A Monstrous Alliance: Open Architecture and Common Space

Gökhan Kodalak

Common Space

The built environment is a contested field on which a multitude of material bodies and immaterial forces encounter each other, forming alliances and assemblages at every turn while simultaneously contending against and disintegrating one another. Architecture, insofar as it is defined as shaping, composing and interpreting this environment in any medium or milieu, becomes an ontologically political domain in the original sense of the word (*politikos*), since it affects – and is inseparably affected by – the everyday life of 'citizens' and their socio-spatial interactions. In the domain of architecture, however, spatial actors do not share the same degree of power and agency in decision-making and space-shaping processes. Within the contemporary built environment, spatial actors are situated in three occasionally overlapping but relatively distinct networks according to their degree of agentive power. The highest degree belongs to *networks of authority*, which consist of norm-setting legislators, dominant in determining and establishing rules of spatial configuration in conjunction with the relevant bureaucratic and administrative institutions, and also with clients and capital investors who are dominant not only in deciding the contents and whereabouts of envisaged architectures, but also in commissioning their planned constructions together with the relevant financial and organisational apparatuses. In comparison, *networks of expertise* possess a moderate degree of agentive power and consist of intermediary actors such as architects, engineers and scholars and their respective associations. To clarify the role of intermediary actors with a simple example: architects, contrary to their delusional self-identification as omnipotent masters of the built environment, *lack* the autonomous power to function without legislators and clients. Rather, they are positioned *around* power; that is, architects have to reflect on and operate the power held by networks of authority in order to sustain their decision-making capabilities.[1] Finally, the lowest degree of agentive power belongs to *networks of performance,* which consist of depotentiated spatial actors, especially everyday users, who are excluded from the decision-making processes of architectural production and configuration almost altogether, and are forced to 'passively experience' whatever is 'imposed upon them', despite their protean patterns of manipulation and resistance.[2] These three networks, however, are not constituted by static structures, essential identities or universal formations; rather, they are composed of overlapping activities, historical discourses, conflicting apparatuses and differential individuations located in specific spatiotemporal contexts within rapidly globalising and urbanising built environments.[3] Although the built environment is constructed with contributions from all spatial actors, networks of authority, in terms of their ability to organise and shape the built environment according to their worldview (*Weltanschauung*), are *hegemonic* over the others.[4] This is why, as Georges Bataille has subtly put it:

> [A]rchitecture never expresses 'the true nature of soci-
> eties' themselves, but rather manifests highlighted
> representations of hegemonic powers who articulate
> 'authoritative command and prohibition', inspire 'good
> social behaviour and often even genuine fear', give
> rise to monuments symbolising their authority to group
> 'servile multitudes under their shadow, imposing admi-
> ration and wonder, order and constraint', and thus,
> 'speak to and impose silence upon the crowds'.[5]

If we acknowledge that architecture, 'in addition to being a means of production' is also 'a means of control, and hence of domination', then it is time to confront, for starters, this fundamental question: how do networks of authority and expertise end up forming an alliance to exclude everyday masses and networks of performance from decision-making processes and render them as predominantly subordinated end-users?[6]

The user is the constituent spatial actor who generates life and sustains vitality within architecture. Peculiarly, however, users *do not exist* in the architectural milieu 'with respect not to their being, but to the intensity of existence' permitted to them by networks of authority and expertise, 'which results in their being virtually inexistent in it'.[7] This imposed user inexistence manifests itself in the form of three types of user alienation from the built environment.[8] The first takes place during *codification processes*, when norm-setting legislators and apparatuses discuss, decide and establish virtual norms and regulations for built environments without user participation or contribution. For example, master plans and zoning plans – in addition to regional and urban planning systems, development acts, conservation protocols, environmental plans, land-use policies, etc. – are a set of regulations implemented by institutional apparatuses to designate how a particular territory can be spatially configured and architecturally shaped in terms of its function, height, volume, lot coverage, share of green spaces and countless other features. Even

before actual architectural projects are conceived and constructed, these regulatory bodies already set virtual limits to architectural possibilities and determine key decisions without any user contribution. The second aspect of user alienation occurs during *construction processes*, when clients and investors make alliances with architects and experts to decide, conceive and build actual architectures that largely, if not totally, exclude user involvement and feedback.[9] These exclusionary alliances are embodied, for instance, in professional contracts and design briefs that not only elaborate technical and financial details, but also consist of a set of explicit instructions used to transfer, as directly as possible, the clients' initial requests and demands to the architects. Contracts and briefs thus assure the limits of the architects' power by imposing that what stays outside the sphere of clients' interests shall stay outside the architects' concerns as well. While architects are guaranteed a certain amount of authority, social status and wealth as remuneration for their submissive compliance in siding with their clients' interests over those of others, users realise that their opportunity to use, experience and interpret architectural constructs, which in any case are already preordained and have restricted options, is allowed to occur only after architects and clients have finished with these constructions. The third alienation that users undergo develops during *experiential processes,* when they become aware that they are allowed to experience architectural constructs only insofar as they do not change, manipulate or reconfigure the closed source-codes, inflexible regulations, predetermined functions, choreographed experiential possibilities, and crystallised forms and structures. The architectural construct is therefore experienced by users as 'an obstacle, as a resistant "objectality", at times as implacably hard as a concrete wall', which is 'not only extremely difficult to modify in any way but also hedged about by Draconian rules prohibiting any attempt at such modification'.[10] As a *fait accompli*, architectural constructs are imposed upon users

without allowing them the possibility to substantially intervene, contribute or manipulate the compositions. Excluded from these processes, users are, by necessity, required to adapt their spatial needs and desires to the limited options these constructs offer, and make the best of predominantly inflexible cages that allow no opportunity to shape, regulate or channel their needs and desires. As a result, users are constantly instructed to accept and even desire their imposed repressive destiny – *amor fati*. This remains one of the primary unresolved tensions of architecture, for how should we define users and everyday spatial actors, if not by their characteristic ability to continually change their own destinies and desires?

Recently, a Spinozist concept, namely 'the multitude', has been updated and applied to contemporary political theory by, among many others, Antonio Negri and Michael Hardt, and it may prove to be quite useful if expanded and applied to spatial and architectural theory, especially when reconsidering the distribution of agentive power among spatial actors.[11] For Spinoza, *multitudo* is a multiplicity of singular bodies that perseveres in collective action as a constituent power, acting on 'the right of the commonwealth' without transferring these rights to any form of external sovereignty, and maintaining its differential character without converging into a homogenous identity.[12] From the very definition of the multitude two primary tensions arise that can also be used as a roadmap for spatial actors engaged in becoming a multitude. The first concerns *deconstructing* external claims of sovereignty that hinder the capability of the multitude's collective action on *common interests*; the second is about *constructing* differential and self-organised collectivities, and with them, *common spaces* against the internal danger of them becoming hierarchical totalities. However, before elaborating on the deconstructive and constructive capacities of the multitude, I need to identify the common as a distinct notion from that of the public or private in terms of its relation with the built environment.

Public space, contrary to conventional wisdom, does not correspond to shared territories where society can freely *present* itself, but instead designates governed zones where society is *represented* by networks of authority – predominantly state apparatuses – who not only own, but also control public spaces with their formative regulations, surveillance methods, symbolic monuments and, if necessary, police officers.[13] The contemporary public space, defined tactfully by Rem Koolhaas as 'what remains of the city once the unpredictable has been removed', has been structured on a rapidly globalising scale as a heavily indoctrinated and anesthetised domain with an illusionary façade of social freedom and self-expression.[14]

Private space, contrary to conventional wisdom once again, does not refer to personalised places where a certain number of people interact and relax in comfort and intimacy, but rather denotes the forcible exclusion of all spatial actors from expropriated territories by their privileged 'owners' and 'masters'. Today, the most alarming side-effects of the brutal privatisation of the spatial environment can be witnessed in the form of discriminatory urban gentrification,[15] ever-increasing slum settlements,[16] catastrophic ecological consequences,[17] paranoid gated communities,[18] and the compulsive mallification and theme-parkification of entire districts, including our everyday lives.[19]

Common space, finally, *lies underneath* both private and public spaces as *the commonwealth of all our natural and cultural milieus*, accessible to everybody, and with the equal right of acting on its commonality. Just like natural substances, such as air and water – which are already in the process of being privatised – and cultural immaterial substances, such as language, the Internet and love; *space is also a common*, yet it has been forcibly appropriated through top-down

configurations, enclosed in the form of territorial properties, and controlled by networks of authority through public and private apparatuses of capture. Lately, David Harvey updated Henri Lefebvre's influential demand, 'the right to the city', which was not 'a simple visiting right', but rather 'a transformed and renewed right to urban life',[20] adding that it is also 'a right to change ourselves by changing the city'.[21] Instead, what we might pursue today is to construct *the right to common spaces*, not as a demand from networks of authority, but as a self-initiated and self-sustained collective claim that starts by changing ourselves into the differential multitude so that we can unearth unpredictable experiences and symbiotic dreams and change the world without taking power.

The multitude's *deconstructive capacity* instigates emancipatory pursuits that aim to liberate appropriated common spaces by defying the hegemonic claims of networks of authority and their expertise in monopolising norm-setting, decision-making and space-shaping processes concerning the built environment. Attempts to open up new possibilities within predefined structures can be equated with a reader's quest to create new meanings from existing written texts. Although texts are 'composed with the vocabularies of established languages' and, like predetermined spatial configurations, 'remain subordinated to the prescribed syntactical forms', readers nonetheless 'make innumerable and infinitesimal transformations of and within the dominant cultural economy in order to adapt it to their own interests' and establish their own 'desires that are neither determined nor captured by the systems in which they develop'.[22] Similarly, the multitude acts as a deconstructive force by unshackling prearranged territorial boundaries and smoothening unilateral stratifications to uncover a 'multi-dimensional space' in which new possibilities can emerge, 'blend and clash'.[23] Such a framework wherein 'the reader is indeed always ready to become a writer' disturbs conventional boundaries and 'forces us

to re-examine the separation between author and reader'.[24] Likewise, rather than succumbing to the role of passive consumers, the multitude becomes a body of spatial hackers who decode over-codified fields that have been strictly configured to regulate and control spatial actions, thus opening up new possibilities on a rigid 'checkerboard' by enabling 'the production of an area of free play' and transforming stratified grids into 'liberated spaces'.[25] On their own, however, deconstructive processes never suffice. The multitude *does not find* the common space as a buried treasure underneath other spaces, but only unfolds its *virtuality* through a rebellious rupture, which means that common spaces still need to be actualised by the multitude with a simultaneous *construction*.

The multitude's *constructive capacity* radically transvalues agentive relations among spatial actors. Decisions, roles and agentive capacities are no longer determined by self-proclaimed authorities or experts, rather, the collective will of all spatial actors concerned with and affected by relevant spatial configurations is utilised for action with a reciprocal and polyphonic ethos.[26] During this constructive process, the imposed passivity of users is shaken off and the fourth wall is breached. In a similar fashion, in the Theatre of the Oppressed, spectators are no longer satisfied with silently watching the show produced and acted by representative actors and directors; instead, they restore their 'capacity of action in all its fullness' and implement the changes they want to see in the play by becoming 'spect-actors'.[27] This is how the multitude becomes a body of co-creators who redefine architecture as a collective, open-source and process-driven performance, injecting dynamism, mutability, and unpredictability into spatial configurations, and negotiating temporary conditions of common decisions by utilising differential needs, conflictual interests, and the mercurial desires of all the interested and relevant spatial actors. Thus, common space emerges as an open and inclusive meshwork where the

multitude freely shares, utilises and sustains a pool of commonwealth based on forms of participatory self-organisation; where it collectively generates new material and immaterial productions; and where it reciprocally rearticulates individual expediencies through constantly renegotiating, redefining and reproducing their social commonality, while synchronously retaining their 'innumerable internal differences'.[28] Common space is constructed by a multitude of cooperative bricoleurs as a *zone of utilisation*: that of sharing and operating what is common; a *zone of participation*: that of allying with bodies and relations within a horizontal assemblage; a *zone of production*: that of generating ever new commons; and a *zone of differentiation*: that of inventing passages to new possibilities and fresh ruptures. This is not another nostalgic appraisal of the Paris Commune or May '68, but rather a retroactive conceptualisation of a recent, gut-led experience: I was there at Gezi.

Gezi Event

The humble protest that started in Gezi Park turned into an Event overnight, shaking Istanbul at its very core. Before too long it had swept the whole nation, becoming a source of inspiration for the entire globe.[29] The Gezi Event emerged from a peaceful sit-in and occupation protest on 28 May 2013. The reaction of the state apparatus was brutal: protesters were attacked with tear gas canisters, subjected to physical violence and their occupation tents were set on fire. This in turn evolved into a nationwide mobilisation consisting of sit-ins, strikes, online activism and hacktivism actions, protest marches, self-organised park forums and millions of people in the streets.[30] The Gezi Event started as an environmental protest against the threatened demolition of Gezi Park that was, and, thanks to the Event, still is one of the few surviving green areas at the core of Istanbul's metropolitan fabric, accommodating over 600 sycamore trees in an area of nine acres. The protestors' defence of the park's existence was not a reactionary quest to solve contemporary ecological problems with a romantic return to the so-called harmonious totality of primordial Mother Nature, but rather a radical pursuit to sustain the transposed framework of natural and cultural milieus within contingent urban layouts. In an age when cities themselves have become *the predominant natural habitat,* not only for humans but also and increasingly for a diversity of other species, Gezi advocated sustaining existing assemblages of nature and culture, while simultaneously imagining new interpenetrations and hybridisations. However, the Gezi Event was not solely about *the* environment, but rather about *environments* in the broadest sense. It was about the natural as well as the cultural environment, about the spatial as well as the mental environment, and about the ethical as well as the politico-economic environment. In fact, Gezi represented nothing less than an awareness of the inadequacy of current environments we live in and the desire to simply imagine new possibilities, open up new spaces, and construct new milieus ourselves.[31]

The Gezi Event also began as an architectural protest against the planned reconstruction of Taksim Artillery Barracks because of its top-down decision-making mechanisms, exploitative politico-economic dimensions, and symbolic imposition of cultural and moral norms. The Barracks, to give a compact historical background, were originally built in 1806 by Krikor Balyan, at a time when the Ottoman administration was undergoing radical military reforms after the paradigmatic transformation of warfare brought about by the French Revolution. The building attained its eclectic style, which combines a mixture of Ottoman, Russian and Indian architectural vocabularies, when it was reconstructed after incurring damage from several fires.[32] From the nineteenth century until the First World War, it housed a variety of activities because of its easily reprogrammable large courtyard: acrobatic shows, horse races, and accommodation for Greek pilgrims. The building, after its transformation into a football stadium for

two decades, was demolished in 1940 according to the master plan of Henri Prost, a French city planner who was to become one of the influential figures in shaping Early Republican Istanbul.[33] Gezi Park was opened in 1943 as the starting point of Prost's continuous green promenade and has remained a park ever since, providing a refreshing green niche at the metropolitan core amongst congested urban fabric and vehicular traffic. On May 2013, state and municipal apparatuses, after bending green space protection ordinances, decided to construct a replica of the Artillery Barracks through top-down decision-making mechanisms founded on at least three primary motivations. Throughout the modern history of the Ottoman Empire and Turkish Republic, ruling powers have insistently exhibited their authority by reshaping Taksim Square, deemed the centre of Istanbul, and hence the centre of the empire or nation state.[34] On a symbolic level, the ruling government wanted to reconstruct Taksim Artillery Barracks as an emblematic icon to represent their ideological alliance with the Ottoman heritage and their will to promote a neo-Ottoman cultural identity. On a politico-economic level, the public park was deemed unprofitable by the reciprocal alliance of state institutions and neoliberal capitalist apparatuses, and thus, under the guise of historical reconstruction, it was decided that one of the most valuable urban spots in Turkey should be 'developed' in a more 'efficient' manner by erecting a shopping mall. Finally, on a moral, disciplinary level, the aim was to castigate and ostracise the 'undesirable others' of society who were frequent users of the park but did not fit within the imposed conservative cultural norms: transsexuals, immigrants, homeless paupers, labouring classes, alcohol drinkers, street artists and 'marginal youth'. When the demolition crew arrived at the park, however, they were confronted by the deconstructive activity of the multitude par excellence. State apparatuses attempted to convert the *public space* they possessed with a top-down strategy into a profitable and symbolic *private space*, only to be

stopped by the multitude with a common agenda. Gezi was not about protecting a 'public space' – if by public we understand a space given to people by public authorities – it was rather about reclaiming a *common space*; that is, a space taken, occupied and activated by people themselves, without the need of a sanctified permission by any authority in the first place. [fig. 1]

'Change life! Change Society! These ideas lose completely their meaning without producing an appropriate space,' says Henri Lefebvre.[35] The Gezi Event utilised innovative spatial dynamics and architectural craftiness, combined with the empowering constructive capacity of the multitude, and transformed the park along with Taksim Square, if not all the streets, parks, and squares that joined its nationwide resonance, into emergent architectural playgrounds. The massive front façade of the Atatürk Cultural Centre facing Taksim Square was converted into an animated patchwork of a myriad banners, flags and posters. Gezi Park itself was transformed into a bottom-up spatial laboratory with barricades as defensive formations, communitarian food exchange spots, shared libraries, occupation tents as transient residential zones, political assembly platforms, performance stages, kindergarten tents, medical and veterinary clinics, self-sustained social media stations, urban eco-gardens, and a labyrinthine network of main and capillary alleys which connected all these spots together and at the same time provided a variety of niches for gathering, entertainment and resistance. Instead of a focus on end product *architectural objects,* the experimental meshwork of Gezi produced process-driven *architectural festivals*. This performative approach, to recall Hakim Bey's 'Temporary Autonomous Zones', unfolded a never-ending capacity for divergent social interactions and convivial spatial mutations, synergised by the active efforts of 'a group of humans', simply 'to realize mutual desires'.[36]

Fig. 1:   Gezi Park under occupation at night; the banner reads: 'Enough is enough.' © Author

The Gezi Event started as a political protest against hegemonic and exploitative power structures. In a short span of time, the possibility of unearthing common spaces beneath grids of authority and actualising them by horizontally generating, operating, and sharing commons, became viral all around the country. Countless parks in every city were reclaimed and transformed into common spaces called 'park forums', where people participated in open assemblies and discussions in order to invent reciprocal political formations. Thus, from horizontally democratising a public park, the Gezi multitude attempted to proceed towards radically democratising society as a whole. These park forums were revolutionary, not because they had the capability to abolish every form of hegemonic structure in an instant, but because they have cumulatively laid the very foundations of future common meshworks with their constant experimentation in heterarchical and participatory forms of self-organisation. As a collective delirium, Gezi was unexpected, unpredictable at every turn, and had many shape-shifting faces. It was an assemblage in a continual state of becoming, a chimera in constant mutation. All social groups that had been considered hostile towards each other in Turkey because of their ethnic or sexual identity, class structure or ideological tendency, combined to constitute the multitude, retaining their differences while imagining and constructing new commonalities. Gezi was local: taking place in neighbourhood parks and assemblies, national: scattered all around the country, collecting all of its tensions and desires, and global: intermeshing similar emancipatory pursuits from Tahrir and Zucotti to Madrid and Athens. When I walked around Gezi Park on the morning of 15 June, the last day of its initial occupation, and sat down on its grass and drank the tea given to me by someone I did not know, I became part of a decentralised collective body, a symbiotic plurality, a self-presentative flesh. I was struck by the exuberance, potency and fullness floating in the air, which was nothing metaphysical; on the contrary, it was so radically immanent in the Event and in the relations among all the components of the emergent meshwork that it resists any form of description, it escapes representation. That same evening, the police made an assault and ejected the multitude from the Park. I was there, in Sıraselviler Street, all night till morning. After witnessing this indescribable affection on the faces of others at the park, and in the air during the day, I felt it in my gut during the night. I am indebted to law-enforcement officers, for although it was partly due to their use of tear gas canisters, I have not cried as beautifully as that for a long time. [fig. 2]

At the Gezi Event I witnessed and became a humble part of the constitution of the multitude; the de-appropriation and occupation of public and private spaces in the search for the common; the deconstructive resistance to uphold the right to the commonwealth against the brutal oppression of hegemonic apparatuses; the instant dissemination of common struggles all around the country through communal forums; and the constant imagination, exploration and actualisation of common spaces and open architectures to accommodate the very life we, the multitude, have been fighting for. Among many emerging experiments around the globe, Gezi demonstrated that we are not only able to imagine, but also to construct common spaces. Indeed, as one of its captivating chants proudly declared: 'This is just the beginning.'

Open-Architecture
Every multitude has its Anomalous. The multitude of common space has the *Anomalous Architect*.[37] The etymological root of anomalous (*anomalos*) is very different from abnormal (*anormalos*), which designates a deviation from the norm (*ab* + *norma*), whereas anomalous refers simply to the uneven, the unequal (*an* + *homalos*). In other words, the anomalous is not a heretic deviating from orthodoxy, but rather that which functions without an origin and perseveres without referencing an

Fig. 2:   A protestor throws back a gas canister in one of the back alleys of Taksim. © Author

essence. Similarly, the anomalous architect is not to be confused with a domestic expert, or with a flag-bearing avant-garde whose self-proclaimed prophecy is to know what needs to be done and leads the submissive masses towards their fate. As a transversal agent, the anomalous architect is situated neither at the front nor at the centre of architecture, but always at the border, at the interface, not as 'another thing with respect to the limit', but as 'the experience of the limit itself'.[38] The anomalous architect extends the interactive passage of mercurial transitions and symbioses; enhances spatial possibilities of collective and co-functioning agencies; accelerates the velocity of unpredictable and differential dimensions; and potentiates the multitude to realise their spatial desires themselves. There is, for this reason, no binary opposition between the multitude and anomalous individuals. Anomalous figures are not defined by a fixed identity or expertise, but rather by a set of performances and initiatives. Without any need for institutional requirements or certifications, anyone who helps render architecture horizontally collective, dynamically temporal and differentially performative can become an anomalous architect.

The performance of the anomalous architect can be best elaborated by drawing a parallel with the tale of Josephine, the songstress mouse in one of Franz Kafka's short stories.[39] In the story, Josephine is widely admired for her ability to express 'the power of song' by the mouse folk who gather every evening to watch her soothing performance after their exhausting daily work. After a short introduction, however, the narrator begins to assert that, as songs go, Josephine's songs aren't 'anything all that out of the ordinary', she is not even singing at all in the true sense of the word; rather, her performance is 'a sort of piping' without any artistic profoundness. Kafka's genius here is that Josephine is not depicted as the ruling master or the privileged artist whom the mouse folk put on a pedestal. On the contrary, Josephine is at exactly the same level as all the other mouse folk; her difference lies solely in her *collectivising performance*, for these gatherings are 'not so much a performance of songs as an assembly of the people'.[40] Just like Josephine, the anomalous architect is nothing but the *performative vehicle* with which *the multitude affirms its own collectivity*. This performance abolishes the exclusivist formation of the profession that 'blocks, prohibits, and invalidates' the speech and actions of users, and, instead, opens up the possibility for them to participate in decision-making processes and to speak and act for themselves.[41] Between the anomalous architect and the multitude a monstrous alliance is to be formed to produce a new type of architecture, namely *Open-Architecture*. But in order to be able to discuss this relationship I shall first have to make a long detour and critically analyse current deadlocks within the architectural profession.

The emergence of the architect is documented 'as far back as the third millennium before the Common Era'; relevant graphic conventions of architecture appear 'several millenniums earlier', and it can be fairly postulated that architects were 'abroad from the moment when there was the desire for a sophisticated built environment'.[42] Since Antiquity, a myriad of figures have been called architects, including, but not limited to: thaumaturgic high priests inspired by divine revelations (Imhotep, Ancient Egypt); legendary *arkitektons* flying above endless labyrinths (Daedalus, Ancient Greece); imperial polymaths heralding notions of usefulness, solidity and beauty (Vitruvian legacy, Ancient Rome); communal head-bricklayers serving under Christ as the architect of the Church (*architectus ecclesiae*, Middle Ages); administrative *ustads* functioning as civil officials (Ottoman legacy); gentlemen of genius claiming design expertise about everything from cities and palaces to humble farmhouses (Albertian legacy, Renaissance); rationalist legislators applying their purist vision to contingent built environments (modernist legacy); and global starchitects acting

as celebrity CEOs of multi-national architectural corporations (contemporary legacy). 'Architect' is therefore not an ahistorical term that defines the same actor across different spatiotemporal contexts, but rather a cumulative combination of imaginary, symbolic and actual constructions of a figure who, in addition to occupying a primary role in shaping the built environment, represents an adaptive struggle to guarantee the distinctness and persistence of the architectural profession in relation to fluctuating economic, political and cultural conditions. One side effect of this ontological campaign has been the slightly paranoid safeguarding of architectural knowledge and practice since the times of ancient cults and medieval lodges, up to the days of modern professional institutions and introverted academic siloes, all of which express the architect's desire to control and regulate the realm of architectural production and discourse, and to be guaranteed protection from the claims of other spatial actors. One of the primary reasons why architects have organised their profession into an exclusionary, self-contained discipline by denying the participation of other spatial actors can be explained in Lacanian terms as *the fear of castration*; that is, the symbolic fear of losing an imaginary power, given that the presence of users in architectural decision-making processes is symbolically perceived by architects as a direct threat to their self-imagined supreme authority.[43]

Since the nineteenth century, the authority of the architect has been based upon *modern expertise,* which basically consists of specialised education and institutional approval. Contrary to everyday users, the architect is a spatial actor whose work, including the production, interpretation and transformation of architecture, is sanctioned by affiliated institutions, which in turn secure the architect's exclusivity by promoting a set of theoretical modes, practical norms and regulatory codes in a ritualistic manner. Although it is a 'supreme illusion to defer to architects, urbanists or planners as being

experts or ultimate authorities in matters relating to space', this self-proclaimed myth is exactly why 'unofficial' builders of slum dwellings and vernacular architecture, or non-expert interpreters of any architectural formation, are not recognised as architects, and their works are consciously ignored by the mainstream profession.[44] Technically, the official distinction between architects and users is neither the knowledge of architecture nor the practice of building but a basic licence of expertise bestowed by relevant institutions of authority (AIA in the US, RIBA in the UK, Chamber of Architects in Turkey, etc.). This is how networks of authority attain the administration of an ambiguous field of knowledge, adjust the framework of architectural education, sustain their exclusive members' cult of expertise, and provide architects with a monopoly on architectural production and knowledge in exchange for their submissive internalisation of institutional norms. During this procedure, the architect is reduced to an operative expert whose primary task is limited, in a reactionary manner, to providing convenient solutions to predetermined problems, with substantially restricted options available to question these problems or redefine the questions.[45]

The problematic construction of the architect as an exclusionary expert is primarily linked to the inhibitory utilisation of *modern educational apparatuses*, *representational tools* and *professional discourses* that condition and shape the architect's conception of space and architecture from the very beginning by totally excluding notions of collective agency and temporal dynamics. In dominant forms of contemporary architectural education, three primary roles bestowed upon the architects-of-the-future stand out in terms of their impact on constructing an architect's identity. The role of *technical expert*, structured with a utilitarian repertoire of Euclidean spatial models, functionalist design codes, typological precedents, quantitative calculations and rationalist classifications, implicitly orients architects towards stable arrangements, rigid

separations and definitive forms, thus preparing them predominantly as potential functionaries. The role of *solitary creator*, constructed with recurrent narratives of thaumaturgic geniuses, heroic celebrities and their fetishistic monuments, encourages the architect to place 'the giant leverage of industrial machinery under the mastery of spirit' and transform 'the built landscape into a self-portrait'. This results in the subordination, if not total exclusion, of divergent actions and multiple voices of less mythical spatial actors.[46] The role of *cryptic rhetorician*, finally, constituted to include highly codified professional and academic jargon in order to safeguard architectural knowledge from 'outsiders', ends up alienating spatial actors by deriding their contributions as 'ignorant or mistaken, implying there is a truthful and correct interpretation of a fixed body of knowledge' to which architects alone have access within their esoteric circles.[47]

Representational and instrumental toolkits for architects witnessed significant developments from the invention of blueprint technology in the nineteenth century to the popularisation of digital tools at the turn of this century. However, this repository, which consists not only of plans and models, perspectival, orthographic and axonometric drawings, photography, xerography, photomontage, computer-aided design and parametric software, but also old-school pantograph-equipped drafting tables, T-squares, 45-degree triangles and rapidographs, has all been utilised for the most part to exclude temporality from the spatial equation. Rather than pursuing multimodal options that incorporate temporal dynamics in processes of analysis and design, architects have consistently used representational tools either as Cartesian calculators to analyse space, design architecture and transfer construction details in frozen stances and quantifiable measures, or as cosmetic marketing tools to present their end-products through fixed models and static visuals. This atemporalising approach indicates, however, a deeper historical problem that does not solely

originate from representational limitations. There is a strong vein in architectural discourse and practice that can be traced back to its very emergence, which has allied itself with a struggle against time if not a will to *pure atemporality*, a struggle against movement, if not a will to *pure inertia*, and a struggle against change, if not a will to *pure permanence*. During the pre-modern era, most 'highlighted' architectural works in many cultures were almost always deemed monuments, palaces or earthly sanctuaries for heavenly entities, often constructed to bestow a symbolic stability for their fragile sociopolitical systems. At that time, architects and their patrons believed that *defying* time would *deify* their work. With the arrival of the modern era, the atemporal conception of space was restructured, but sustained within emerging Cartesian frameworks. Although this paradigm has been challenged since late modernity by Riemannian and Lobachevskian geometry, quantum physics, evolutionary theory and continental philosophy, among other epistemological shifts, the architectural milieu has stood firm: from modernist 'forefathers' like Le Corbusier to your favourite contemporary Starchitect, architects have continued to demonstrate their ability to grasp and mould space through static models and quantifiable measures, sustaining the illusion that space is an atemporal, homogenous, and isotropic entity, giving way to fixed spatial conceptions and frozen architectures.

Against the atemporal conception of space, Michel Foucault rightly expresses that 'we do not live in a kind of void', but rather, 'we live inside a set of relations',[48] which Gilles Deleuze expands by pointing out that 'space itself' is not only 'based in things, in relations between things', but also 'between durations' themselves.[49] Architecture is not doomed to futilely pursue fixed spatiotemporal dynamics, but can become a catalyst to enrich them by renouncing frozen beginnings or ends, by consciously situating itself 'always in the middle, between things', simply as an 'interbeing, intermezzo'.[50] This amounts to a

radical shift in architecture's primary focus away from the mono-modality of producing end products and towards the multi-modality of generating interactivities. As any architectural construct is 'not a static object but a moving project, and that even once it has been built, it ages, it is transformed by its users, modified by all of what happens inside and outside', it is time to grasp and produce architecture 'as a navigation', as well as 'movement, as flight, as a series of transformations'; in other words, 'as a changing and criss-crossing trajectory' of new possibilities, 'of flip-flopping users' concerns and communities' appraisals'.[51] In fact, the radicalness of this shift is nothing but the simple inclusion of temporality into architecture, not as the stationary and eternal moment of *being*, but as the ever-changing and augmented present of *becoming*. Then, as Ahmet Hamdi Tanpınar delicately puts it in his famous poem, architecture shall stand 'neither inside time / nor completely outside', yet shall reside 'in the indivisible flow / of an extensive, monolithic instant'.[52]

Open-Architecture is the embodiment of a monstrous alliance between the multitude and anomalous architects. Contrary to problematic traits of the conventional architectural profession, such as exclusionary authority, regulatory expertise and an atemporal conception of space, open-architecture features *horizontal collectivity* through participatory frameworks, *differential performativity* through modifiable spatial codes, and *dynamic temporality* through process-driven operational modes. *Horizontal collectivity* indicates the incorporation of a bottom-up cooperative model for decision-making and experimentation processes. In Spinozist ethics, the ability of a body to act (*potentia*) is not to be utilised as an egocentric power to coerce, dominate or subdue others, but rather to persevere, realise and empower oneself by constructing 'a world that not only reflects but furthers the value of others' lives'.[53] Accordingly, open-architecture weaves a reciprocal relationship among spatial actors and

capacitates the multitude to channel their spatial desires in a twofold way: first, for their individual bodies, and second, for the general conatus: the common. *Differential performativity* designates the opening of spatial compositions to a myriad of possibilities that are to be performed by the multitude through the constant modification and diversification of open-architectures themselves. While architectural constructs conventionally 'allow their designers to determine the meaning and expectations of others', and deny the same capability to those who use them, open-architecture overthrows this frigid confinement in order to 'give each person who uses them the greatest opportunity to enrich the environment with the fruits of his or her vision'.[54] Finally, *dynamic temporality* denotes the affirmation of process-oriented and kinetic experiences, amplified by the constant displacement of relationality and context. However, open-architecture is not limited to external displacements, it is rather 'always displaced in relation to itself'.[55] That is, it is not another Cartesian monument based on the twin fantasies of frozen spatiality and crystallised limits, but a mercurial construct that harbours spontaneous performances and aleatory situations.

Monstrous alliances between anomalous figures and the multitude have a history of expressing assemblages in constant revolt, creating generative ruptures and pursuing new openings in a number of different fields. During the 1980s, when 'free and open-source software' was established in the form of open computer programmes with shared, modifiable and re-distributable characteristics, the latter were at first presumed to be applications of self-inflicted piracy. Instead, they have since become an ever-expanding experimentation in *open-programme development*, and an invitation to computer users to fill in the coding gaps with their own contributions.[56] When Robert Rauschenberg's 'White Paintings' were exhibited as uninflected white canvases in Eleanor Ward's Stable Gallery in 1951, they were at first presumed to scandalously express

nothing but blank frames. Instead, they were a provocative experimentation in *open-painting*, and an invitation to viewers to fill in the visual gaps with their own shadows.[57] When John Cage's 4'33'' was first performed in 1952 by pianist David Tudor sitting silently and playing nothing for four minutes and thirty-three seconds at Woodstock, New York, it was presumed to express nothing but nihilistic silence. It was instead a down-to-earth experimentation in *open-music* and an invitation to the audience to fill in the audial gaps with their everyday noises.[58] When in 1938 Antonin Artaud's 'Theatre of Cruelty' first theorised the abolition of the stage and the auditorium, replacing them with 'a single site, without partition or barrier of any kind', it was presumed to express nothing but its theorist's delusional madness. Instead, it was a carnivalesque experimentation in *open-theatre* and an invitation to spectators to fill in the performative gaps with their own actions.[59] When Cedric Price and Joan Littlewood's 'Fun Palace' was first conceived in 1960 as a huge ephemeral structure without any predetermined programme or fixed spatial configuration, it was thought to express nothing but the fantasy of a technocratic hippie-town on crack. Instead, it was a playful experiment in *open-architecture* and an invitation to spatial actors to fill in the programmatic gaps with their spatial desires and collective activities.[60] Rather than elaborating and augmenting these examples, however, I prefer to conclude this essay by sketching out my own humble attempt at becoming an anomalous architect through a recent experiment in open-architecture, namely the *Open-Cube*.

Open-Cube

Open-Cube was an experiment in open-architecture that took place in Antalya, Turkey, during September 2013, under the ongoing impact of the Gezi Event.[61] The project was conducted to challenge the problematic tenets of contemporary architecture, such as exclusionary authority, regulatory expertise and the atemporal conception of space, despite certain external limitations.[62] The Open-Cube experiment consisted of a group of mobile cubic structures that hijacked and occupied several spots of Antalya's urban fabric, including the urban square of Karaalioğlu Park and the historical entryway of Hadrian's Gate. Technically, the open-cubes were 2.5m x 2.5m x 2.5m constructions, made inhabitable by the removal of their front and rear faces, and rendered mobile by the addition of four little wheels under their base. On a warm September morning, they were released in Antalya's urban matrix without any prior explanation and without any specific function, as an invitation to everyday spatial actors to fill in the experiential gaps with their own performances, according to their varying needs and desires. [fig. 3] During the first week of the experiment, spatial actors sought out the potential uses of open-cubes. White-collar workers read their newspapers inside them; an old lady prayed in tranquillity after she oriented her cube towards the Mediterranean Sea; two students with their laptops spent a whole afternoon inside, sheltering from the sun, and a homeless man spent two nights sleeping under one of the roofs.

Rather than focusing on form making, structural engineering and material tailoring, open-cubes advocated *horizontal collectivity, differential performativity* and *dynamic temporality*. To begin from the perspective of horizontal collectivity, open-cubes were *agentive power-allocating* machines. Everyday, spatial actors became vectors of de-appropriation by getting rid of a set of previously imposed disciplinary measures that anaesthetised, if not blocked, their poietic capability of spatial interaction. Within an open-source architectural fabric, spatial actors were presented with catalysing ruptures in order to acquire a new role of continually unearthing mercurial spatial possibilities and ever-changing experiential trajectories, *for* and *by* themselves. They disregarded vertical organisational models and instead presented a horizontally rhizomatic system, which encouraged, if not empowered, subordinated

Fig. 3: Open-cubes waiting to be activated in Karaalioğlu Park, Antalya. © Author

spatial actors to occupy, displace and programme these structures with their spontaneous performances. From a Spinozist perspective, open-cubes increased the degree of power of spatial actors to act and explore their potentials with and through these constructs. During the second week of the experiment, spatial actors got used to the cubes' mutability. A nervous couple, after moving their open-cube to a relatively less visible spot, kissed each other for a few seconds, probably for the first time, a brownish-coloured street dog sneaked in and lay down in one of the cubes before being thrown out by two kids, and a multitude of protestors converted open-cubes into micro-quarters of civil disobedience by painting them colourfully in support of the Gezi Event, until the municipal police arrived and repainted them white. Open-cubes, to sum up, potentiated everyday users to become creative co-developers of their own spatial experiences.

From the perspective of differential performativity, open-cubes were *open-source programme-distributing* machines. They provided everyday users with the possibility to alter their programmatic source codes through their collective impetus. Contrary to predetermined functions and fixed contents that consciously restrain user-defined spatial activities, the initial volumetric bodies of open-cubes were intentionally left blank to allow their users to inject their own ephemeral activities and decide on their own programmatic palette. Thus, the initial negation of fixed content in open-cubes was an affirmative negation, in that their active resistance to hegemonic constructions of inherent meanings exposed them to the possibility of infinite manipulations and interpretations. They became producers of events rather than functions, and generators of change rather than fixed circumstances. The combination of open-cubes and a multitude of vibrant spatial actors transformed Antalya's selected spatial niches into non-alienating playgrounds, and rendered them performative laboratories of the streets. During the third week of the experiment, spatial actors started

'utilising' open-cubes. One of them was appropriated by a hawker to sell flowers, another was dismantled, probably to be sold as second-hand construction materials, a third was transformed by street musicians into a mobile stage and, according to the direction of the urban flow, moved to different spots of the park until the performers had collected enough money for a few more bottles of wine. Open-cubes, in brief, supported everyday users in establishing their own programmatic needs and desires.

From the perspective of dynamic temporality, open-cubes were *process-based experience-crafting* machines. They challenged the prevalent belief that architecture is and needs to be atemporal and bound to a fixed location; instead they promoted mercurial experiences through mobile dislocation. Although spatial actors acquired the capability to move these structures wherever they deemed more suitable for their planned activities, this was not solely a process of trading one fixed location for another. That is, the displacement and mobility of open-cubes provided spatial actors with the possibility of experiencing space through temporal fluidity and perceptual interactivity. Accordingly, open-cubes reinvented their own context every time their spatiotemporal relation to their surrounding environmental dynamics was changed. They radiated different possibilities when utilised alone, when combined to form larger assemblages, when they were utilised at congested urban squares, when pushed into less crowded recreational landscapes, when operated as mobile containers, or when used as temporarily settled structures. During the final week of the experiment, open-cubes gained public acceptance and became accustomed components of Antalya's urban milieu. Neighbourhood kids had fun becoming pirates and smugglers while pushing and pulling open-cubes around, skate-rollers and skateboarders invented new tricks using open-cubes as their new, non-sentient companions, and an open-cube was even loaded on a van and carried

Fig. 4: Open-cubes activated in a variety of different ways by their spatial actors. © Author

away, probably to be attached to another building at the periphery of the city as an eclectic expansion module. Open-cubes, in short, invited everyday users to experience architecture as events and situations. [fig. 4]

For a month in Antalya, open-cubes gave their users the possibility to choose, develop and alter their spatial environment on their own, and proved how differential combinations of spatial experiences can create ever-expanding potentials by discarding many preconceived limitations and exclusions. As a non-linear system, they introduced 'participatory open-ended situations' to attain the ability to 'change in indeterminate ways over time, continually manifesting new properties'.[63] In the end, the open-cube experiment intermeshed the combined activities and performances of all the participating spatial actors and environmental actants, the fluidity of time and durations, the multidimensionality of material and immaterial relations, the alterability of locations and contexts, the diversity of desires and affects, the unpredictability of spontaneous events and happenings, and the differentiality of ever-changing combinations, conflicts, and hybridisations.

At the end of his magnum opus *Towards a New Architecture*, one of the most influential books on modern architecture that, for many, still maintains its hypnotising power, Le Corbusier provided a choice: 'Architecture or Revolution'. Insofar as architecture is utilised, if networks of authority are employed as a regulatory apparatus to discipline and order the masses, 'Revolution can be avoided.'[64] However, I prefer to end this essay, not with a conservative rhetorical choice, but with the radical possibility of a monstrous alliance.

Architecture *and* Revolution.

Revolution can be incorporated.

Notes

1. For De Certeau, the historian similarly lacks power, but is always around it: Michel de Certeau, *The Writing of History* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1988), pp. 6-11.
2. Henri Lefebvre, *The Production of Space* (Cambridge: Blackwell, 1991), p. 43.
3. Networks are spatiotemporal assemblages with no fixed boundaries or static memberships. Clients and architects may become parts of networks of performance when they experience architecture commissioned and designed by others. Privileged users may become simultaneously a part of networks of authority and performance if they commission themselves private residences, etc.
4. The argument about the hegemonic position of networks of authority within the contemporary built environment is an attempt to marry Marxist and Gramscian theories of power with those of Foucault and Deleuze by designating different degrees of power to allow hegemonic relations, while at the same time offering the possibility to relations and components of all networks to be hybrid (consisting of interpenetrating subjects, discourses and apparatuses), contingent (specific to spatiotemporal contexts), evolving (adapting and transforming), and fluctuant (overlapping and shifting in-between networks) under particular conditions.
5. Bataille suggests a path towards 'bestial monstrosity' as a 'way of escaping the architectural straitjacket': Georges Bataille, 'Critical Dictionary', *October*, 60 (Spring, 1992), p. 25.
6. Lefebvre, *The Production of Space*, p. 26.
7. Badiou similarly defines the proletariat as 'inexistent': Alain Badiou, *The Rebirth of History: Times of Riots and Uprisings* (New York: Verso, 2012), p. 67.
8. See Marx's four types of alienation (*Entfremdung*) of workers under capitalism: Karl Marx, *Economic and Philosophic Manuscripts of 1844 and the Communist Manifesto* (New York: Prometheus Books, 1988), pp. 69-85.
9. Attempts in community-based planning and design may be deemed as exceptions; however, they also

suffer from their internal bureaucratic shortcomings, such as the problem of 'pseudo-participation', which, for Pateman, 'covers techniques used to persuade employees to accept decisions that have already been made'. Carole Pateman, *Participation and Democratic Theory* (Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 1970), p. 68.

10. Lefebvre, *The Production of Space*, p. 57.

11. Antonio Negri and Michael Hardt, *Empire* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2000); *Multitude: War and Democracy in the Age of Empire* (New York: The Penguin Press, 2004); *Commonwealth* (Cambridge, MA: The Belknap of Harvard University Press, 2009); Paolo Virno, *A Grammar of the Multitude* (New York: Semiotext(e), 2004), and Etienne Balibar, *Spinoza and Politics* (London: Verso, 2008). For a wider philosophical perspective: Gilles Deleuze, *Spinoza: Practical Philosophy* (San Francisco: City Lights Books, 1988), and Gilles Deleuze, *Expressionism in Philosophy: Spinoza* (New York: Zone Books, 1990).

12. See especially chapters 1-5 and 11: Baruch Spinoza, 'Political Treatise', in *Spinoza: Complete Works*, ed. by Michael Morgan (Indianapolis: Hackett Publishing Company, 2002), pp. 52-54, 680-700.

13. Deleuze indicates that we live in free-flowing orbital spaces but under ultra-rapid forms of control: Gilles Deleuze, 'Postscript on the Societies of Control', *L'Autre journal*, 1 (May 1990), pp. 3-7.

14. Rem Koolhaas, 'Junkspace', *October*, 100 (Spring 2002), p. 184.

15. Gentrification is directly linked to 'the economic polarization of the population', in which 'the poor are continuously under pressure of displacement' by the wealthy. Peter Marcuse, 'Gentrification, Abandonment, and Displacement: Connections, Causes, and Policy Responses in New York City', *Journal of Urban and Contemporary Law*, 28 (1985), p. 196.

16. 'Mass production of slums' is the flip side of unmitigated capitalist exploitation. Mike Davis, *Planet of Slums* (London: Verso, 2006), pp. 1-19.

17. I analysed the problematic relationship between architecture and ecology more comprehensively here: Gökhan Kodalak, 'Güncel Mimarlık Sorunsalları: Ekoloji', *Arredamento Mimarlık*, 249 (October 2011), pp. 87-97.

18. Sennett regards gated communities as the celebration of 'the middle-class ghetto'. Richard Sennett, *The Fall of Public Man* (London: Penguin Books, 2002), p. 295.

19. Sorkin notes that the aura of theme-parkification 'is all-pervasive', and asks today, 'who doesn't live in Disney World?' Michael Sorkin, 'See You in Disneyland', in *Variations on a Theme Park: The New American City and the End of Public Space*, ed. by Michael Sorkin (New York: Hill and Wang, 1999), pp. 205-32.

20. Henri Lefebvre, 'The Right to the City', in *Writing on Cities*, ed. by Eleonore Kofman and Elizabeth Lebas (Oxford: Blackwell Publishers, 2000), pp. 147-60.

21. David Harvey, 'The Right to the City', *New Left Review*, 53 (2008), p. 23.

22. Michel de Certeau, *The Practice of Everyday Life* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1988), pp. xi-xxiv.

23. Roland Barthes, 'The Death of the Author', in *Image Music Text* (London: Fontana Press, 1977), pp. 142-9.

24. Walter Benjamin, 'The Author as Producer', *New Left Review*, I (1970), p. 87.

25. De Certeau, *The Practice of Everyday Life*, pp. 105-6.

26. The multitude's constructive process consists of 'an association of free men, working with the means of production held in common, and expending their many different forms of labour-power', transparent 'in production as well as in distribution'. Karl Marx, *Capital: A Critique of Political Economy*, Volume One, (New York: Penguin Books, 1982), pp. 171-2.

27. For Boal, 'Theater is action […] a rehearsal of revolution!' Augusto Boal, 'Theatre of the Oppressed', in *The New Media Reader*, ed. by Noah Wardrip-Fruin and Nick Montfort (Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press, 2003), pp. 339-53.

28. Negri and Hardt, *Multitude*, p. xiv.

29. I use the term 'Event' in a similar way to Alain Badiou's definition: a rupture from which something new, in the broadest sense, emerges. Alain Badiou, *Being and Event* (New York: Continuum, 2005), pp. xi-20.

30. More than three million people throughout Turkey actively participated in the Gezi Event. Over 5,000

were arrested, more than 8,000 were injured, and tragically, 8 lost their lives. Amnesty International, *Gezi Park Protests*, (London: Amnesty International, 2013).

31. I analysed the Gezi Event more comprehensively in: Gökhan Kodalak, 'Gezi Ve Yeni Çevre Tahayülleri', in *Direnişi Düşünmek: 2013 Taksim Gezi Olayları*, ed. by Volkan Çelebi and Ahmet Soysal (İstanbul: MonoKL, 2013), pp. 119-37.

32. Zeynep Çelik, *The Remaking of Istanbul: Portrait of an Ottoman City in the Nineteenth Century* (California: University of California Press, 1993).

33. *From the Imperial Capital to the Republican Modern City: Henry Prost's Planning of Istanbul (1936-1951)* ed. by Cana Bilsel and Pierre Pinon (İstanbul: İstanbul Araştırmaları Enstitüsü, 2010).

34. Sibel Bozdoğan, *Modernism and Nation Building: Turkish Architectural Culture in the Early Republic* (London: University of Washington Press, 2001).

35. Lefebvre, *The Production of Space*, p. 59.

36. Hakim Bey, *T.A.Z.: The Temporary Autonomous Zone, Ontological Anarchy, Poetic Terrorism* (New York: Autonomedia, 1991), p. 41.

37. My theory of the anomalous architect is based on Deleuze and Guattari's anomalous figure. Gilles Deleuze and Felix Guattari, *A Thousand Plateaus: Capitalism and Schizophrenia* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2005), pp. 232-52.

38. Giorgio Agamben, *The Coming Community* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2007), p. 67.

39. Deleuze and Guattari identify Josephine as an anomalous figure par excellence whereas Jameson and Žižek interpret her story from a communist perspective: Deleuze and Guattari, *A Thousand Plateaus*, p. 243; Fredric Jameson, *The Seeds of Time* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1994), p. 125; Slavoj Žižek, *Living in the End Times* (London: Verso, 2010), pp. 366-71.

40. Franz Kafka, 'Josephine the Singer, or the Mouse Folk', in *Selected Short Stories of Franz Kafka* (New York: Random House, 1993), pp. 305-28.

41. Foucault critiques the elitist role of the intellectual and theorises a horizontal reformulation in a similar fashion. Michel Foucault, 'Truth and Power', in *The Foucault Reader*, ed. by Paul Rabinow (New York: Pantheon Books, 1984), pp. 51-76.

42. Spiro Kostoff, ed., *The Architect: Chapters in the History of the Profession* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1977), pp. v-viii.

43. Jacques Lacan, *Le Séminaire, Livre IV, La Relation D'objet, 1956-57* (Paris: Seuil, 1991), p. 219.

44. Lefebvre, *The Production of Space*, p. 94.

45. Jeremy Till, *Architecture Depends* (Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press, 2009), p. 167.

46. Jeffrey T. Schnapp, 'The Face of the Modern Architect', *Greyroom*, 33 (2008), p. 7.

47. *Occupying Architecture: Between the Architect and the User,* ed. by Jonathan Hill (London: Routledge, 1998), pp. 5-7.

48. Michel Foucault, 'Of Other Spaces', *Diacritics*, 16 (1986), pp. 22-7.

49. Gilles Deleuze, *Bergsonism* (New York: Zone Books, 1991), p. 49.

50. Deleuze and Guattari, *A Thousand Plateaus*, p. 25, 51. Bruno Latour and Albena Yaneva, 'Give Me a Gun and I Will Make All Buildings Move: An ANT's View of Architecture', in *Explorations in Architecture: Teaching, Design, Research*, ed. by Reto Geiser (Basel: Birkhäuser, 2008), pp. 80-9.

52. Ahmet Hamdi Tanpınar, *Bütün Şiirleri* (İstanbul: Dergah, 1976), p. 19.

53. Spinoza's propositions 18, 35, 36 and 37 in Part IV, and Butler's collectivist interpretation. Baruch Spinoza, *Ethics* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000), pp. 330-9. Judith Butler, 'The Desire to Live: Spinoza's Ethics under Pressure', in *Politics and the Passions, 1500-1850*, ed. by Victoria Kahn, Neil Saccamano and Daniela Coli (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2006), pp. 111-30.

54. Ivan Illich, *Tools for Conviviality* (Glasgow: Fontana Collins, 1975), pp. 23-59.

55. Gilles Deleuze, *The Logic of Sense* (London: The Athlone Press, 1990), p. 228.

56. Richard Stallman, 'Why Software Should Not Have Owners', in *Free Software, Free Society*, ed. by Joshua Gay (Boston: GNU Press, 2002), pp. 47-53.

57. John Cage, 'Robert Rauschenberg', in *John Cage*, ed. by Richard Kostelanetz (London: The Penguin Press, 1974), pp. 111-2.

58. Cage proclaimed that 4'33'' was not about silence but rather about 'accidental sounds'. John Cage, *Conversing with Cage* (New York: Limelight, 1988), pp. 69-70.

59. Antonin Artaud, *The Theater and Its Double* (New York: Grove Press, 1994), pp. 12-13.

60. The Fun Palace was developed not only to antici-pate but also to harbour change itself. Cedric Price and Joan Littlewood, 'The Fun Palace', *The Drama Review: TDR*, 12 (1968), 130.

61. Open-Cube was designed by ABOUTBLANK, my inter-disciplinary architecture office in Istanbul, and sponsored by the 2nd Antalya Architecture Biennial.

62. Limitations included an extremely low budget and a short amount of time (only one month for the project's conception, design and construction), which meant we were unable to invite local spatial actors to participate in processes of production, or to problematise the inflexible roles of architectural 'form' and 'structure'.

63. For system-oriented architectures, see Sanford Kwinter, 'Soft Systems', in *Culture Lab*, ed. by Brian Boigon (New Jersey: Princeton Architecture Press, 1993), pp. 207-28; Reyner Banham, 'Softer Hardware', *Ark,* 44 (Summer 1969), pp. 2-11.

64. Le Corbusier, *Towards a New Architecture* (New York: Dover, 1986), p. 289.

Biography

Gökhan Kodalak is a co-founding partner of ABOUTBLANK, an interdisciplinary architecture office based in Istanbul, and a PhD candidate in the History of Architecture and Urbanism programme at Cornell University. He received his architectural design and theory degrees in Istanbul and has produced a number of award-winning architectural and urban design projects and exhibitions. His publica-tions have so far revolved around the issues of agentive architecture, space and power, hybrid ecology, metropol-itan commonwealth, vibrant preservation, and the hygienic underbelly of modern architecture.