the built environment has reached along with the inaction of profession following the architecture postmortem. Nevertheless, the already dematerialized truth-claim, which is anticipated with democracy, ethics, rights, could not permeate into the assured, self-reproofed

¹⁸⁸ M.J. Neveu and N. Djavaherian, *Architecture's Appeal: How Theory Informs Architectural Praxis* (Taylor & Francis, 2015), 8.

envelope of architectural materialism. At this point, although criticism is negative, it does not advance as a transformative power, and it cannot go beyond a mere definition that analyzed the complexity and contradictions, which are legitimated under the truths of the post-truth era. The contemporary architectural proposals to fight against the tenets of neoliberalism, if not crediting the death of architecture, impose a position as opposition, resistance, and negation, which can be called at variance with the present periodicity, hence as nostalgic. Is there something new in the political extremism embedded in advance negative criticism? What is suggested is not to neutralize the political contact. Yet without misjudging the potency of radical criticism that has its roots in modernity, there is a need for an immediate obligation for critique to escape from the confinement of sheer intellectual debate and remold in the contemporary communicative acclimatization. In this case, how can criticism infiltrate within the closed system of architecture reoriented towards managerialism both in practice and theory?

The present state of architectural discourse is a constellation of truth-claims on discipline's indecisive identity advanced by its own agency. Truth-claims are patterned to external crises that have yielded to internal disciplinary/professional conflicts. Those patterns have power on our perception of what architectural reality is and what reality might have become. What is proposed is a framework that extends the realist account of social sciences to read the truth-claims of architecture following the period of "After Theory." Rather than devising a method, the study is asserted only to extend the contact area of critical realist metatheory and architecture theory to guide the philosophical account of contemporary architecture placed at the center of the politicization of critical discourse about the sociological and economic present. The mutual understanding of critical realist theory and architecture theory opens a constitutional debate on how architectural theories at the 21st century should be constructed.

In the chronic crisis and transition scenography, this research is intended to review the recurring plea for negation and resistance in contemporary discourse against the stream that calls on the death of architecture by underlining the moral premises of

the multidisciplinary critical realist social philosophy. Critical realism will be appealed through its emancipatory vision that will stage what is “real” concerning the changing epiphanies of Architecture in sync to emerging social phenomena.

CHAPTER 5

A DISCIPLINE RECAST: THE INCOMPLETE ETHICO-POLITICAL PROJECT OF ARCHITECTURE THEORY

5.1 A Prospect for “Parrhesia”: The Ethical Index of Architecture Theory

*“Then everything includes itself in power
Power into will, will into appetite;
And appetite, an universal wolf,
So doubly seconded with will and power,
Must make perforce an universal prey, And last eat up himself.”¹⁸⁹
Troilus and Cressida, Act One, Scene Three*

The critique of neoliberalism has become a prolific research category for the contemporary architecture theory as it has been for humanities and the social science disciplines for so long. This simultaneous phenomenon exercising beyond nations as intertwined and evolved out of globalization has been seemed to branch out in distinct strands under many disciplinary analyses, initially emanated in economics and geography. The socio-spatial relations concerning neoliberalism have crystallized under built environments and the following capitalist construction demand and spatialization. As noted, contemporary architecture and design strategies have become the ground that the neoliberal agenda presents new categories of experiences and cultural paradigm advancement. Moreover, the roof that architecture provided for the tenets of neoliberalism also frames its consecutive analysis, a divided yet co-occurring discursive formation in and out but mainly on

¹⁸⁹ James Holly Hanford, "A Platonic Passage in Shakespeare's "Troilus and Cressida"," *Studies in Philology* 13, no. 2 (1916).

architecture's disciplinary boundaries. Within these two-folded discourses, one concerns its legitimization and the advancement of subordination, the other its counter activist portrayal. In the case of the architectural practice, while the one end indicates the "resistance" practices fleshed out of the contemporary neoliberal society's refusal, the other remarks the "compliant" practices adapted to the building market's everchanging premises. Contradictions, tensions, reactions, and reconciliations between these two ends provide a rethinking basis for a prospective discipline that may empower the weakened ties of criticism; consequently, discipline's relation to criticism may become the reaction step performing beyond mere opposition. Without a doubt, the path to explore a revisionist position over architecture theory's already-visited routes also drives towards an intense confrontation of these two tense sides of the practice. Therefore, to reach out a positional conjecture on architecture bearing on neoliberal avantgarde, it is needed to be dazed by the human condition inherited to our present. Underscoring the human condition and its relationality that prevails upon Architecture's actuality brings a subjective scale to any claim of an existential orientation via architecture. As far as recasting architecture has a revivalist sound, the challenge eventually contains moral-self and inevitably aggregates and reflowerishes the ongoing debate on the architecture agency and the architect's role. Within this grounding, architecture theory's moral index is comprised at the heart of dialogue worthy of naming.

In the first place, any agent within this operative mechanism called architecture and any exertion of whom, towards an end product, whether it is building, or an "architectural text" opened to be read, viewed, or experienced, involves a course of the dialogue. The dialogue through diverse communicative systems that architecture has been operated is an obligation for such a creative act. Then reenvisioning on semiotic practices involved in architecture is never an antiquated endeavor; it is the only possible way to beat a path to the door of moral halt ensuing cognitive fabric, namely the moral consciousness as Jurgen Habermas named. Before dealing with the particular notes addressing the triangle of architecture, neoliberalism and ethics, primarily a versatile relational framework will be given in terms of translation,

dialogue, and intentionality. Consequently, this framework is supposed to lead to the architect's subjectification together by his/her discursive formation grown out of the universalist qualities of the triad of rationality, responsibility and answerability that may develop into a prospect of Parrhesia.

However, for creating a reflective pause before initiating the aforementioned framework, Marcel Duchamps' words on "The Creative Act" will serve as a pretext:

"Let us consider two important factors, the two poles of the creation of art: the artist on the one hand, and on the other the spectator who later becomes the posterity. To all appearances, the artist acts like a mediumistic being who, from the labyrinth beyond time and space, seeks his way out to a clearing. If we give the attributes of a medium to the artist, we must then deny him the state of consciousness on the esthetic plane about what he is doing or why he is doing it. All his decisions in the artistic execution of the work rest with pure intuition and cannot be translated into a self-analysis, spoken or written, or even thought out."¹⁹⁰

Art and architecture share the exact condition that their essence is based on creativity. This vast ground carries an idealistic conception of similarity for both, yet, what discerns them is the interpretative habits that they inherited. Following Duchamps's statement, it is possible to say that art is muted to words; on the contrary, architecture is out loudly lived through words before being erected and experienced; it necessitates to be translated for persuasion and adequacy. Unlike art, architecture comes into existence through the matter of what art abstained, the self-analysis. While art is accredited through monologue, dialogue is resolutely the constituting system for architecture. Therefore, their disposition in translatability decouples not just art and architecture but the artist and the architect as well. As opposed to the artist of whom the verbalization of the matter-reason behind his/her artwork is

¹⁹⁰ "The Creative Act," in M. Duchamp and M. Sanouillet, *The Essential Writings of Marcel Duchamp: Marchand Du Sel ; Salt Seller* (Thames and Hudson, 1975), 138.

denied, the architect must elaborate through prescriptions, validations, and instructions. Art has the free pass to rule as “L’art pour l’art” but architecture outgrows its own autonomy and desperately needs legitimization.

In “Tulane Papers: The Politics of Contemporary Architectural Discourse,” in 1995, Mark Wigley equated the capacity of architecture to its capacity of storytelling with a straightforward statement: “Architecture is only ever discourse about building.”¹⁹¹ He states that: “The basic politics of discourse is determined by our shared commitment to the proposition that architecture is a unique kind of object in our culture because it in some way both precedes and enables discourse. When a building becomes architecture by talking – yes, that’s all architecture is, the talking building, or the idea of the talking building- this talk supposedly comes out of the building itself.”¹⁹² While Wigley features storytelling over the other modes of practicing as an interactional and social transaction of ideas that initially ground the building itself, indeed, recontextualizes architecture and its ties to politics. He concentrates on what is behind what is made visible through stories. In his word: “A major issue is how people legitimize their choice of subject, how they choose examples within that subject, how their arguments are constructed, how stories are told.”¹⁹³ It is a point that his argument contains a Heideggerian evocation; the language is potent for concealment as much as for revealment. In particular, this dimensional relation with language broadens the question of ethics. As Jerome Bruner underlines: “To tell a story is, “inescapably, to take a moral stance.”¹⁹⁴ It would seem that in architecture, too, moral choices are beginning to be made with the words even before the desired object. Architecture metabolizes at first through words aside buildings. That is to

¹⁹¹ Wigley, “Story-Time,” 82.

¹⁹² Ibid.

¹⁹³ Ibid.

¹⁹⁴ B. Jerome, J.S. Bruner, and U.P.J. Bruner, *Acts of Meaning: Four Lectures on Mind and Culture* (Harvard University Press, 1990).

say, the stories told by architects, or their buildings bring along an interrogation of morality. The narration of architecture is already resonant with the primacy that architects are moral subjects. Then, we can take this as preoccupied with the theme of intentionality. Down to “a discipline to recast,” it must be noted that any transformative story to be told is also conjured with a moral point of view. Highlighting or exposing intentions would also require responding to the interrelation with the perception of self-consciousness, in other words, assigned as moral consciousness.

Despite the beneath moral conduct and its objectives, when architecture is sleeved down to its autonomous final artifact, the design practice is responsible for an all-around procedure. The end product is in continuum with the rational decision-making line of action involving many actors who object, negotiate, settle, and approve. Even architecture is referred to as “seemingly neutral,” the prescription of the artifact must precede its aftereffect. Beyond its embellished narrative, “why” the particular outcome is decidedly mastered is an initial question prospected to be justified and along reconciled. The internal logic peculiar to the artifact, the preconditions, and the prospective bias are realized into a self-analysis before being embedded into the real world. Architecture is only unfolded after a series of ‘rational’ decisions that invoke a close grip on the notion of answerability.

Moreover, when the artifact is materialized, the building is remained concretized and fixed; however, its con-text continually changes. Correspondingly, anyone who is touched in any sense by the outcomes of architecting expands the limits of the archive of the building. Then, architecture ceases to be the self-referential sign, and it turns out an everyday object for personal inquiries, a frame to host for the upcoming stories. While the intrinsic relationship between the building and its context marks a threshold for the discourse that emerges out of it, the discursive production surpasses the material object that has been founded on and becomes a distinct entity within the cumulative “unities of discourse.” These streaming accumulations are postulated as the datum for dialogism when the architect’s job is done. Then architecture is augmented beyond a mere building knitted together with

a narrative fantasy and masters beyond that literal level through dialogue. In short, conversely to art and the artist, the last statement of Duchamps may need to be rewritten for architecture and the architect as such: “All his/her decisions in the ~~artistic~~[architectural] execution of the work [cannot] rest with pure intuition and ~~cannot~~[have to] be translated into a self-analysis, spoken or written, more than just thought out.”¹⁹⁵

Likewise, in *Philosophy to Fine Art* as one of the seminal books in the genre that enhance the philosophical interconnectedness of art and architecture, Georg Wilhelm Friedrich Hegel portrays architecture’s mission “as manipulating external inorganic nature that it becomes cognate to mind.”¹⁹⁶ Architecture is, then, a mere rationalization process engaged in diverse exigencies that seem to belong to any other discipline rather than architecture itself. As regards, it is not a coincidence that the word “cognate” is chosen purposely since it is a term of linguistics, meaning “having the same origin as another word or language.”¹⁹⁷ Architecture is undoubtedly the medium of translation that, in the end, speaks the mind.

Translatability is a prime impetus on what architecture is designated to do. It enables to clarify what architecture turns into beyond its underlying designerly decision-making. It becomes an opening line for much architectural case analysis that encapsulates the world created by language, namely the construct of culture, into the “extra-lingual reality” of architecture and vice versa. That is to say, the concept of translation is most celebrated to examine architecture in all cases and utilized as a constructive reading tool for architectural theory leveled in semiotic research.

¹⁹⁵ Duchamp and Sanouillet, *The Essential Writings of Marcel Duchamp: Marchand Du Sel ; Salt Seller*.

¹⁹⁶ G.W.F. Hegel and B. Bosanquet, *The Introduction to Hegel's Philosophy of Fine Art* (Kegan Paul, Trench, 1886a., 1886), 160.

¹⁹⁷ “cognate.” Oxford English Dictionary.

Transcoding of translation into architecture theory and history can be traced back to its authentic sources, which share the cultural-linguistic roots in diverse intellectual allegiances. One of the leading circles dedicated to the phenomenon of culture and its semiotic systems knotted to the concept of translation is the seminal research field held by Jury Lotman in Tartu-Semiotic School. He treats translation as the critical incentive of culture even capitalizes it as the foundation of thinking. Lotman characterized that as: "...the elementary act of thinking is translation. Now we can go further and say that the elementary mechanism of translating is dialogue."¹⁹⁸ Lotman, in other words, formulated a model of culture indebted to acts of communication.

"It follows that the act of communication (in any sufficiently complex, and consequently culturally valuable, instance) should be seen not as a simple transmission of a message which remains adequate to itself from the consciousness of the addresser to the consciousness of the addressee, but as a translation of a text from the language of 'I' to the language of your 'you'."¹⁹⁹

Lotman's approach may contribute to "Architecture" in terms of its own agentic and societal reception. All the addressers and addressees share that dialogic consciousness over the architectural mind, yet each language that Architecture is constructed on is still as prominent as its collective totality.

The semiotic quality lying beneath social sciences is also inseparable in the context of many distinct seminal approaches since semiotics is a radical orientation of self-

¹⁹⁸ Yuri M. Lotman, *Universe of the Mind: A Semiotic Theory of Culture*, trans. Ann Shukman (Great Britain: Indiana University Press: Bloomington and Indianapolis, 1990), 143.

¹⁹⁹ Originally referenced to Yuri M. Lotman, "Culture as collective intellect and the problems of artificial intelligence" in *Dramatic structure: poetic and cognitive semantics*, edited by Lawrence Michael O'toole and Ann Shukman. Vol/ 6 of *Russian Poetics in Translation*, edited by Ann Shukman, 84-96. Oxford: Holdan Books, in the book L. van Doorslaer and T. Naaijkens, *The Situatedness of Translation Studies: Temporal and Geographical Dynamics of Theorization* (Brill, 2021).

reflexivity that speaks for itself -meta-linguistic per se. The semantic equivalence of the acts of communication can be traced in another seminal project; Jurgen Habermas also constructed a model for a society seeking a human-generated change based on the linguistic capacities loaded with the concept of reason.²⁰⁰ The foundational capacity of communication intrinsic to both culture and society not only procreates but transcreates. This abiding characteristic makes linguistic-communicative turns a reference source for any moment of steady-state search of an answer for the disciplines that serve the public, as fully embodied with both the culture and the society. In the view of the above relationship, architecture and its (own) constitution(s) by language are inseparable from `communicative action` and its potency. Following that, architecture as the product and production of translation openly operates through dialogue by embodying “the communicative action.” Dialogue not only produces architecture but propagates it, which makes the visions transcend beyond the confines of architecture through dialogue. Therefore, the transformative change that has been sought for architecture from (its) crises may be indebted to the reiteration of the emphatic engagements of Habermas’s communicative action onto the possibility of considering architecture itself as the one of communicative action. The architectural agency is needed to work on a communicative action to take, which is to coordinate the premises set for discipline with the social realities disregarded. As Habermas noted: “The communicative theory of action is not a metatheory, but the beginning of a social theory concerned to validate its own critical standards.”²⁰¹ Since both community and communication share the same etymological root of common, any communicative deliberation points to reconciliation on a linguistic guide between architects and society. One action that will contain the cognitive alignment may be set upon “parrhesia.”

²⁰⁰ Jurgen Habermas, *The Theory of Communicative Action: Volume 1: Reason and the Rationalization of Society*, trans. Thomas McCarthy (Beacon Press, 1985).

²⁰¹ *Ibid.*, xxxix.

Parrhesia is an ancient Greek concept that has been explored by Michel Foucault and shared through his lectures “Discourse and Truth: The Problematization of Parrhesia” at Berkeley in 1983. This Hellenistic term is the projection of a tradition of truth cultured around the fifth century BC, meaning literally “frank speech.” However, parrhesia is a multidimensional concept evolved through Greek and Roman heritage; as Foucault underlines, the term means differently when held in specific contexts. While Foucault resolves the term as projected on frankness, truth, danger, criticism, and duty, he also analyzes the term’s evolution regarding its relationship with rhetoric, politics, and philosophy.²⁰²

“...parrhesia is a kind of verbal activity where the speaker has a specific relation to truth through frankness, a certain relationship to his own life through danger, a certain type of relation to himself or other people through criticism (self-criticism or criticism of other people), and a specific relation to moral law through freedom and duty. More precisely, parrhesia is a verbal activity in which a speaker expresses his personal relationship to truth, and risks his life because he recognizes truth-telling as a duty to improve or help other people (as well as himself).”²⁰³

Parrhesia, as Foucault indicates, stems etymologically from *pan* and *rhema*; it verbatim means “to say everything from.”²⁰⁴ It is a stance that constructs a genuine relationship with oneself through speaking truthfully, a philosophy that associates the speaker straight to their discourse. While there is a community to address as a recipient, it is indeed a dialogue with oneself; then, parrhesia becomes a way to construct an identity through frankness, making someone in parrhesia a parrhesiastes. The content of discourse is not ample to parrhesia, yet further undertaking a commitment to the attitude towards truthness is most qualified.

²⁰² Michel Foucault, "Discourse and Truth: The Problematization of Parrhesia," in *6 lectures at University of California at Berkeley, CA* ([https://foucault.info/parrhesia/Oct-Nov. 1983](https://foucault.info/parrhesia/Oct-Nov.1983)).

²⁰³ Ibid.

²⁰⁴ Ibid.

Foucault describes the subjectivization of the speaker inherent in parrhesiastic demeanor:

“If we distinguish between the speaking subject (the subject of enunciation) and the grammatical subject of the enunciated, we could say that there is also the subject of the enunciandum- which refers to the held belief or opinion of the speaker. In parrhesia the speaker emphasizes the fact that he is both the subject of enunciation and the subject of the enunciandum- that he himself is the subject of the opinion to which he refers.” The specific “speech activity” of the parrhesiastic enunciation thus takes the form: “I am the one who thinks this and that.”²⁰⁵

Concerning truth, Foucault underlines a critical mark and asks, “does the parrhesiastes say what he thinks is true, or does he say what is really true?”²⁰⁶ His quest unfolds the ligament for parrhesia linked to truth; the moral life of the speaker is affirmed through that parrhesiastic discourse as truth-giver. With this rendering, Foucault frames the parrhesia of antiquity contrary to modern-day epistemology. In the Greek sense, the congruence of belief and truth is taken for granted under the moral identity of parrhesiastes and is only legitimate through the parol accord of parrhesia in contrast to the wanted evidential experience of the Cartesian issue. “The ‘parrhesiastic game’ presupposes that the parrhesiastes is someone who has moral qualities which are required, first, to know the truth, and secondly, to convey such truth to others.”²⁰⁷ However, according to Foucault, truth-having is only parrhesiastic if the parrhesiastes take a risk by telling the truth. Philosophers using parrhesia in the ancient Greek epoch, speaking up truth against power, had highly suffered danger risking life. Raising a voice of truth outside of the status quo is always identified with courage and venture. However, considering the present time, as Foucault recognizes, the risk is not always a risk of life. When the contemporary

²⁰⁵ Ibid.

²⁰⁶ Ibid.

²⁰⁷ Ibid.

neoliberal quantity-oriented populism is taken into account, parrhesia is, at minimum, about risking the potentials that may be brought by contenting oneself with what is false.

Therefore, as Foucault identified parrhesia with responsibility, “the orator who speaks the truth to those who cannot accept his truth, for instance, and who may be exiled, or punished in some way, is free to keep silent. No one forces him to speak; but he feels that it is his duty to do so.”²⁰⁸ Thus, Parrhesiastes acts through responsibility and moral law; in like manner, it is the criticism itself that lays beneath any parrhesiastic act; this is one of the significant characteristics attributed to parrhesia by Foucault. Parrhesiastes knows how things should not be and dare say how they should to the majority, yet the parrhesiastic disclosure is not a mere declaration of discontent with the outer socio-political field. “The function of parrhesia is not to demonstrate the truth to someone else, but has the function of criticism: criticism of the interlocutor or of the speaker himself.”²⁰⁹ The self-questioning in the form of speaking truth to oneself is also a parrhesiastic disposition; Foucault further exemplifies the term’s evolution in relation to philosophy over great Cynic philosophers Seneca, Epictetus, Serenus, and deconstructs parrhesiastic practices as someone sets a specific relationship to oneself which he named “aesthetics of the self.”²¹⁰ Following the philosophical setting of Greco-Roman culture that Foucault framed: *We are also responsible for the aesthetics of the architectural-agency as for the self.*

²⁰⁸ Ibid.

²⁰⁹ Ibid.

²¹⁰ Ibid.

5.2 Emancipation: Architecture's Moral-Self and the "Emancipatory Critique"

Emancipation is a theoretically sophisticated concept nurtured in social sciences, which seeks the binding force weaving collective struggle and social transformation together into a new state of the universal and rational realm addressing human needs. Emancipation has been used in a general sense as a counterpart for liberation or freeing from human suffering, yet it has further been loaded with depth through the intellectual climates. As the thesis has been established on that the architectural *cogitatio* has never been cast far from critical social theory, then, it is so pervasive for the contemporary architectural discourse to follow up the ideational path that has reached the concept of emancipation spirited in the shores of critical theory, political theory, and Marxist philosophy.

On this account, before dealing with the recent emancipatory project of architecture based on the evolving discourse on globalized capitalism and its repression of tailoring the work of architects to muteness against the unbalance of social welfare and equality, it is essential to note the context of criticality, in which the concept of emancipation has been initially devised. The critical force advocated within the concept of emancipation has originated by all means in critical theory and was initially deployed within the Frankfurt School theorists, Horkheimer, Adorno, and Marcuse by grounding over the philosophical foundation of Marx, Kant, Hegel, and Weber.²¹¹ The historical groundwork that elicits the concept of emancipation has sprouted from the intellectual atmosphere witnessing the social world that the crises have devastated. The world wars, the following economic contractions, and the social despair ensued social transformations that were already happening without the

²¹¹ Shirley R. Steinberg and Joe L. Kincheloe, "Power, Emancipation, and Complexity: Employing Critical Theory," *Power and Education* 2, no. 2 (2010): 140.

possibility of evaluation drawn out of critical distance. This urgency to comprehend the in-progress social change of its time, the peculiarities of the concurrent Bolshevik Revolution, and the responses within the German stream of European Marxism has led the intellectuals of Frankfurt School and the Institute of Social Research towards the very roots of Marxist theory.²¹² They constructed a philosophical approach to social reality following the materialist theory, social theory, and psychoanalysis with the empirical sociological data-driven from the German socio-politic landscapes. However, inventing a novel mode of thinking called “critical theory” over the roots of the Marxist frame deployed the juncture of theory and practice into a practical social venture, which seeks solidarity and change. Through this reformulation, *theoria* has been put to be conducted upon as action, that is, the praxis. Praxis, as the definition of the Oxford English Dictionary proposed, is “conscious, willed action, esp. That through which theory or philosophy is transformed into practical social activity; the synthesis of theory and practice seen as a basis for condition of political and economic change.”²¹³ Critical theory as the essential foundation of practice is harbored through utopian narratives for the architectural sphere, which is often accompanied by negative criticism showing the downsides of discipline. Negativity through discursive productions still responds to any incompetency that practice embodied. pragmatist perspective asserting the incapacity of writing about architecture on transforming the built environment detaches discourse from being proactive. While realism accepts that reality exists outside of our assumption, the critical realist agenda that this thesis stands for argues that “a theory transforms practice, in the best case, by exposing and correcting cognitive errors implicit in

²¹² M. Jay and American Council of Learned Societies, *The Dialectical Imagination: A History of the Frankfurt School and the Institute of Social Research, 1923-1950* (University of California Press, 1996), 3.

²¹³ “Praxis” OED online, def.1.

practice.”²¹⁴ It supports the idea that a mere negative criticism is not a mere ineffective reaction, it indeed offers pro-action through that critical realist insight against the “practical attitudes [that] become immune to theoretical critique.”²¹⁵

“1. Critical theories have special standing as guides for human action in that: (a) they are aimed at producing enlightenment in the agents who hold them, i.e. at enabling those agents to determine what their true interests are; (b) they are inherently emancipatory, i.e. they free agents from a kind of coercion which is at least partly self-imposed, from self-frustration of conscious human action. 2. Critical theories have cognitive content, i.e. they are forms of knowledge. 3. Critical theories differ epistemologically in essential ways from theories in the natural sciences. Theories in natural sciences are ‘objectifying’; critical theories are ‘reflective.’”²¹⁶

Sustaining critical theory and its form of knowledge advocates the Architecture-self in constant reflexivity against the formalist urge for architecture that dissolved the social. In the most fundamental context, the polarity sets in positivist demarcation that is emulated for architectural practice. The essential opposition of critical and post-critical architecture points backward to the opposition of anti-naturalist and positivist stance that is defined by Raymond Guess:

“In Frankfurt usage of a ‘positivist’ is a person who holds: (a) that an empiricist account of natural science is adequate, and (b) that all cognition must have essentially the same cognitive structure as natural science. If all theories in natural science have an ‘objectifying’ structure, then to assert that all cognition has the structure of natural science is to assert that all cognition is ‘objectifying’ cognition. So positivism can be seen as the ‘denial

²¹⁴ Andrew Collier, *Critical Realism: An Introduction to Roy Bhaskar's Philosophy* (Verso, 1994), 15.

²¹⁵ Ibid.

²¹⁶ Raymond Guess, *The Idea of a Critical Theory: Habermas and the Frankfurt School* (Cambridge University Press, 1981), 1-2.

of reflection,' i.e. as a denial that theories could be both reflective and cognitive.”²¹⁷

Post-critical denial of reflection is in convergence with the positivist philosophy of knowledge, which reset the delicacy towards ideas in contrast to pure actions. “With the demise of ‘big schools’ of thought, the idea of a Theory that would directly guide architectural practice has lost its appeal. What has become known as the ‘crisis of theory’ can be brought back to the awareness that critical theory does not automatically lead to a form of critical practice.”²¹⁸ The desire for the efficacy of theory for practice expands on the overcast atmosphere of architectural discourse embedded in the assertive pragmatist publications. However, the aim must be to build an architectural mind that defines such a theory as appropriate and “critical” for praxis, and that is retained by carefully designating a moral self for each associate of any collective.

“Acts (or praxes) are the specific outcomes of the exercise of the power of intentional agency, the human counterpart of events in the non-human world: things that we do, as distinct from things that happen to us or just happen.”²¹⁹

The architect’s singular role is still determinist to “good society and good architecture,” even if it is inapt for the things that cannot be controlled in today’s complexities. The contextualization of the possibility of “architectural” parrhesia lies in the potential of examining the transformative motive sprung in several disciplines regarding the dissolution of the marginalized “major” and amplified under the “minor.” By interpreting the theories and concepts developed in sociology and politics resonated in the light of the philosophical concept “minorité” entailed by

²¹⁷ Ibid., 2.

²¹⁸ Isabelle Doucet and Kenny Cupers, "Agency in Architecture: Reframing Criticality in Theory and Practice," *Footprint* 4, no. September 2009 (2009): 1.

²¹⁹ “agency.” In Hartwig, *Dictionary of Critical Realism*, 19.

Deleuze and Guattari, there are many proposals for the “minor” in diverse disciplinary settings following the nineties onwards, “minor literature,”²²⁰ “minor theory”²²¹ “minor politics”²²² as well as “minor architecture.”²²³ *This mutual shift in thought* can be referred to as an origin to act for the parrhesiastic engagement of architecture, which makes it possible that a discursive reaction turns into an architectural action. Therefore, praxes as minor as one’s own capacity will still innately intent freedom “from instinctual determination and to produce in a planned, premeditated way.”²²⁴ Nevertheless, the glorified status subjected to the architect’s role is represented even in negation:

“There is a fundamental difference between the figure of the architect then in 1920 and 1930 and our time. If the Le Corbusier worked as an ‘intellectual’ engaged in a ‘patient search’ as opposed to Martin Wagner, Bruno Taut and Ernst May under the Weimar Republic, all of them intensely involved as ‘organizers’ in state municipalities and decision making, there is no such figure of the architect today, neither as an ‘intellectual’ nor as a ‘radical’ organizer. For while the former were, in various ways and more or less directly engaged with real issues of their time, the architect today is a member of global capitalism’s permissively hedonistic society. If he or she has any claim to be an ‘intellectual’ in the proper sense of the term, it can only be as ‘servile intellectual’ at the service of ‘the absolute monarchy of the capital.’ Perfectly at home with our post-utopian time, he or she is like the pathetic figure of Frank Gehry, utterly devoid of any utopian impulse.”²²⁵

²²⁰ Deleuze, Gilles et al. "What Is a Minor Literature?" *Mississippi Review*, vol. 11, no. 3, 1983, pp. 13-33.

²²¹ Cindi Katz, “Towards Minor Theory,” *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space*, 14(4), 1996, 487–499.

²²² Onur Eylül Kara, *Yapabileceğimizi Yapmak: Minör Siyaset ve Türkiye Örneği*, İletişim Yayınları, 2019.

²²³ Stoner, J. *Toward a Minor Architecture*. MIT Press, 2012. Stoner, J. *What Is a Minor Architecture?: A Bit of toward a Minor Architecture*. MIT Press, 2014.

²²⁴ Hartwig, *Dictionary of Critical Realism*.

²²⁵ Lahiji, *An Architecture Manifesto: Critical Reason and Theories of a Failed Practice*, 156.

The identity of an architect has been adapted to the formation of the neoliberal subject, where the problem of moral subjectivity is more apparent than ever. In this context, distinguishing the moral real from the moral counterfeit is the ultimate critical practice an architect may attain. As critical realist emancipatory critique stresses: “When it is just a set of false beliefs that enslaves, their replacement by true beliefs is liberation.”²²⁶ Furthermore, the premises of critical theory is still and all compelling in post-truth fiction; any attempt to discover the trace of truth is emancipatory since “a critical theory is concerned with preventing the loss of truth that past knowledge has labored to attain.”²²⁷ In this context, likewise, the “political” theme has become apparent in the architectural discourse starting the millennium; the “emancipatory” theme has followed up and “politicized” architecture more than ever. The recently published books on the emancipatory potential of Architecture have accompanied the sequential publications on politics:

*“Can Architecture Be an Emancipatory Project? Dialogues on Architecture and The Left”*²²⁸

*“Architecture or Revolution: Emancipatory Critique After Marx”*²²⁹

*“Positions on Emancipation Architecture between Aesthetics and Politics”*²³⁰

*“An Architecture Manifesto Critical Reason and Theories of a Failed Practice”*²³¹

The endeavor to recognize the relationship between architecture and emancipation, enunciating both the intellectual pessimism and the utopian optimism, unlocks further inquiries on subjective agency and practical morality, which critical realist

²²⁶ Andrew Collier, *Critical Realism: An Introduction to Roy Bhaskar’s Philosophy*, p.190

²²⁷ James Bohman, "Critical Theory," <https://plato.stanford.edu/archives/spr2021/entries/critical-theory/>.

²²⁸ Lahiji, *Can Architecture Be an Emancipatory Project?: Dialogues on Architecture and the Left*.

²²⁹ *Architecture or Revolution: Emancipatory Critique after Marx* (Taylor & Francis, 2020).

²³⁰ *Positions on Emancipation Architecture between Aesthetics and Politics*.

²³¹ *An Architecture Manifesto: Critical Reason and Theories of a Failed Practice*.

philosophy may be deployed. From a critical realist perspective, the moral self is an object of both personal and social production, constituting itself in the way of a eudaimonic practice concerning the emerging premises and anxieties regarding the totality of discipline.

“Society as the condition of action and society as its outcome both belong to the subject-matter of social science, which is concerned with mechanisms whereby the former develops into the latter. So far as people are concerned, the distinctively personal concepts – consciousness (and Unconscious in the Freudian sense), agency, reason, motive, desire, belief – are all connected with the aspect of action as production. Action as reproduction/ transformation is generally action as taken over by social mechanisms. The only exception is when production and reproduction coincide, i.e. when people intentionally reproduce or transform their social structure. The duality of practice, then, is a duality between social and personal aspects of practice.”²³²

The agentic consciousness starts on the individualist spectrum, in order to be able to talk about the moral self of Architecture, the moral self must be established at individualist experience. The assured way to do this is again through the imprescriptible statement given by Tafuri.

“For us the critique of ideology was a critique of the left. My own program was to develop a critique of the ideological thought that has pervaded architectural history, art history, and history in general... one should always address the critique of ideology towards his or her own ideology, not the ideology of his or her enemy. What needs to be deideologized is precisely the cultural context within which one fights.”²³³

²³² Collier, *Critical Realism: An Introduction to Roy Bhaskar's Philosophy*, 146.

²³³ Manfredo Tafuri, interview by Luisa Passerini, *La Storia come Progetto* (Los Angeles: Oral History Program, University of California, Los Angeles, and the Getty Center for the History of Art and Humanities, 1993), 44. In Pier Vittorio Aureli, “The Critique of Architectural Ideology, in *Architecture and Capitalism* by Peggy Deamer.)

The individual should be able to take a stance against the premises of his acculturation in which he/she is cogently manipulated. That puts the deideologization is a task tailored peculiarly for each and anyone who takes an interest in Eudaimonia despite being under the weather of post-truth.

5.3 Learning from Critical Realism

Proposing critical realist philosophy as a meta-analysis for understanding the shifts in assizing what architecture is may act upon the future diagnosis and intervention that the following periodical architectural phenomenon will be subjected to. Moreover, it has the potency to instill a reaction-formation to the architectural agency to declare oneself's own moral pronouncement against the shared climate of practice that only provides publicity for late capitalism. Learning from the critical realist treatise may help architects to constitute a personal work identity and ethics based on a better rendering of reality and prominence of value and stand evocative to create a new design inventory for the practice, which anticipated solidarity and transparency.

Therefore, it is intended to take a particular architectural thinking approach that may be possible if an understanding of critical realism is achieved. That is, also, to distinguish ourselves from a mere realist outline, which has been imposed on the agency since pragmatism beats “architectural theory,” yet, without following into deflationist hermeneutic spiral. Critical realism is recognized as a philosophical guidance for this chapter that may open up a broader comprehension of architecture's reception within its agency. This subchapter argues that the school of thought in critical realism and its theory construction process may revive the abiding necessity of critique on the positions taken via different roles in different scales that the thesis is after.

Foremost, how architecture has lost its ties to the “critical” and flawed its reputation within its agency warns us to take the idea of architecture as a total phenomenon into the center. For the diagnosis of architecture, any agenda attached in-depth to periodicity serves itself as a document. As deployed through the beginning of the 90s, the era between the late 60s to mid-90s as a document said roughly that the architectural production had been put to be based on the search for intellectualism. However, the spirit behind the social contribution and the struggle for civic activism of 1968 set in a reaction that suspects architecture discipline's social and intellectual potency. Nevertheless, the settled disciplinary anxiety has soon dominated and turned into the overuse of theoretical exploration. The urge to "criticality" was wasted away within the discourse ruled by schools, institutions, and publications. Yet, the products of which have later been subjected to the accusation of pseudo-intellectuality, and following that theorizing, lost its triumph to a new period that is emerged as a strong contest to the “critical,” as called pragmatism. That reaction to academization has dominated the discipline at short notice and soon saturated the agenda, which indexed the detachment from “real” practice that is over-encoded extrinsic thematics into the architectural domain under the garment of philosophical deficiency. The reality of architecture is degraded to a certain level by the pragmatist judgment that the intellectual pursuit laid on language and discourse is taking architecture nowhere. In this way, the interest in “criticality” faded or can be admittedly phrased as ‘exchanged’ with “post-criticality,” since the endemic architectural desire has slipped to new goals that are acclaimed to be the real “architectural.”

Moreover, in the following decades, the emergence of the so-called pragmatic venture has treated to be reconciled with the needs of capitalism, and it determined new fields of effects, which consumed as opposed to the "criticality" that architecture may touch otherwise. That progress-oriented, transgressive, and wild atmosphere of doing architecture dispensed with criticality has again resulted in its counter reception as the self-reflective cycle of architectural diagnosis per se. Architecture has been resulted in “failed practice” that cannot meet the objectives of not being

manipulated, and the complete diagnosis regarding architecture is stated as political anew. The repeating crisis schema carries much baggage regarding what is known and what will come next as a historical reference. The speculative mechanism in architectural discourse depends on the cycle that demands discredit, after, disorient, and finally, displace the immediately prior diagnosis. Therefore, any emergence resulting from the cycle is soon counted as synthetic; the positioning regarding architecture once again demands the real.

The persistence to sort out these contradictions and interrogations on the everchanging nature of what architecture offers is inherently linked to philosophy, which is bound up with theories of knowledge. How architecture sorts out its definitions and reactions genuine to periodicities dwells itself a theory of knowledge belonging to an epistemological context. The turmoil of the disciplinary, practical, theoretical, and pedagogical debates on judgment criteria drained into a vicious circle that over-analyzed the knowledge-producing activities. Nevertheless, settling more into that context or proposing more and more of an epistemological content did not carry the totality of architecture away from its 21st-century problems and sorrows. Therefore, articulating a position over a paradigmatic compass underpins a philosophical approach, which the thesis manifests by primarily giving ontology prominence. That is for sure, for scientific knowledge, certain assumptions guide all research, so does the research on the diagnosis of architecture. While the epistemic and the methodological landscapes of architectural research tide between predicaments and survivals, the least that is discussed is in what way ontological beliefs drive these epistemologies and methodologies. As known fundamentally, “ontology refers to researcher's belief about the nature of reality.” Therefore, the interest is needed to be shifted to the collective and agentive reception of the realities of Architecture, hence, the ontological. Corresponding that, a critical realist approach can elucidate the struggles of architectural diagnosis and the ensuing identity crisis as a well-suited philosophical stake.

Critical realism is a broad scholarly terrain on which many discussions revolve around diverse disciplinary perspectives of human sciences; it emerged as an

alternative approach in the conception of scientific knowledge. Critical realism is essentially a philosophical movement originating through the works of Roy Bhaskar(1944-2014) -yet, transcending his foundation- that has its evolutionary maneuvers elaborated through the 1970s till the 2000s. A general introduction may entitle these phases roughly as transcendental realism, critical naturalism, explanatory critiques, and dialectics if read as shaped in sequence through the canonical books written by Bhaskar.²³⁴ Complementarily, it has been framed chronologically through significant phases of original critical realism, dialectical critical realism, and at last, the philosophy of meta-reality. The evolutionary phases critical realism underwent belongs to the depths of a genuine philosophical investigation, which is drawn apart from what an architectural thesis may offer. However, its foundation is exceptionally accessible as a metatheory for those not credited with the philosophy proficiency, which makes the critical realist movement a powerful tool to guide architectural agency to take account of a peculiar cogitative attitude towards the 21st-century contradictions incidental to the architectural sphere. Therefore, the following introductory base underlying the extent of the critical realist movement indicates architecture adapted as/under social science.

By mining the four rudiment moments of the critical realism project, I will try to pinpoint a contact area for the Intrinsic Prognosis of current Architecture theory. The preconstruction of critical realism emerged initially with the books *A Realist Theory of Science*(1975) and *The Possibility of Naturalism*(1979) by Roy Bhaskar. The first, given as transcendental realism, was initiated as an oppositional philosophical stance against the Western philosophical tradition that solely speaks for the positivist conception of science that goes back to Humean skepticism and Kant's transcendental idealism. `Transcendental` of transcendental realism is denoted in a meaning confining to Kant's.²³⁵ As follows: An analogy that showed the parallelism

²³⁴ M. Archer et al., *Critical Realism: Essential Readings* (Taylor & Francis, 2013), ix.

²³⁵ Collier, *Critical Realism: An Introduction to Roy Bhaskar's Philosophy*, 25.

to what Copernicus signified for the theory of the universe is used for the transformative attitude of Kant's thinking achieved in philosophy. Kant's "Copernican revolution" was referred to as an anthropocentric shift in defining reality and our knowledge of it. The term "transcendental" intends that knowledge is only possible if it is perceived to the observer's senses, experience, thus cognition, which essentialized reality to "the way it appears to us through those given forms of jointly intuitive and conceptual grasp."²³⁶ The position puts epistemology at the foci of Kantian philosophy, which featured knowledge as it is equal to its episteme that is only conditioned to a subject. This understanding dominated the philosophy of science over three hundred years, which basically has centralized positivism until it brought an ample critical activity towards the twentieth century, outlined by Popperian, Kuhnian, and Wittgensteinian school of thought. "The positivist vision of science pivoted on the monistic theory of scientific development and a deductivist theory of scientific structure."²³⁷ This has its source in two fallacies peculiar to the philosophy of positivist orthodoxy: the epistemic and the ontic fallacy. The question of what it is is reduced to the question of what we can know, which depleted the field of ontology since the non-being is set out of the limits of knowledge of the subject. The realism stance makes its point for a reality independent from the subject; it stands for "reality is not necessarily how it appears to us," which falls into the statement that "The domain of real is distinct from and greater than the domain of empirical."²³⁸

Nevertheless, Bhaskar asserted a counter position to empiricist custom with A Realist Theory of Science (1975), reframed a non-anthropomorphic theory of science by taking "transcendental" onto realism. What is brought with transcendental realism as a base point for the critical realism project is that Bhaskar deepened the realm of

²³⁶ "transcendental realism (TR)." in Hartwig, *Dictionary of Critical Realism*, 476.

²³⁷ Archer et al., *Critical Realism: Essential Readings*, xii.

²³⁸ Ibid.

reality by distinguishing an intransitive domain along the established transitive dimension. Following that, for Bhaskar, the real cannot be confined to the relative and fallible transitive domain that excludes mechanisms, structures, properties, and causal powers apart from subjects' cognitive span. Therefore, the real is overlappingly stratified in the real, the actual, and the empirical domains by exceeding both transitive and intransitive dimensions. The tripartite constitution of reality covers the generative mechanisms, the generated events, and perceived experiences, which are noted as a set nested one within the other. While the domain of the real has comprehensively meshed with mechanisms, events, and experiences, the domain of the actual extends just to events and experiences, yet the empirical is only the experiences/concepts and signs received together.²³⁹

“By constituting an ontology based on the category of experience, as expressed in the concept of the empirical world and mediated by the ideas of the actuality of the causal laws and the ubiquity of constant conjunctions, three domains of reality are collapsed into one. This prevents the question of the conditions under which experience is in fact significant in science from being posed; and the ways in which these three levels are brought into harmony or phase with one another from being described.”²⁴⁰

The understanding of architecture is so assorted that the underlying ontological positions elude our grasp on the epistemic content built on. The primacy given to the epistemic output in architectural diagnosis is so similar to Roy Bhaskar's preceding evaluation regarding the sole category of experience that the whole set of reality is reduced. The diagnostic positions in architecture building a discourse then become just a vast map of unbeknown ontological standpoints confined in one sole of the domains of reality. On this assertion, the very corporeality of architecture, the

²³⁹ Bhaskar, *A Realist Theory of Science* [1975], 2.

²⁴⁰ "Philosophy and Scientific Realism," in *Critical Realism: Essential Readings*, ed. M. Archer, R. Bhaskar, A. Collier, T. Lawson, and A. Norrie. (Taylor & Francis, 2013), 41.

building itself, the completed product; the actuality that the very object of architecture is subjected to, which is “existing and acting at present,” depending upon eventual conjunctions; and the causal powers that both the product and its varied interpretations are structured by, entails differentiated ontological stance in constituting a diagnosis for an architecture totality.

“...one needs both a concept of the transitive process of knowledge-production and a concept of the intransitive objects of the knowledge they produce: the real mechanisms that generate the actual phenomena of the world, including as a special case our perceptions of them.”²⁴¹

When "architecture" becomes an adjectival for theory, history, and criticism, we cannot deny each nature of those. The textuality of architecture and its matter embedded in its social scientific part generates its defining aspect. Therefore, any attempt for architecture diagnosis needs to be constituting an ontology acknowledging these domains of transitivity and intransitivity. Nevertheless, besides the necessary philosophical precepts, a third concept is needed to be suited for the architectural object to be separated in its own idiomatic terms, an empirical methodology for its absoluteness. The term is brought into the discipline by Pier Vittorio Aureli as he defines an `absolute` for architecture following Agamben's semantic trajectory passing through Indo-European expressions to the renderings of both Hegel and Heidegger. Aureli engages attention to the concept by saying: “I use absolute not in the conventional sense of 'purity' but in its original meaning as something being resolutely itself after being 'separated from its other.’”²⁴² While establishing the condition of architecture over being separated and separating, he indeed characterizes the formal end product, which becomes nothing but itself. Returning to Aureli's source reference, Agamben etymologically starts with the

²⁴¹ Ibid., 45.

²⁴² Aureli, *The Possibility of an Absolute Architecture*, ix.

phonetic “se” of “se-luo” of the Latin verb Solvo from which the word 'absolute' is derived. Moreover, it exists in different languages signifying “what is proper and exists autonomously.” Furthermore, in Greek philosophy, the term absolute is expressed as kath'heauto, meaning “according to itself.” “To consider something kath'heauto is to consider it absolutely, that is, according to what is proper to it, according to its own se.”²⁴³ It is quite paradoxical for the discipline of architecture; since its corporeality is that “se,” which constitutes its absoluteness, it has the potential to become an intransitive object by itself in what is proper to itself.

However, “architecture” appropriates being absolute in two ways as it is both building (Fabrica) and reasoning (ratiocinatio).²⁴⁴ Meanwhile, by opening a parenthesis, following the eyes of critical realists, “absolute” at first implies “unrestricted, complete or utter,” meaning at the same time “not ontologically dependent on anything else.”²⁴⁵ Then, the corporeality of architecture may be seen as not ontologically dependent, which may indeed consolidate the appraisals for the discourse on the autonomy of architecture. On the other hand, the discussion may follow the same trajectory for the trilogy of architecture theory, history, and criticism. In “Critical Realism: The difference that it makes, in theory,” Jose Lopez explains how critical realism contributes to our perspective of how social theory works and how we should embrace it:

“Insofar as disciplines are constituted by both discursive and non-discursive practices, the conceptual networks that make social theory possible are part of the (intransitive) reality that social theory attempts to represent. It is their sui generis (intransitive) nature, the fact that they are a precondition for theoretical practice,

²⁴³ G. Agamben and D. Heller-Roazen, *Potentialities: Collected Essays in Philosophy* (Stanford University Press, 1999), 117.

²⁴⁴ Vitruvius, in Younés, "Constructing Architectural Theory," 233.

²⁴⁵ “absolute.” in Hartwig, *Dictionary of Critical Realism*, 14.

that makes it possible to examine conceptual development as a relatively autonomous process.”²⁴⁶

In this respect, the conceptual networks that architecture theory is accused of being saturated are also tied to the intransitive reality, allowing them to become ex posteriori. Returning to the constitution of architectural theory, history, and criticism, respectively, their beings depend on the architectural object's being; however, its intransitive nature plays a role in the disjunction of architecture and theory even under the title of "architecture theory." Therefore, the totality of architecture is both ontologically dependent and independent, causing the aporia for the architectural excogitation unless we did not stratify its reality from a critical realist point of view.

The world's differentiated status through a critical realist lens leads the researcher who is after cogitation to a complex totality as it is distinct from both the positivist and the post-positivist rendering of reality. Bhaskar, in his book “The Possibility of Naturalism: A Philosophical Critique of the Contemporary Human Sciences,” takes up a lucid argument on that margin:

“My investigation into the leading philosophies of social science may be conveniently introduced with a paradox. Positivism, grounded in the epistemological datum of the experience of the social scientific subject, produces some concept of the generality of its subject, but at the price of rendering social activity quite unlike science; while hermeneutics, grounded in the ontological notion of the conceptuality of the social scientific understanding, manages partially to reconstitute the experience of subjects in society, but at the price of rendering social activity insusceptible to science. For the positivist, science is outside society; for the hermeneuticist, society is outside of science. And this paradox is reflected in the character of the debate, or rather the structure of

²⁴⁶ Cruickshank, *Critical Realism: The Difference It Makes*, 84-85.

the confrontation between two. The weakness of the one position find their antithesis in the strength of the other. Positivism sustains embryonically adequate concepts of law (generality), ideology and society; hermeneutics embryonically adequate concepts of subjectivity, meaning and culture. The self-authenticating experience of a subject (of the experience of objects) finds its reflection, or mirror image, in the constitutive conceptualizing activity of a (subject-) object (of the experience of subjects) or, in a significant refraction due to Gadamer, of a subject (of the experience of objects).”²⁴⁷

Critical realist philosophy is taken to convey a standpoint for architectural diagnosis or broadly the architectural cogitatio, and this statement is where the end product, the corporeality of architecture, may substitute boldly in place of “activity of a (subject-) object(of the experience of subjects).” Here, let us go back to how Agamben deepens the Absolute in terms of Hegel's resolution; Hegel characterized Absolute “by its appearance as "result," as being "only at the end what it truly is.”²⁴⁸ Then, the corporeality of architecture, the built form itself, is the “result,” the end product which finally becomes what architecture truly is only at the end. What Bhaskar saw as paradoxical for the philosophies of social science provides the key to show what is problematic for architectural perspective. As it is viewed in parallel to Bhaskar's argument, the self-authenticating experience of architectural agency, which is indeed the architectural discourse, finds its reflection on the absoluteness of architecture or onto the conversion to mere textuality. Consequently, being conscious of the fallibility of our theories, the architectural agency must constitute an ontology/ontologies for the totality of architecture as dispersed through the domains of real, actual, and empirical. In line with this critical realist approach, the

²⁴⁷ Bhaskar, *The Possibility of Naturalism: A Philosophical Critique of the Contemporary Human Sciences* [1979], 123.

²⁴⁸ Agamben and Heller-Roazen, *Potentialities: Collected Essays in Philosophy*, 121.

agency can mediate away from the constraints of the reductive unity and can take each of its philosophical stances according to the levels of differentiated reality.

Nevertheless, besides the positivist hermeneutic threshold, it is essential to note that the production of science is itself a social activity; this primary focus is where the critical naturalism phase of the critical realist project has evolved around. Roy Bhaskar in *The Possibility of Naturalism*²⁴⁹, published in 1979, mediates between the two sharp ends of -in his definition- hyper-naturalistic positivism and anti-naturalistic hermeneutics, these two of which are the primary polarity inherited within the philosophy of human sciences as he enumerated as first; yet further relational dichotomies are sustained along, and these are briefly epitomized by Bhaskar, as quoted at length:

“(2) Then there was the split between individualism and collectivism, which critical naturalism would resolve by seeing society relationally and as emergent. (3) A connected split, upon which the debate about structure and agency was joined, was between the voluntarism associated with Weberian tradition and the reification associated with the Durkheimian one. This critical naturalism would transcend in its transformational model of social activity. (4) Then there was the dichotomy between facts and values, mostly sharply expressed in Hume’s law, which critical naturalism would refute in its theory of explanatory critiques. (5) Then, fuelling the positivism/ hermeneutics debate, was the dichotomy between reasons and causes, which critical naturalism would by showing how, once one rejected Humean causality, reasons could be causes sui generis on a critical realist conception of causality. (6) Finally underpinning many of these dichotomies was the dualism between mind and body, (or, more macroscopically, between society and nature), which critical

²⁴⁹ In Margaret Archer’s remark, the book can be entitled as *The Impossibility of Naturalism* as well stated by Roy Bhaskar. “As Roy Bhaskar has often remarked, his book could just as well be entitled *The Impossibility of Naturalism* for it is not advocating the unity of method if this is taken to be synonymous with a ‘unity of methodology’ in the positivist tradition.” In Archer et al., *Critical Realism: Essential Readings*, 190.

naturalism would overcome, by seeing mind as an emergent power of matter in its synchronic emergent powers materialism.”²⁵⁰

The causal dualities peculiar to the social sciences are inherited to the architecture theory conceived at the heart of architectural diagnoses. “A duality is a combination, exemplifying non-arbitrary dialectical connection and dialectical distinction of existentially interdependent and essentially distinct correlatives.”²⁵¹ The architectural discourse at the turn of the 21st century is already confined within the dualisms solidified as Ideational – Material, Content – Form, Knowledge – Reality, Actual – Possible, Intellectual pessimism – Utopian hope, Reaction – Action, and so on. While these might have been assembled under the transitive domain of Architectural knowledge, the relationship between politics and the absolute object of architecture also falls under a parallel illustration as if these dichotomies reflect each other entirely. Albená Yaneva, in “Five Ways to Make Architecture Political: An Introduction to the Politics of Design Practice,” problematizes the relationship claimed between politics and architecture; hence she diagnoses an ill-approach in terms of direct mirroring.²⁵²

“Architecture and politics are commonly understood as two separate domains of activities with their own logics, institutions and practices. Existing attempts to connect architecture and politics typically strive to relive the politics behind design or the design techniques disguised as politics. Architecture and politics often stand on the two sides of a reflecting surface; put in relationship of influence, dependence, interlocution, projection or determinism. When it comes to architecture's relation to politics, the latter is still understood in the light of traditional theories of politics related to ideology, state, nation, government, policies and activism. These

²⁵⁰ Ibid., xiii.

²⁵¹ Hartwig, *Dictionary of Critical Realism*, 149.

²⁵² Yaneva, *Five Ways to Make Architecture Political: An Introduction to the Politics of Design Practice*, 15.

realities are foundational in the sense that they are commonly used to justify and explain everything in architecture. ... Related in a mirror-fashion, on the one side we place of power, political shifts and domination, while on the other architectural form, styles and architects. Yet, this is an asymmetrical equation: politics appears as a separate domain of reality that can be used as specific type of causality to account for aspects of architecture. The domain of architecture is given a solidity, durability and consistency that it cannot hold by itself. Some of the most common asymmetric projections and ontologies read: 'Architecture reflects politics and can produce political effects,' 'Architects are agents of power', 'Architectural styles mirror political shifts', 'Politics is imprinted on cities; 'Architecture helps the construction of identities,' and 'Building types embody politics'."²⁵³

These mindsets underlying asymmetric ontologies pave the way for hypocritical. It is impossible not to fall into another crisis seeking to recast architecture manipulated for any other means rather than itself without resolving dualism and the subsequent mirroring. The transformative approaches in critical realism propose alternative methodologies to extend the critical practice of architecture, the difference it makes is to offer both-and perspective instead of either-or, it claims explanatory exploration for generative mechanism in instead of the advent of cause and effect, it favors the relationality of structure and agency rather than the way architecture is shaped over the duality of structure and agency. Therefore, the reductive reading of the realities of architecture over dualities hinders the emancipatory drive for resolution out of contemporary aporia. The notion of architectural reality carries its meaning in the sense that critical realism defines what reality is: A “potentially infinite *totality* of which we know something but not know how much.”²⁵⁴ Therefore, to refine the complexity of architectural discourse, which is only reproduced one on another growing into an infinite totality, starts with defining our metatheory. Entangled to

²⁵³ Ibid.

²⁵⁴ Hartwig, *Dictionary of Critical Realism*, 400.

the symptomologies of contemporary architecture, intervention at the level of discipline is in the first place ontological, and later inevitably political. The causes are two-fold: first, such an impulse already politicizes the architectural discourse, and on the other hand, the discourse itself places politics at the center of its interrogation.

Any manifestation of “reality,” then, is political in nature, as defined in relative frameworks. Within critical realism, reality has been cast through the domains of real, actual, and empirical -the “differentiation” of reality as coined by Bhaskar. Architectural “reality” is also stratified, differentiated, and in constant transformation yet tied to a comprehensive metatheoretical unity. The theorization of sociological matter involves the grand inquires, reappearing through periods in novel contextualizations. These classic explanatory attempts in social theory are revisited through certain paradigms and multiplied into many other paradigmatic frameworks, which are simultaneously directed into the architectural domain and transcoded. Within this ever-changing yet inert atmosphere of querying conceptual foci, the continuing classic explanatory attempts are still (and will be) inevitable for even the discipline of Architecture, “we are interested in them because they produce ways of explaining things. They set theoretical and political agendas.”²⁵⁵

“Critical realism is also critical in a political as well as a methodological sense. For many critical realists, the task of research is to enable the move from facts to values. That is, the task of empirical research is to explore how existing social, political and economic relations create inequality, and turn on exploitation, in order to develop a normative critique against those relations. Research is used to provide the facts about hardship and exploitation, and such facts normative and political arguments may be developed against status quo.”²⁵⁶

²⁵⁵ William Outhwaite, *Social Theory: Ideas in Profile: Ideas in Profile* (Profile, 2015), 2.

²⁵⁶ Cruickshank, *Critical Realism: The Difference It Makes*, 3.

The intentionality inherent in any individual agency must be pertinent to that explanatory exploitation. Because any discursive formation, whether major or minor, has causal powers, as much as the social structures and mechanisms whose effects are not realized unless objectified in an explanatory critique. Therefore, the ethico-political project of architecture is and always will be in emergence, unfolding semantic proposals to overcome the certain shortcomings of ex parte causes of the phenomenon that points to the diminishment of architecture. Unlike, what is intended is to construct a narrative nourished from critical realist philosophy trying to direct architecture from dual causal properties to the coalescence of emergence-structure-agency, then the partition of reality; real-actual-empirical; and lastly, the relation of value-validation-perception. These planes of explanation relay to channel the contemporary architectural prognosis into getting infused with the triad of critical realism as “ontological realism-epistemic relativism-judgemental rationality,” which will underline the act of negation once more.

CHAPTER 6

CONCLUSION

This thesis, at first, undertakes a share to respond to the quest for the possibility of architectural knowledge. When the concern is about the issue of how that knowledge is possible for a specific discipline that is channeled through both realized practice and discourse, the first attempt is to follow the disciplinary claims - the diagnosis of architecture- to come up with a shared datum mirroring transient self-image of the architecture sphere. However, the quest is beyond the abysmal content of architecture theories; it turns out into a solid philosophical problematic about the agency of architecture whose beliefs or claims about the nature of reality that the polycrisis of architecture is incognito embedded. Therefore, the study takes phenomenology at its center referring to the political contestation of discipline.

“Architecture” is a term, which is so contagious that it could be meant for anything architecture-related. Architecture had been reduced to the canons, the insignia of the Modern Movement; it substituted machines; headed the technological ideals; displaced the “text” for semiotic explorations; offered socio-political critique for the socially and politically unmotivated zeitgeist; occupied utopias; surrogated the city erected out of tabula rasa; digitized; virtualized; augmented the physical world.²⁵⁷ Architecture is granted as a laboratory for the external world and conceived as an immediate context. Because by nature, any spatial engagement that architecture

²⁵⁷ “Preface,” in Nesbitt, *Theorizing a New Agenda for Architecture: An Anthology of Architectural Theory 1965 - 1995*, 12.

suggested is omnipresent, it appears to exist ideally to have the potential to be a catalyst for even anything. Through the published anthologies of the late twentieth century based on the anglophone architectural discourse; we had the chance to see the whole sphere of architecture from a bird's eye view. The plurality of stances underlying the term became exposed; yet, all are so entangled with a crisis's rhetoric, following the crisis of modernism, postmodernism, capitalism, neoliberalism, oppressive politics that architecture as a thing in itself cannot keep on track. Then finally, architecture-itself / architectural self became the ill-being, a milieu of and for polycrisis.

This thesis problematizes how to respond to the ambiguity of what architecture is, how it is cast against the externalities, and how its reception by its own agency redefines architecture. While these projections are directly related to the being, the architectural self, the exploration is automatically framed around an ontological question, hence philosophically metaphysical. On the other hand, the discursive material that centralizes architecture takes out a diagnostic position on the phenomenon of architecture derived from a discourse based on discourse. Therefore, any attempt to resolve the state of being and respond to the inner and outer contradictions requires architectural cogitation, an act of will, a philosophical thinking that the architectural thought becomes its own object of reflexive awareness, in other words, architecture working on oneself.

That kind of investigation is already genuine to the discursive practice that seeks to foreground architecture's totality; the textual perspective to identify both the retrospective and emerging possibilities for architectural knowledge has been inscribed in the first chapter, *The Diagnostic Positions to Cast Architecture for the 21st century*. As a disciplinary approach, the thesis fits in the tradition of phenomenological hermeneutics; the study is both interested in the interpretative process itself and as well as deciphering the related phenomenon. Hence, the textuality of the thesis also engages the audience to move toward that hermeneutic circle to take a position as a responsible knower. As to reflect that, the first chapter is constituted as a preliminary investigation to contextualize the nature of

hermeneutics in architecture and rethink the relevance of its cognitive virtue. The study claims to understand discourse in a mutual relationship to disclosure, which provides a conceptual ability to detach truth as distinct from propositions yet constructed through them. Thinking architecture in these terms outgrows the history of its own discourse into an alethic inquiry. Then, architectural cogitatio embraces the task of the historian to articulate the unarticulated, to challenge the inured. For inhabiting these possibilities, the interpretivist perspective needs tools to order the written and knot them with the sites that remain unwritten. Revealing the orderliness of the discursive weave stems from a search for commensurability that is in allegiance with the timely thematic constitution of discourse through the concepts of periodicity and emergence. However, in advance, the orderly phenomenon is opened to reception and contextualized under a new validation premise. Then, architectural discourse is over again contested since it is closely connected to value as *relata* of the matter caught in between the foundational duality of *materia* and *idea*. While that relationality envisages Architecture as a complex whole in constant change, there is an ahistorical essence of architecture carried beyond the periodical, which is the call for the self. Within the continual narratives, the shared commonality of the percept of architecture freed from historical biased as an intersubjective phenomenon entails disclosure to metatheories.

Nevertheless, the hermeneutic circle of architecture is a two-edged sword that is both the enemy and the ally. Historically, the extra-theoretical surplus of the architectural discourse produced until the nineties and the counter pragmatist movement that rationalized itself against any interpretative practice has beset the criticality between predicament and resurgence. The in-betweenness is mainly disposed architecture as a cognitive object and paved the way for a disciplinary crisis in the form of self-critique. Through the turn of the 21st century, the content-form duality and that ill-state of architecture are consolidated by the symptoms that became apparent through the contemporary progressive built environment under neoliberal capitalism, which is discussed in the chapter; *A Discipline Miscast/ Outcast: Architecture Lodged in between Predicament and Resurgence*. The state in which Architecture has been put

into is explained over “Aporia” conceptually, providing a framework for the realization that opened the aporetic judgments on the object domain of architecture to view by its own agency in relation to the immanent critique in Hegelian-Marxist roots. Yet, the immanent critique of aporia again comes into existence through the interpretive imperative, that the whole content once again belongs to a meta critique.

The diagnostic schema drawn under this chapter is grounded for a state of theoretical fracture for realism in the next, *A Discipline to Forecast: Architecture Situated in-between the Actual and the Possible*. Within the neoliberal conjecture, the deviation regarding the unity and stability of architecture brought a crisis, yet, where there is a crisis, there is also a search for emancipation. By reassessing the actual status of architecture in demise, the conflicted status has been referred to in pursuit of “Aletheia,” searching “the transcendently real self.” Because, through the Millennium, Architecture theory’s critical historiography re-intersected with the terrain of politics more than ever. And in the last decade, there has been a tremendous number of publications in architectural scholarship that directly use the term political in their title. The search for causalities associated with the political economy has indexed architecture theory to seek philosophical realism. The focus has been shifted to the structures and generative mechanisms rather than the postmodern idealism, which is summoned as “the view that everything that exists is ideas or made up from ideas.”

However, the present animation of political philosophy calls the statement of Manfredo Tafuri from the 1960s to the present day, which was the reaction to the intense transformation of the political, cultural, and social fabric that the capitalist development and modernization brought in Italy as described by Aureli precisely. Yet, the validity of “the critique of architectural ideology” by Tafuri for our present-day is still absolute:

“Even if Tafuri would explicitly adopt a Marxian perspective on architecture and urban development only in the late 1960s, already at this time he identified the problem of modern architecture with its impossibility contain and direct the development of the modern city,

and this became the starting point for Tafuri's first important book--*Teorie e storia dell'architettura* (Theories and History of Architecture)--in which he put forward a fundamental critique of how modern architectural historiography consistently mystifies the contradictions of architecture by rendering its history as progressive narrative. He demonstrated how such historical perspective systematically masked the very cause of such progress and obscured the cultural crisis provoked by the development of modern culture."²⁵⁸

In today's terms, the transnational new world economy and its evolved neoliberal characteristics and complexities still mimic procedures that reorganize everyday living for opportunistic returns.

“For Tafuri, the entire project of the search for sociohistorical meaning through architecture- including neofunctionalism, postfunctionalism, and criticism from within- seemed like nothing so much a microcosm of capitalism itself and the structure of its representations: putting the best face on rationalization and consumption, providing experiences and spaces, heretofore uncharted, that capital could now colonize and profit from.”²⁵⁹

Realizing the necessity to distinguish what the reality is, how that reality is presented and represented, and what we think about the reality and its representations requires constant diligence. Only with specific terms of evaluation constituted on those inferences, one can orient oneself's own disciplinary practice by elaborating oneself's own relationship between facts and values. That kind of undertaking is initially personal before attained collectively. Therefore, the effort to forecast a discipline between the actual and the possible must be cultured individually preliminary to any shared manifestos.

²⁵⁸ Pier Vittorio Aureli, "Manfredo Tafuri, Archizoom, Superstudio, and the Critique of Architectural Ideology," in *Architecture and Capitalism: 1845 to the Present*, ed. Peggy Deamer (Routledge, 2014), 137.

²⁵⁹ Hays, "Architecture Theory, Media, and the Question of Audience," 43.

The mystification recognized by Tafuri is unfortunately attached to everyday life in a neoliberal setting and epidemically caught in any practice. Moreover, its designation by society can be beyond an anticipated 'negative' affirmation. Its reception and conceptualization also carry the possibility of misinterpretation by social agents who are already in that sort of contagion.

“The hermeneutic tradition rightly shows that social science deals with a pre-interpreted reality, but it reduces social science to the modalities of a subject-subject relationship without recognizing that the social may be inadequately conceptualized by social agents.”²⁶⁰

At these times, for any object of social science, likewise, for architecture, an explanatory imperative must be in charge, through which reality can be dismantled to its objects, sources, and beliefs. Therefore, the inherent duality of architecture, the reality, and the appearance, is further discussed over the concept of speculation, derived from the Latin ‘speculum,’ “the mirror that reflects something else.” Architecture’s mirror-selves require more effort to be explained in-depth than any other social sciences since its object constitutes corporeality in its own disciplinary specificity. Thereupon, the plurality and relativity entail a realist fragmentation in architectural cogitatio. Over the contradictory calls on the death of architecture or its “alloverness,” a realist ontology must be reclaimed, yet different from the predecessor formalist, autonomist, and progressive tendencies, in a more comprehensive claim that provides a philosophical underlaborer for the issues of innate dualism, relativism, and the confused agentic rationalization. Besides confining in the empirical that is only the experiences, concepts, and signs received together governing the total conception of Architecture, the architectural sphere must unfold itself into the depths of reality, extending to the mechanisms, events, and experiences. A social-scientific search for an extensive intellectual stimulation that

²⁶⁰ K. Dean et al., *Realism, Philosophy and Social Science* (Palgrave Macmillan UK, 2006), 11.

is constructed to offer an alternative for its own philosophy has paired with the ill-state of architectural agenda debated through its symptoms. The desired stratification for architecture is proposed to be ensured by the scholarly movement of critical realism. The critical realist orientation in social scientific methodology as ambitiously cultivated over periods of developing a philosophical system by Roy Bhaskar articulates diverse axiologies for the effects of totalizing approaches in disciplines ordered around the social theory. Critical realism is evolved in relation to the philosophical discourse of modernity and is sociohistorically tied to the crisis-riddled period of the mid-1960s onwards. Starting as a transcendental realist philosophy of science against the existing positivist conception, it has proposed an ontology that cannot be equated to epistemology based on the relativity of knowledge. The understanding brought a new approach to reality, comprehending reality as in emergence and in-depth to real, actual, and empirical domains, through which mediated “ontological realism, epistemological relativism, and judgemental rationality” in an alliance. The mission for the philosophy of natural science then expanded onto the field of philosophy of human sciences, intending to reform the dualist structure derived through positivism and hermeneutics, individualism and collectivism, facts and values, structure and agency by heeding relationality seeing the social sphere as an open system. The "critical" distinction brought to social sciences by the critical realist approach brings an apparatus of explanatory critique to explain the causation behind any belief of the object of social sciences. “If we have a true account of the causes of such false beliefs then we may pass immediately to a negative evaluation of those causes, and thence to any condition, structure or state of affairs found to be necessary for them, and thence, *ceteris paribus*, to a positive evaluation of action directed at removing or transforming those causes and their condition.”²⁶¹ For the myths of architecture, the critical realist “explanatory critique” is operative to be utilized to distinguish architecture’s mirror selves, in

²⁶¹ Archer et al., *Critical Realism: Essential Readings*, xviii.

other words, the personae. Explanatory criticism has been introduced in critical realist philosophy that is cast mutually parallel with Marxian thought to direct communicative intent since the social phenomenon is language borne. “An explanatory critique is one which presents arguments that there is a gap between real and our experience of the real and this gap tends to promote systemic misunderstandings regarding the nature and significance of everyday experience.”²⁶² The contemporary urge for closing the gap is defined with respect to the upsurge of architectural publications that dominated the last two decades with the main interest in politics, which explicitly or implicitly rests on an emancipatory desire. While the negative criticism apparent in those extends the explanatory weight, yet does not spontaneously delineate and lead to a form of critical practice. At that point, the thesis searches for the prospects on what is the architectural mind, the phenomenological stance that will make possible such a theory as appropriate for transformation, for recasting.

Critical realism also carries the Hegelian and Marxist dialectics further; the dialectical critical realist phase aims to draw the necessities in understanding and action for the “transformational model of social activity” seeking freedom. The dialectic of the emancipatory axiology of critical realism is unified by the categories of non-identity, absence, totality, and agency; this detailed ontological-axiological chain may entitle new modes of thinking in further studies opened to benefit for the unending cogitative search that Architecture embedded. Bhaskar's philosophical project and the manifestation of human emancipation elaborated in critical realism may guide the emerging “emancipatory critique” issued in the central question of the role of Architecture in liberation from the burden of capitalism.

The reclaimed political project of architecture theory is also accompanied by a moral equivalent when recasting the discipline as a resolution. Any diagnostic position is

²⁶² Dean et al., *Realism, Philosophy and Social Science*, 3.

inescapably referred a moral stance even if not stated. Therefore, conveying an architectural diagnosis is indeed an act of communication, which is further to be exposed. Following a Habermasian point of view, communicative action must be set to constitute a way for discipline to validate its own critical standards. Henceforth, The Greek concept of “Parrhesia” is explored as it is a stance that constructs a genuine relationship with oneself through speaking truthfully, a philosophy that associates the speaker straight to their discourse, which framed the ethical index for architectural cogitatio.

“Agency is collective as well as individual... The transpositions of schemas and remobilizations of resources that constitute agency are always acts of communication with others. Agency entails an ability to coordinate one's actions with others and against others, to form collective projects, to persuade, to coerce, and to monitor the simultaneous effects of one's own and others' activities.”²⁶³

The theory of (architectural) knowledge depends on the mediation of agentic intentions. The outlined diagnosis, prognosis, and resolution of discipline presuppose the exercise of power held by the architectural agency. While a collective realization is assumed to lead to transformative action for architectural practice out of the established crisis, the individualist act is often ignored as incapacitated. Yet, the road to the collective has always passed through the trail of individuals. So, discerning Parrhesia as a dialogue between one’s architectural cogitatio and practice is the first step to owning genuine moral pronouncement that is in the effect of the collective cognitive domain embedded in the architectural sphere. As an individual of architectural agency, one has to settle own disciplinary matter through singular parrhesiastic communication with oneself, undisputed moral uprightness. Henceforth, architecture can embrace its own reality by going beyond the practices idealized and glorified under the dominant aesthetic/ political field regime. A

²⁶³ William H. Sewell, "A Theory of Structure: Duality, Agency, and Transformation," *American Journal of Sociology* 98, no. 1 (1992): 21.

Parrhesiastic act with its own voice can only be achieved by only risking architecture's sublime status, indeed its own life.

REFERENCES

- Agamben, G., and D. Heller-Roazen. *Potentialities: Collected Essays in Philosophy*. Stanford University Press, 1999.
- Albrecht, Johannes. "Against the Interpretation of Architecture." *Journal of Architectural Education* 55, no. 3 (2002/02/01 2002): 194-96.
- Altan Ergut, E, and B. Turan Özkaya. "Mapping Architectural Historiography." In *Rethinking Architectural Historiography*, edited by D. Arnold, E.A. Ergut and B.T. Ozkaya. London New York: Taylor & Francis, 2006.
- Anderson, Richard. "Tired of Meaning." *Log*, no. 7 (2006): 11-13.
- Anderson, Stanford. "Architectural Design as a System of Research Programmes." *Design Studies* 5, no. 3 (1984/07/01/ 1984): 146-50.
- Archer, M., R. Bhaskar, A. Collier, T. Lawson, and A. Norrie. *Critical Realism: Essential Readings*. Taylor & Francis, 2013.
- Archer, Margaret. "Realism and the Problem of Agency." *Alethia* 5, no. 1 (2002/07/15 2002): 11-20.
- Arnold, Dana. *Reading Architectural History*. London & New York: Routledge, 2003.
- Artun, Ali. "Sanatın Sınırları." Paper presented at the 12. Ulusal Sanat Sempozyumu: Değişen Paradigmalar ve Sanatta Sınır Deneyimler, Ankara, 2018.
- Aureli, Pier Vittorio. "Manfredo Tafuri, Archizoom, Superstudio, and the Critique of Architectural Ideology." In *Architecture and Capitalism: 1845 to the Present*, edited by Peggy Deamer, 132-47: Routledge, 2014.
- . *The Possibility of an Absolute Architecture*. MIT Press, 2011.
- . *The Project of Autonomy: Politics and Architecture within and against Capitalism*. Princeton Architectural Press, 2008.
- Barthes, Roland. "Writers, Intellectuals, Teachers [1971] ". In *A Roland Barthes Reader*, edited by Susan Sontag, 378-403. London: Vintage, 1982.
- Bayne, T., and M. Montague. *Cognitive Phenomenology*. OUP Oxford, 2011.
- Berkel, B. & Bos, C. . *Move*. Amsterdam: UN Studio & Goose Press, 1999.
- Berth Danermark, Mats Ekström, and Jan. Ch. Karlsson. *Explaining Society: Critical Realism in the Social Sciences*. Routledge, 2002.
- Bhaskar, Roy. *Dialectic: The Pulse of Freedom [1993]*. Taylor & Francis, 2008.
- . *From Science to Emancipation: Alienation and the Actuality of Enlightenment [2002]*. Taylor & Francis, 2012.

- . "Philosophy and Scientific Realism." In *Critical Realism: Essential Readings*, edited by M. Archer, R. Bhaskar, A. Collier, T. Lawson, and A. Norrie.: Taylor & Francis, 2013.
- . *Philosophy and the Idea of Freedom [1991]*. Routledge, 2011.
- . *Plato Etc: Problems of Philosophy and Their Resolution [1994]*. Taylor & Francis, 2010.
- . *The Possibility of Naturalism: A Philosophical Critique of the Contemporary Human Sciences [1979]*. Taylor & Francis, 2013
- . *A Realist Theory of Science [1975]*. Taylor & Francis, 2013.
- . *Reclaiming Reality: A Critical Introduction to Contemporary Philosophy [1986]*. Taylor & Francis, 2011.
- . *Scientific Realism and Human Emancipation [1986]*. Taylor & Francis, 2009.
- Blackburn, Simon. *The Oxford Dictionary of Philosophy*. Oxford University Press, 2016.
- Bliss, Henry E. "The Subject-Object Relation." *The Philosophical Review* 26, no. 4 (1917): 395-408.
- Bohman, James. "Critical Theory."
<https://plato.stanford.edu/archives/spr2021/entries/critical-theory/>.
- Brown, A., S. Fleetwood, and M. Roberts. *Critical Realism and Marxism*. Routledge, 2002.
- Budd, John M. "Phenomenological Critical Realism: A Practical Method for Lis." *Journal of Education for Library and Information Science* 53, no. 1 (2012): 69-80.
- Caputo, John D. *Hermeneutics: Facts and Interpretation in the Age of Information*. Penguin Books, 2018.
- Carmo, Mario. *The Alphabet and the Algorithm*. MIT Press, 2011.
- . "Architecture: Theory, Interdisciplinarity, and Methodological Eclecticism." *Journal of the Society of Architectural Historians* 64, no. 4 (2005): 425-27.
- Carrier, David. "Arthur Danto on Andy Warhol's Brillo Box."
<http://www.warhol.org/arthur-danto-on-andy-warhols-brillo-box/>.
- Carter, M., F. Bagley, C. Marcinkoski, and H.D. Alonso. *Perspecta 38: Architecture after All : The Yale Architectural Journal*. MIT Press, 2006.
- Catling, Charlotte Skene. "The Naked Truth Architecture or Revolution." *The Architectural Review*, no. 1412 (October 2014).

- Choi, E., and M. Trotter. *Architecture Is All Over*. Columbia Books on Architecture and the City, 2017.
- Collier, Andrew. *Critical Realism: An Introduction to Roy Bhaskar's Philosophy*. Verso, 1994.
- Cottingham, John. "Descartes on 'Thought'." *The Philosophical Quarterly* (1950-) 28, no. 112 (1978): 208-14.
- Cruikshank, Justin. *Critical Realism: The Difference It Makes*. Taylor & Francis, 2003.
- Cusset, François. "Theory (Madness of)." *Radical Philosophy* (May/June 2011), no. 167 (2011): 24-30.
- D'Souza, Aruna. "Introduction." In *Art History in the Wake of the Global Turn*, edited by Aruna D'Souza Jill H. Casid. New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 2014.
- Danto, Arthur C. "The Artworld." *The Journal of Philosophy* 61, no. 19 (1964): 571-84.
- . *Beyond the Brillo Box: The Visual Arts in Post-Historical Perspective*. University of California Press, 1998.
- . "The End of Art: A Philosophical Defense." *History and Theory* 37, no. 4 (1998): 127-43.
- . "Hegel's End-of-Art Thesis (1999)." In *A New History of German Literature*, edited by Anton Kaes Hans Ulrich Gumbrecht, Joseph Leo Koerner, Dorothea E. von Mücke, 535-40. Cambridge, Massachusetts; London, England: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2014.
- . *The Philosophical Disenfranchisement of Art*. Columbia University Press, 1986.
- Dean, K., J. Joseph, J. Roberts, and C. Wight. *Realism, Philosophy and Social Science*. Palgrave Macmillan UK, 2006.
- Derrida, Jacques. *Aporias: Dying--Awaiting (One Another at) the "Limits of Truth" (Mourir--S'attendre Aux "Limites De La Vérité")*. Stanford University Press, 1993.
- Doucet, Isabelle, and Kenny Cupers. "Agency in Architecture: Reframing Criticality in Theory and Practice." *Footprint* 4, no. September 2009 (2009): 1-6.
- Doucet., Scott Lash and Antoine Picon. In conversation with Kenny Cupers and Isabelle, and Comments by Margaret Crawford. "Agency and Architecture: How to Be Critical?". *Footprint* 4, no. Agency in Architecture: Reframing Criticality in Theory and Practice (2009): 7-19.
- Duchamp, M., and M. Sanouillet. *The Essential Writings of Marcel Duchamp: Marchand Du Sel ; Salt Seller*. Thames and Hudson, 1975.

- Eşingen, Günce. "Textual Readings of Architecture: Orienting Semiosphere." Middle East Technical University, 2014.
- Finlayson, James Gordon. "Hegel, Adorno and the Origins of Immanent Criticism." *British Journal for the History of Philosophy* 22, no. 6 (2014/11/02 2014): 1142-66.
- Foucault, M., and D.F. Bouchard. *Language, Counter-Memory, Practice: Selected Essays and Interviews*. Cornell University Press, 1980.
- Foucault, Michel. *The Archaeology of Knowledge and the Discourse on Language*. Translated by A. M. Sheridan Smith. New York: Pantheon Books, 1972.
- . "Discourse and Truth: The Problematization of Parrhesia." In *6 lectures at University of California at Berkeley, CA*, 1-67. <https://foucault.info/parrhesia/>, Oct-Nov. 1983.
- . *The Order of Things*. Taylor & Francis, 2018.
- . "'Space Knowledge and Power' Interview by Paul Rabinow in Skyline." Rizzoli Communications, Inc., <https://foucault.info/documents/foucault.spaceKnowledgePower/>.
- Gage, Mark Foster. *Aesthetics Equals Politics: New Discourses across Art, Architecture, and Philosophy*. MIT Press, 2019.
- Gandelsonas, Mario. "Linguistics in Architecture [1973]." In *Architecture Theory since 1968*, edited by K. Michael Hays, 112-24: MIT Press, 2000.
- Gerschenkron, Alexander. "On the Concept of Continuity in History." *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society* 106, no. 3 (1962): 195-209.
- Gorski, Philip S. "'What Is Critical Realism? And Why Should You Care?'" Review of *A Realist Theory of Science*, Roy Bhaskar; *The Possibility of Naturalism: A Philosophical Critique of the Contemporary Human Science*, Roy Bhaskar; *Scientific Realism and Human Emancipation*, Roy Bhaskar; *Reclaiming Reality: A Critical Introduction to Contemporary Philosophy*, Roy Bhaskar; *Philosophy and the Idea of Freedom*, Roy Bhaskar; *Dialectic: The Pulse of Freedom*, Roy Bhaskar; *Plato etc.: The Problems of Philosophy and Their Resolution*, Roy Bhaskar; *From East to West: Odyssey of a Soul*, Roy Bhaskar; *meta-Reality: The Philosophy of meta-Reality*, Roy Bhaskar; *Reflections on meta-Reality: Transcendence, Emancipation and Everyday Life*, Roy Bhaskar; *From Science to Emancipation: Alienation and the Actuality of Enlightenment*, Roy Bhaskar; *The Philosophy of MetaReality: Creativity, Love and Freedom*, Roy Bhaskar; *The Formation of Critical Realism*, Roy Bhaskar, Mervyn Hartwig; *Dictionary of Critical Realism*, Mervyn Hartwig. *Contemporary Sociology* 42, no. 5 (2013): 658-70.
- Grincerì, Daniel. *Architecture as Cultural and Political Discourse: Case Studies of Conceptual Norms and Aesthetic Practices*. Taylor & Francis, 2016.

- Guess, Raymond. *The Idea of a Critical Theory: Habermas and the Frankfurt School*. Cambridge University Press, 1981.
- Habermas, Jurgen. *The Theory of Communicative Action: Volume 1: Reason and the Rationalization of Society*. Translated by Thomas McCarthy. Beacon Press, 1985.
- Haldane, John. "Form, Meaning and Value: A History of the Philosophy of Architecture." *The Journal of Architecture* 4, no. 1 (1999/01/01 1999): 9-20.
- Hale, Bob. "'Realism'." <https://www.britannica.com/topic/realism-philosophy>.
- Hanford, James Holly. "A Platonic Passage in Shakespeare's 'Troilus and Cressida'." *Studies in Philology* 13, no. 2 (1916): 100-09.
- Harris, Dianne. "That's Not Architectural History! Or What's a Discipline For?." *Journal of the Society of Architectural Historians* 70, no. 2 (2011): 149-52.
- Hartwig, Mervyn. *Dictionary of Critical Realism*. Edited by M. Hartwig. Taylor & Francis, 2015.
- Hays, K. Michael. *Architecture Theory since 1968*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2000.
- . "Architecture Theory, Media, and the Question of Audience." *Assemblage*, no. 27 (1995): 41-46.
- . "Notes on Narrative Method in Historical Interpretation." *Footprint*, no. Trans-disciplinary (Autumn 2007): 23-30.
- . "Some Thoughts on the Pathology of Architecture." In *Architecture Is All Over*, edited by E. Choi and M. Trotter, 30-45: Columbia Books on Architecture and the City, 2017.
- Hegel, G.W.F., and B. Bosanquet. *The Introduction to Hegel's Philosophy of Fine Art*. Kegan Paul, Trench, 1886a., 1886.
- How, Alan. *Critical Theory*. Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan, 2003.
- Huet, Bernard. "Formalism – Realism [1977]." In *Architecture Theory since 1968*, edited by K. Michael Hays, 256-60. Cambridge: MIT Press, 2000.
- Isenstadt, Sandy. "The Interpretative Imperative." *Harvard Design Magazine* Durability and Ephemerality, plus Books on History and Theory, no. 3 (Fall 1997).
- Jameson, Fredric. "From Metaphor to Allegory." In *Anything*, edited by Cynthia C. Davidson, 25-36. New York, Cambridge, London: Anyone Corp, MIT Press, 2001.
- Jay, M., and American Council of Learned Societies. *The Dialectical Imagination: A History of the Frankfurt School and the Institute of Social Research, 1923-1950*. University of California Press, 1996.

- Jencks, C., and K. Kropf. *Theories and Manifestoes of Contemporary Architecture*. Wiley, 2006.
- Jerome, B., J.S. Bruner, and U.P.J. Bruner. *Acts of Meaning: Four Lectures on Mind and Culture*. Harvard University Press, 1990.
- Joseph, J., and J.M. Roberts. *Realism Discourse and Deconstruction*. Routledge, 2004.
- Kaminer, Tahl. *Architecture, Crisis and Resuscitation: The Reproduction of Post-Fordism in Late-Twentieth-Century Architecture*. New York: Routledge: Taylor & Francis, 2011.
- . *The Efficacy of Architecture: Political Contestation and Agency*. Taylor & Francis, 2016.
- Karamanolis, G., and V. Politis. *The Aporetic Tradition in Ancient Philosophy*. Cambridge University Press, 2018.
- Kostic, Alexandar. "Aporia in Architectural Design." *Architecture Philosophy* 3, no. 2 (2018): 136-58.
- Kriegel, U. *Current Controversies in Philosophy of Mind*. Taylor & Francis, 2013.
- Kruft, H.W., R. Taylor, E. Callander, and A. Wood. *History of Architectural Theory*. Princeton Architectural Press, 1994.
- Kwinter, Sanford. *Architectures of Time: Toward a Theory of the Event in Modernist Culture*. MIT Press, 2002.
- Lahiji, Nadir. *Architecture against the Post-Political: Essays in Reclaiming the Critical Project*. Taylor & Francis, 2014.
- . *An Architecture Manifesto: Critical Reason and Theories of a Failed Practice*. Taylor & Francis, 2019.
- . *Architecture or Revolution: Emancipatory Critique after Marx*. Taylor & Francis, 2020.
- . *Can Architecture Be an Emancipatory Project?: Dialogues on Architecture and the Left*. John Hunt Publishing, 2016.
- . *The Political Unconscious of Architecture: Re-Opening Jameson's Narrative*. Taylor & Francis, 2016.
- Leach, Andrew. *What Is Architectural History?* Cambridge, UK Malden: MA: Polity, 2010.
- Lopez, J., and G. Potter. *After Postmodernism: An Introduction to Critical Realism*. Bloomsbury Publishing, 2005.
- Lotman, Yuri M. *Universe of the Mind: A Semiotic Theory of Culture*. Translated by Ann Shukman. Great Britain: Indiana University Press: Bloomington and Indianapolis, 1990.

- Macarthur, David. "Reflections on Pragmatism as a Philosophy of Architecture." *Foorprint Analytic Philosophy and Architecture: Approaching Things from the Other Side* no. 20 (Spring / Summer 2017): 105-20.
- Mallgrave, H.F. *Architectural Theory: An Anthology from Vitruvius to 1870*. Wiley, 2006.
- Marion, J.L., and J.L. Kosky. *On Descartes' Metaphysical Prism: The Constitution and the Limits of onto-Theo-Logy in Cartesian Thought*. University of Chicago Press, 1999.
- Marx, W. *The Meaning of Aristotle's 'Ontology'*. Springer Netherlands, 2012.
- McLeod, Mary. "Architecture and Politics in the Reagan Era: From Postmodernism to Deconstructivism." *Assemblage*, no. 8 (1989): 23-59.
- McNeill, Donald. "Globalization and the Ethics of Architectural Design." *City* 10, no. 1 (2006/04/01 2006): 49-58.
- Mills, Catherine. "Giorgio Agamben (1942–)." The Internet Encyclopedia of Philosophy, <https://iep.utm.edu/agamben/>.
- Moneo, J.R. *Theoretical Anxiety and Design Strategies in the Work of Eight Contemporary Architects*. MIT Press, 2004.
- Næss, Petter. "Critical Realism, Urban Planning and Urban Research." *European Planning Studies* 23, no. 6 (2015/06/03 2015): 1228-44.
- Nesbitt, Kate. *Theorizing a New Agenda for Architecture: An Anthology of Architectural Theory 1965 - 1995*. Princeton Architectural Press, 1996.
- Neveu, M.J., and N. Djavaherian. *Architecture's Appeal: How Theory Informs Architectural Praxis*. Taylor & Francis, 2015.
- Norwood, Bryan E. "Metaphors for Nothing." *Log*, no. 33 (2015): 107-19.
- Ockman, Joan. "Pragmatism/ Architecture: The Idea of the Workshop Project." In *The Pragmatist Imagination: Thinking About Things in the Making*, 16-27. New York: Princeton Architectural Press, 2000.
- Outhwaite, William. *Social Theory: Ideas in Profile: Ideas in Profile*. Profile, 2015.
- Patin, Thomas. "From Deep Structure to an Architecture in Suspense: Peter Eisenman, Structuralism, and Deconstruction." *Journal of Architectural Education* 47, no. 2 (1993/11/01 1993): 88-100.
- Patočka, J., J. Patočka, J. Dodd, E.V. Kohák, and Open Court Publishing Company. *Body, Community, Language, World*. Open Court, 1998.
- Pérez-Gómez, Alberto. "Hermeneutics as Discourse in Design." *Design Issues* 15, no. 2 (1999): 71-79.
- Petrescu, D., and K. Trogal. *The Social (Re)Production of Architecture: Politics, Values and Actions in Contemporary Practice*. Taylor & Francis, 2017.

- Picon, Antoine. "Learning from Utopia: Contemporary Architecture and the Quest for Political and Social Relevance." *Journal of Architectural Education* 67, no. 1 (2013): 17-23.
- Pollio, V., and M.H. Morgan. *Vitruvius: The Ten Books on Architecture*. Dover Publications, 1960.
- Positions on Emancipation Architecture between Aesthetics and Politics*. Edited by Florian Hertweck and co-edited by Nikos Katsikis. Germany: Lars Müller Publishers / University of Luxembourg, 2018.
- Rabbat, Nasser. "The Pedigreed Domain of Architecture: A View from the Cultural Margin." *Perspecta* 44 (2011): 6-192.
- Rancière, Jacques. *Disagreement: Politics and Philosophy*. University of Minnesota Press, 1999.
- Reinmuth, Gerard. "Relationality and Architecture: How Refocusing the Discipline Might Reverse the Profession's Seemingly Unstoppable Trajectory of Decline." *Architectural Theory Review* 21, no. 1 (2017/01/02 2017): 89-107.
- Rescher, Nicholas. *Reality and Its Appearance*. Bloomsbury Publishing, 2011.
- Robinson, William I. "Beyond Nation-State Paradigms: Globalization, Sociology, and the Challenge of Transnational Studies." *Sociological Forum* 13, no. 4 (1998): 561-94.
- Rom Harre, Roy Bhaskar. "How to Change Reality: Story V. Structure- a Debate between Rom Harre and Roy Bhaskar." In *After Postmodernism: An Introduction to Critical Realism*, edited by J. Lopez and G. Potter: Bloomsbury Publishing, 2005.
- Schafer, Ashley. "Theory after (after-Theory)." *Perspecta* 38, no. Architecture after All (2006).
- Schwitzberg, Eric. "Introspection."
<https://plato.stanford.edu/archives/win2019/entries/introspection/>.
- Scott, J., and G. Marshall. *A Dictionary of Sociology*. Oxford University Press, 2009.
- Sewell, William H. "A Theory of Structure: Duality, Agency, and Transformation." *American Journal of Sociology* 98, no. 1 (1992): 1-29.
- Sharr, Adam. "Can Architecture Lie? On Truth, Knowledge and Contemporary Architectural Theory." *Architectural Theory Review* 8, no. 2 (2003/11/01 2003): 164-72.
- Silvetti, Jorge. "After Words." *Assemblage*, no. 27 (1995): 75-79.
- Speaks, Michael. "Theory Was Interesting... but Now We Have Work: No Hope No Fear." *Architectural Research Quarterly* 6, no. 3 (2002): 209-12.

- Spencer, Douglas. *The Architecture of Neoliberalism: How Contemporary Architecture Became an Instrument of Control and Compliance*. Bloomsbury Publishing, 2016.
- Stahl, Titus. *Immanent Critique*. Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, 2021.
- Steinberg, Shirley R., and Joe L. Kincheloe. "Power, Emancipation, and Complexity: Employing Critical Theory." *Power and Education* 2, no. 2 (2010/06/01 2010): 140-51.
- Stieber, Nancy. "Introduction." *Journal of the Society of Architectural Historians* 64, no. 4 (2005): 417-18.
- Stoppani, T., G. Ponzio, and G. Themistokleous. *This Thing Called Theory*. Taylor & Francis, 2016.
- Šuvaković, Miško. "Architecture and Philosophy: Relations, Potentialities and Critical Points." *SAJ* 4 (2012): 160-74.
- Sykes, A.K., and K.M. Hays. *Constructing a New Agenda: Architectural Theory 1993-2009*. Princeton Architectural Press, 2012.
- Tafuri, Manfredo. "Towards a Critique of Architectural Ideology [1969]." In *Architecture Theory since 1968*, edited by K. Michael Hays, 6-35. Cambridge: The MIT Press, 2000.
- van Doorslaer, L., and T. Naaijken. *The Situatedness of Translation Studies: Temporal and Geographical Dynamics of Theorization*. Brill, 2021.
- Vis, Benjamin N. "Adapting a Critical Realist Research Process." In *Cities Made of Boundaries. Mapping Social Life in Urban Form*, 45-71: UCL Press, 2018.
- Wigley, Mark. "'Story-Time'." *Assemblage Tulane Papers: The Politics of Contemporary Architectural Discourse*, no. 27 (1995): 81-94.
- Woods, Lebbeus. "After Forms." *Perspecta* 38 (2006): 125-32.
- Wrenn, Mary V. "Immanent Critique, Enabling Myths, and the Neoliberal Narrative." *Review of Radical Political Economics* 48, no. 3 (2016/09/01 2015): 452-66.
- Yaneva, Albena. *Five Ways to Make Architecture Political: An Introduction to the Politics of Design Practice*. Bloomsbury Publishing, 2017.
- . *Mapping Controversies in Architecture*. Ashgate Publishing Limited, 2013.
- Younés, Samir. "Constructing Architectural Theory." *Philosophy* 78, no. 304 (2003): 233-53.

CURRICULUM VITAE

Günce Eşingen Kınayoğlu

EDUCATION

Degree	Institution	Years
Master of Architecture	Middle East Technical University	2011-2014
Bachelor of Architecture	Middle East Technical University	2007-2011
High School	Atatürk Anadolu High School, Ankara	2002-2007

PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE

- Research Assistant, Hacettepe University, Department of Interior Architecture and Environmental Design, 2013 – cont.
- Intern Architect, Uygur Architects, 2009.

PUBLICATIONS

- Eşingen, Günce. “Textual Readings of Architecture: Orienting Semiosphere,” under the supervision of Prof. Dr. Ayşen Savaş, Middle East Technical University, Department of Architecture, M.Arch. Thesis, Ankara, 2014.
- Eşingen, Günce. “Architectural Discourse and The Labour of Sign Production,” paper presented in the 2nd International Conference on New Trends in Architecture and Interior Design, Zagreb, Croatia, 19-22 Nisan 2016.
- Eşingen Kınayoğlu, Günce. “Towards the Relāta of Art|Architecture|Theory: ‘Contemporary’ Matters In-Between Value and Validation,” book chapter in; Abbas, GM.; Acar, S.; Bancı, S.; Çağlar, N.; Ruhi-Sipahioğlu, I.; Yılmaz, B. (eds.); (2020). MateriART: Architectural Design, Research, and Technology, Lisbon: Caleidoscopio. (ISBN: 978-989-658-668-3 (Accepted to be published, yet publication postponed due to pandemic measures.)

EXHIBITIONS

- “*Paint by Numbers/ Sayılarla Boya,*” Exhibition Participant with Gökhan Kınayoğlu in “Caution! Slippery Ground! / Dikkat Kaygan Zemin! Mimarlık Kültürü Üzerine Bir Sergi,” 23-26 Mart 2015, İstanbul Modern, İstanbul.
- “*Şeyler,*” Exhibition Participant in ““iç’işleri,” 21 Mart-07 Nisan 2017, Ahmet Göğüş Sanat Galerisi, Hacettepe Kültür Merkezi, Ankara.
- “*O Tarafa Kalmayın,*” Exhibition Participant in “Penumbra,” 06 Mart-16 Mart 2018, Hacettepe Güzel Sanatlar Merkezi Sergi Alanı, Ankara.

AWARDS

- *Honorable Mention* in Kemal Kurdaş Mausoleum Competition with Gökhan Kınayoğlu, 2013.
- *Third Prize* in Turkish Shooting Federation 90th Anniversary Range Complex Architectural Project, Invited Competition with İpek Mehmetoğlu, Tolga Baş and Gökhan Kınayoğlu, 2013.
- *Honorable Mention* in Şişli Municipality Halide Edip Adıvar Külliyesi National Architectural Project Competition with Gökhan Kınayoğlu, 2012.
- *First Prize* in Prosteel Structure Design Competition with Doruk Özdemir, 2011.

Foreign Languages Native Turkish, Advanced English, Beginner French.