

John Hejduk's Fabrications. Imagination and reality in the architectural design process.

Authors:

Jane Anderson

School of Architecture,
Oxford Brookes University
Gipsy Lane
Oxford, OX3 0BP
j.anderson@brookes.ac.uk

Colin Priest

Chelsea College of Arts
University of the Arts London
16 John Islip Street,
London SW1P 4JU
c.e.priest@chelsea.arts.ac.uk

Jane Anderson is the Programme Lead for Undergraduate Architecture at Oxford Brookes University. She is an architect and National Teaching Fellow. Her published works include *Architectural Design* (AVA Publishing, 2011), *A Typological Analysis of Live Projects* (eds. Harriss and Widder, 2014) and *Undercurrent* (*Charrette*, 2014).

Colin Priest is the Course Leader for BA Interior and Spatial Design at Chelsea School of Arts, University of the Arts, London. His inter-disciplinary practice-based research frames encounters for a public audience to engage in places of urban and environmental change. www.studiocolumba.com

Jane and Colin are co-founders of the Live Projects Network, an international network connecting academics, practitioners, students and clients engaged in live project activity: www.liveprojectsnetwork.org

Title: John Hejduk's Fabrications. Imagination and reality in the architectural design process.

ABSTRACT

The interaction between reality and imagination in the architectural design process is explored via analysis of the work of John Hejduk, live projects, the subject / object problem and Thing Theory.

Abstract word count: 31 words.

Approx. word count: 6869 words.

John Hejduk's Fabrications. Imagination and reality in the architectural design process.

INTRODUCTION AND METHODOLOGY

This paper asks how do reality and imagination interact within the architectural design process?

Four connected lines of enquiry have been pursued:

1. Does the interplay between reality and imagination in the architectural design process alter when it occurs in a live project¹ rather than a professional project or conventional educational design studio project?
2. What do the actions of the different agents in the architectural design process reveal about the interplay of reality and imagination?
3. How can the work of John Hejduk (1929 – 2000) help architects, educators and students to reappraise the role of reality and imagination in the architectural design process?
4. How can designing for The Story Museum, Oxford, a physical architectural space concerned with imaginary spaces improve our understanding of reality and imagination in the architectural design process?

The aims of this paper are to uncover, clarify and reappraise the interplay of reality and imagination in the architectural design as a cognitive process. By doing so, the intention is to:

1. Reassess empirical responses and received wisdom about what is real and what is imagined in the architectural design process.
2. Reassess the perception of differences in the relationship between imagination and reality in the architectural design process that occurs in education and practice.

Reference is made to interviews with respected architects undertaken by Lawson² and Anderson³. The interviews have been analysed to reveal the architects' perceptions of the relationship between reality and imagination as they reflect on their own design process.

This paper includes a series of enquiries into the relationship between reality and imagination in the architectural design process made with year one students at the Oxford Brookes School of Architecture through a programme of live projects, OB1 LIVE⁴. In particular, their work with The Story Museum, Oxford in 2011-12. This comprised two connected live projects, *Fabrications* and *Tower of Stories*, a book, *Fabrications* (2011) and an installation, *Tall Tales* for the exhibition, *Other Worlds* (2012). Reflecting on our observations as tutors and drawing on student feedback gathered between 2013 and 2016, it extends ideas that began to form in a paper presented at the Spatial Perspectives Conference at Oxford University in June 2012 and were developed further in a paper presented at the Writingplace Conference at T. U. Delft in November 2013.

A reflection is made on the design of physical spaces for The Story Museum that evoke and were evoked by imaginary spaces. This reveals complexities surrounding the relative perceptions of reality and imagination between the different agents (students, client collaborators and tutors) involved over the course of a design project from conception to occupation.

A study of the written, drawn, pedagogical and built work of John Hejduk supports the reflections on reality and imagination drawn from The Story Museum. As an architect, educator, writer, artist and poet, John Hejduk spanned similar territory between architectural education and practice as well as literature and stories through his writing. Reference is made to his projects *The Collapse of Time* (1987) and *The Lancaster / Hanover Masques* (1992), the student project, *Nine Square Grid problem* and the installation *The Retreat Masque*, constructed for *Writing the city*, Stockholm (1998).

In his work Hejduk explores the relationship between the subject and object. Charting the development from Descartes to Lefebvre of the philosophical understanding of the inter-relationship of subject and object helps to identify the inter-relationship between reality and imagination in the architectural design process. In order to resolve our difficulties in accepting the counter-intuitive

John Hejduk's Fabrications. Imagination and reality in the architectural design process.

relationship that such philosophies present, *Thing Theory* is proposed as a conceptual framework to improve our understanding of how architectural designs emerge, are transformed in the designer's mind, how architects communicate them to others and how they are understood and shared by others.

PERCEPTIONS OF REALITY AND IMAGINATION IN THE ARCHITECTURAL DESIGN PROCESS

"There are towers and there is ivory, both quite real; it is their combination in the idea of an Ivory Tower which is both imaginary and consequential."⁵

The phrase *ivory tower* is often used to characterise the world of academia to contrast it with the grounded reality of the everyday. The concept informs the debate between architectural practice and theory, particularly when discussing where architectural education should be located.⁶ The intangibility of theory contributes to its dismissal as being disconnected from reality. Academia is the customary site for the generation of theory so its products, including education, are often assumed to lack reality. An as yet unbuilt architectural design is intangible and can also be dismissed as lacking reality. These issues are problematic when trying to understand reality in relation to architectural design education.

We had observed that this perception created confusion for year one students learning to design upon entering architectural school.⁷ The conventions of what is and is not real in a typical design studio brief are normally implicit and therefore confusing to the uninitiated. This was a significant motivating factor in our introduction of live projects on day one of year one. One student when asked what they enjoyed most about the design module answered: "[the] live project as you felt more involved in the project."⁸ The live projects discussed here are part of students' compulsory design modules in semesters one and two. This gave a much-needed opportunity to develop pedagogy to address the detachment of both practice and contemporary architectural education from everyday lived experience. Students who had undertaken live projects reported a strong sense of community and a recurring feedback comment was typically expressed thus: "it helped designing for a community that you could interact with."⁹ One student achieved a level of insight not normally possible at this stage because they noticed that they had fallen into a common trap for designers of becoming so absorbed in the fascination of making that the needs of the client and site had been neglected:

"I liked the creative ways of doing site analysis and learning about the client, but I felt that I was a lot more focused on making an artefact."¹⁰

Briefs were negotiated with our external collaborators to ensure that students could explore their creative potential. As a result, students didn't report becoming hamstrung by budgetary, material, or ethical constraints that they would not have addressed in a traditional design studio project. One student's description shows an acceptance of real-life constraints as a given rather than as insurmountable restrictions: "The opportunity to develop a design that had little restraints in the brief allowed me to explore my creativity and imagination. I enjoy the way that my design was encouraged to develop with my intentions in mind as well as to purely fit into a normal brief."¹¹ Since establishing the live projects programme in 2008, we have observed that they enable students to absorb both the reality of the situation as well as its creative and imaginative potential into their developing architectural design process in a natural, non-disruptive way. This process of observation, reflection, analysis and discussion led us to develop this definition of live projects:

"A live project comprises the negotiation of a brief, timescale, budget and product between an educational organisation and an external collaborator for their mutual benefit. The project must be structured to ensure that students gain learning that is relevant to their educational development."¹²

In common with many people, our original understanding of what was real and what was imaginary in the architectural design process was that reality approximately equated to what was tangible and

John Hejduk's *Fabrications*. Imagination and reality in the architectural design process.

physical. These assumptions were challenged by working with The Story Museum. Children's stories often reflect on these issues with great insight and clarity: "Of course it is happening inside your head, Harry, but why on earth should that mean that it is not real?"¹³

Despite initial assumptions that architectural practice is immersed in reality, the practice of architectural design is essentially a predictive pursuit, engaged in thought, activity and production that is directed towards realising an as yet unrealised future. Does the architect achieve reality when the building is designed, completed or when it is occupied? In a competitive commercial environment, creativity and imagination can be suppressed. Nonetheless, architecture's ambitions exceed the task of simply building a building. Are artefacts such as architectural models evidence of the former, the continued or the never-attained reality of a project? Could the reality of a project be as intangible as a proposal that has taken root in the minds of both architect and client? It seems inadequate to define reality in architectural design as the physical manifestation of an inhabited building.

The distinction between reality and imagination in architectural practice is problematic if the distinction is defined by intention or completion. Changing circumstances over time and design decisions made during the creative process alter our expectation of the likelihood that a project will be realised and therefore how real it is perceived to be. Perhaps architects have been guilty of focussing on the significance of their own imaginative experience as authors and have not spent enough time observing the imaginative journeys made by others such as the client or community over the course of the project.

In 2011 OB1 LIVE undertook the *Fabrications* live project for The Story Museum. On reflection we observed the significance of the role played by tutors in articulating and mediating the shifts between reality and imagination for students and client collaborators. This was most important for the collaborators during the negotiation of the brief, installation and project presentations. As a live project rather than a professional one, collaborators were aware that the students' learning was as much of an outcome as the physical construction. Tutors supported students throughout the project as they learned the process of architectural design. In particular this was needed when they appeared to be occupying either imagination or reality exclusively and needed to be reminded to test their current position against the other condition of reality or imagination. This advice was given in order to progress the design and was given in a way that is similar to the advice familiar in a traditional design studio project when a tutor suggests a change in medium e.g. from sketch to model. In a traditional design studio project there is no such imperative to shift between reality and imagination all the way through a project. The live project enabled important conversations where students were required to make decisions on whether to prioritise an idea or a structure, whether to explore its limits and what the consequences of failure would be. These debates began in the first four weeks of semester one. They were of a nature that would be impossible to explore in a traditional design studio project and were more sophisticated than those possible in a conventional year one project.

At completion, the present was strongly real for all agents. There was mutual agreement about what that present reality was and why that reality had occurred. The evidence for this came during a concluding presentation and feedback session where client collaborators, students and tutors discussed design proposals and concepts important to the project and there was considerable agreement about why these proposals and concepts were significant (see Fig. 1). Over the course of the project each agent diverged and converged as they moved between reality and imagination. The perceptions of agents can differ and vary over the course of a project without causing explicit disruption to it. An understanding between the agents of these shifting perceptions of reality and ability to communicate them is significant to the success of the project's conception and realisation.

SUBJECT AND OBJECT

Verbal, written and drawn descriptions of architectural projects provide evidence of shifts in perception of reality as circumstances change during the design process. Whether work is described as either subject or object reveals whether we perceive the building to be an inanimate, passive,

John Hejduk's Fabrications. Imagination and reality in the architectural design process.

material object or an animated, active, conscious subject. For philosophers the distinction between subject and object is concerned with understanding human experience by considering what exists (objects) and how we (subjects) perceive these objects to exist. This allows us to interrogate what we perceive to be real and imagined as well as to begin to understand how this may differ in the minds of others.

In works such as the 1648 *The Description of the Human Body* and the 1649 *Passions of the Soul*, René Descartes differentiated the physical body and the non-physical mind.¹⁴ Cartesian Dualism, which places mind over matter, is a clear concept that fits neatly with our individual empirical experiences: I (the subject) observe the object in order to understand the world. I can influence that object. However it becomes more difficult to draw universal conclusions when we consider ourselves in relation to others. In his 1781 *Critique of Pure Reason*, Immanuel Kant retained this dualism¹⁵ but altered the traditional relationship between subject and object by positing that we can never have direct experience of the physical because our experience is filtered through our senses. We can only experience a phenomenal world. How the mind perceives the world becomes the essential question.

In the 1818 *The World as Will and Representation*, Arthur Schopenhauer shifted the focus away from trying to solve a dualistic subject-object problem. The subject doesn't cause the object and the object doesn't cause the subject. They are inter-dependent.¹⁶

Writing from the perspective of the field of material culture, Tilley describes the complexity of the relationship between subject and object:

“Object and subject are indelibly conjoined in a dialectical relationship. They form part of each other while not collapsing into or being subsumed into the other....The ontological relationship between the two embodies this contradiction or ambiguity: same and different, constituted and constituting.”¹⁷

Freed from the limits imposed by a solely empirical understanding that objects are inanimate or passive and that subjects are animate or active, it can be observed that the relative roles, identities and even materiality of subject and object can alter during the design process. For example, during the design process the architect and their collaborators are immersed in the future life of the building. Although as-yet unrealised, the building is a subject with a life of its own for those involved in its design. Not only can a building be a subject, an object does not always have to possess a physical materiality. Anthropologist Victor Buchli describes different material registers in which we can understand architectural form beyond the tangible: “image, metaphor, performance, ruin, diagnostic, or symbol”.¹⁸ These non-physical forms are key devices that architects use to create and communicate meaning and experience that resonates beyond the individual designer and reaches wider society via their architecture.

JOHN HEJDUK

Reflection on Hejduk's work increases sensitivity to the subtle condition between subject and object¹⁹ particularly in relation to the nature of architectural creation, production and inhabitation. In works such as *The Lancaster / Hanover Masques* he categorised his architecture and its inhabitants into objects and subjects – often in unexpected ways. Many of Hejduk's architectural designs are anthropomorphic, creating further ambiguity between architecture and its inhabitants. The unresolved tensions between architectural theory and practice are exposed by Hejduk's very particular approach to what is real and what is imagined. He was criticised as “the consummate paper architect, an artist who has shirked off the cumbersome apparatus of conventional practice and created entire cities of the mind.”²⁰ Such comments obscure the complexity of the relationship between reality and imagination in the design process. Architects often unwittingly take up entrenched positions in opposing camps of theory and practice. Sensitive to this, Hejduk would occasionally assert his practical experience such as his substantial renovation of the Cooper Union School of Architecture building²¹ and the thorough pragmatic grounding in practice of his early career.²²

John Hejduk's Fabrications. Imagination and reality in the architectural design process.

He also explained unapologetically that he did not "make any separation between a drawing, a model, and a so-called actual building."²³ Later in his career he welcomed the construction of twenty-six²⁴ of his unrealised designs as installations in places such as the Architectural Association in London and Copenhagen for the *Writing the City* project. "It's like a traveling repertory theater....They come into the town, they do what they have to do, and they leave to go to the next place. I love that."²⁵ These often temporary constructions began to be built in the 1980's and most interestingly were initiated by students and tutors or commissioned by museums and festivals rather than by Hejduk himself. His involvement was more collaborative and open than one might expect from the author of these designs: "My only request is that they capture the spirit."²⁶ Myths such as the Labyrinth and Medusa are significant themes in Hejduk's work which not only emphasise the presence of imagination in the architectural design process but also its significance in our experience of built and inhabited architectural spaces. The experimentation and unconventional realisation of these installations spanned conventional boundaries between the professional and educational, the practical and theoretical.

THE STORY MUSEUM

"'Story' and 'Museum': two potent words. Now combine them and you're crossing the threshold into a physical space, a magical idea, an organisation, and immensely valuable storyboard."²⁷

The live project collaborations with The Story Museum in 2011-12 extended our understanding of the relationship between reality and imagination in the architectural design process. The nature of the live project itself raises these issues by occupying the territory between professional projects and conventional student projects and therefore challenging familiar assumptions about intention, realisation and agency.²⁸ The subject matter of stories and the location of a semi-derelict building stimulated discoveries on the themes of perception, occupation and change over time.

In 2003 The Story Museum began by taking its storytelling programme into schools and communities.²⁹ In 2009 an anonymous donor gave The Story Museum three buildings arranged around a courtyard in Pembroke Street, Oxford.³⁰ These buildings have had several recorded uses dating back to the thirteenth century including a public house, student housing and most recently, a Post Office sorting office and telephone exchange. The buildings were empty between 2004 and 2010 when basic repairs enabled The Story Museum to move into the semi-derelict building. They needed to find a way to operate in a permanent home and to welcome visitors for the first time.

The Story Museum was in the process of appointing an architect-led team for a two-phase development. The first student live project was to build prototype storytelling devices / spaces to enhance the use of the building in its partially renovated state. An additional, more speculative project was agreed for a tower to become part of Oxford's dreaming spires in a city where so many children's stories began. The likelihood of realisation of this project was small but the students' proposals gained authenticity through their intimate knowledge of The Story Museum gathered in the earlier project.

The first two projects were recorded in a book, *Fabrications*.³¹ It included images and text describing the projects as well as a list of concepts found in the projects that were identified as particularly resonant by students and The Story Museum in the concluding presentation and feedback session. Reflecting on these concepts it can be seen that every project can be identified as either deriving from something real or deriving from something imaginary (see Fig.1). The concepts that relate to something real all deal with the uncanny or the ephemeral. The concepts relating to the imagined all spring from a subversion or inversion of everyday reality. In other words, reality and imagination are inter-dependent and define each other. The sense of uncanny that we have when something appears to be familiar but strange can be described as the "cognitive dissonance caused by objects that lie on category boundaries."³² In *The Architectural Uncanny*, Vidler portrays Hejduk and his architecture as not quite fitting in anywhere when he describes him as creating "vagabond" architecture.³³ When we encounter the architectural uncanny our sense of context, customs and order are disrupted. Architecture that lies on the boundary between real and unreal is unsettling because the mind seeks

Comment [JA1]: Reference Hejduk uncanny book.

John Hejduk's Fabrications. Imagination and reality in the architectural design process.

to make sense of the world by placing objects and people in known categories. When people experience the uncanny it either stimulates them to engage more or it provokes a revulsion that stimulates dismissal or hostility.

In a post-project meeting with the directors of The Story Museum in October 2014, they confirmed that they continue to reference the *Fabrications* when considering what can be realised in the space. The OB1 LIVE projects were significant to them because they thought that the students had managed to achieve reconciliation between real space and children's imagined spaces. They speculated that this could have come from an implicit understanding of how the museum wished to operate, the transitional nature of the context or as a result of the student's relative youth. Another explanation might be that the students' designs took the form of working prototypes, films, design proposal drawings and models, a book and an installation. This allowed them to retain a degree of ambiguity that enabled storytelling to take place for designers, client and visitors.

Our experience as tutors acting as mediators between student designers and client collaborators, gave us insight into their perceptions of reality and imagination over the course of the project from conception to occupation. In order to find a conceptual framework for our findings, we turned to the work and writings of John Hejduk. What follows is a comparative analysis of our collaborations with The Story Museum and readings of a similar range of work by John Hejduk (see Fig. 2).

ARCHITECTURAL DESIGN: ANIMATING THE OBJECT

Fabrications (OB1 LIVE, Oxford, 2011)

The collaboration with The Story Museum sparked two reciprocal investigations into ways to generate imaginative space. The Story Museum was striving towards realisation of the refurbishment project (albeit seeking to construct scope for imagination within the context of reality). The students were engaged in their very first architectural design project and therefore learning how conceive and express an imagined reality (albeit using real objects such as models, prototypes and drawings to represent it).

The project brief was to design and make prototype story-telling devices for the re-occupation of redundant spaces in the museum. It was given this name because of the significance of the etymological connection between the reality of building ("to fabricate") and the invention of a lie or a story ("to fabricate"). In the student brief for the Nine Square Grid project Hejduk also quoted these different meanings.³⁴ This project was used by Hejduk, Robert Slutzky and Lee Hirsche³⁵ "as a pedagogical tool in the introduction of architecture to new students"³⁶ for decades starting at the University of Texas, Austin in 1954 and continuing at the Cooper Union School of Architecture in New York. Although the resulting student work appears to be a formal exercise in learning to draw orthographically, the process was undertaken with the intention that "an idea of fabrication emerges".³⁷

Hejduk's counter-intuitive treatment of reality and imagination was significant to his design process and reveals the unsettled interaction between them. In a lecture on education³⁸ he describes a problem he had set for students at the Cooper Union. He showed them fruit in different guises: a Cezanne still life painting, a student drawing, a bowl of artificial fruit and a bowl of real fruit. When asked, 95% of his students said that the real fruit would taste best. His response was "And I knew we had a problem."³⁹

The brief for the OB1 LIVE Fabrications project drew students' attention to the co-existence of realities such as the material and the functional as well as intangible qualities such as the imaginative and the conceptual. It was kept sufficiently open to enable individuals' personal responses to form the basis for their proposals. The importance of using imaginative and practical thinking to consider both occupation and use was stressed:

John Hejduk's Fabrications. Imagination and reality in the architectural design process.

"this brief is not asking you to design a chair. You are designing for the activity of listening, telling and experiencing a story in a space simultaneously real and imagined. This is a physical, intellectual and emotional activity."⁴⁰

The Fabrications were made from everyday objects and were designed for (mis)reading with the building, superimposing serendipitous narratives. Several projects referred to the associated back story of the material, endowing it with both plot and characters. It emphasised the power of the everyday object (and architecture) to become a catalyst for imagination and to be transformed when activated by the user.

Collapse of Time (Hejduk, London, 1986)

Hejduk wrote about the experience of handling and reading ten booklets from Venice that were one of the inspirations for *The Collapse of Time* along with his poem, *The Sleep of Adam*: "The *actual place* was the very *documents themselves*."⁴¹ At the beginning of a design project, past, present and future are being considered simultaneously. Storytelling is employed to help establish understanding and find meaning. Hejduk's insight that "all are objects and all are subjects"⁴² is particularly significant. The building proposal, by its very absence cannot be dismissed as a dumb object. Its anticipated transformation imbues it with the significance and narrative to metamorphose it into a subject. Architecture that stimulates the imagination never fully slips into being just an object. A strong grasp of the significance of designing with occupation in mind and an acknowledgement that the putative building is a subject as much as it is object, helps the architect to avoid the trap of designing empty object-buildings where formal invention is the predominant driver for design.

Hejduk explains that "Actual thought is of no substance. We cannot actually see thought, we can only see its remains."⁴³ Hejduk recounts in vivid detail things that he experienced in the real world to explain what stimulated his insights. By enabling us to see the scene in our own minds, we understand the concept. He describes a tree trunk covered in phosphorescent empty insect shells and hearing the metamorphosed insects singing, invisible, from the upper branches. He explains that art is the shell of thought. This insight connects the real and tangible with the imaginary and intangible in a symbiotic relationship. It also supports the arguments above that architecture is both object and subject, that this can shift over time and that perception of this relationship will vary for the different agents over the course of the design process.

THE AMBIGUITY OF SUBJECT AND OBJECT

Tower of Stories project (OB1 LIVE, Oxford, 2011)

Our next project to design a storytelling tower for The Story Museum was concerned with an anticipated but more speculative future. In six weeks students produced drawings and models of proposals including a rain-disguised tower, a prayer space and an occupied seashell.

The creative process of architectural design is concerned with the projection, manipulation, testing and communication of imagined space. This does not occur within a purely imaginative mode. At the beginning of the process of design the architect is absorbing the realities of the client and the place and is highly conscious of its intended future occupation. The very earliest ideas are of completion. The architect and client are completely reliant on their imaginations to decide the realities of this future. The development of the design to sit within an evolving and negotiated future context means that the completed building will never exactly match the first imagined but potent reality. Through our use of live projects with all of the uncertainty and risk that they bring, students are exposed to the changing nature of reality over time, absorbing this into their design process from day one of year one. By making stories and the imagination the subject matter, it exposed just how intertwined and often unarticulated both conceptual and real thinking are during the design process. It revealed that it was possible to be unreal to be real, just as every story, however fantastic, contains a grain of truth.

The Lancaster/Hanover Masque (Hejduk, 1992)

John Hejduk's Fabrications. Imagination and reality in the architectural design process.

In the project *The Lancaster / Hanover Masque*, Hejduk detaches himself from context by drawing an entire community from his imagination. The drawings are accompanied by tables of text describing precise yet imagined data for each "object" and "subject" in his fictional community:

"Object

Post Office

Mobile unit with tractor treads, electric powered. Unit dimensions: 4ft x 4ft x 12ft..."

Subject

The Post Mistress"⁴⁴

On close reading, it can be seen that although people are listed as subjects and buildings as objects, the Travelling Performers appear as subjects and objects. The buildings are anthropomorphic and human figures normally only interact with objects when they are employed in moving or animating a structure. One drawing titled "Characters"⁴⁵ depicts twenty-five different buildings not people. On re-reading the book we realised that we had incorrectly remembered some of the people inhabiting certain buildings when in fact they are mostly confined to separate drawings. By inhabiting the world that Hejduk had created, subject and object had merged.

Hejduk described the experience of making the drawings for *The Lancaster / Hanover Masque*: "The lead of the pencil hardly touched the surface of the paper: a thought captured before a total concretion."⁴⁶ These drawings subvert conventions of architectural representation because Hejduk decides not to show the narrative of the spaces. He blurs and overlays plan, section and elevation, reflecting the additive and partial way that we experience space. He does not show how, why or where it is occupied but rather attempts to show how the spaces are perceived by occupants.

OCCUPATION: REMNANTS OF IMAGINATION.

Tall Tales (OB1 LIVE, Oxford, 2012)

The Story Museum invited OB1 LIVE to participate in *Other Worlds*, an exhibition of site-specific installations formed through collaborations between writers and artists. OB1 LIVE's contribution was installed in the kitchen of the derelict telephone exchange canteen. After an absence of five months, the students were jolted back into the reality of the building's undeveloped existence: "It hasn't changed!" In their minds during the design process, the building had moved and altered with their imaginations. It was almost a surprise not to see their story towers projecting from the roof.

The installation entitled *Tall Tales*, re-imagined the 1:20 tower models as a description of the possible shifting futures for The Story Museum. This could not have been expressed if the tower models were displayed conventionally as a series of finite architectural objects. The solution was to negate their physical presence using artificial light, merging them with the silhouettes of the redundant kitchen equipment and projecting a single speculative shadow skyline in order to return them to their fictional state as subjects once more.

The Retreat Masque (Hejduk, Stockholm, 1998)

Hejduk's built works such as *The Retreat Masque* for the *Writing the City* project challenge our assumptions about the definite and complete nature of constructed architecture. In Katja Grillner's essay on the project, she observes "Somehow the construction maintains its eerie fictional nature in spite of its evident materiality."⁴⁷ Hejduk draws attention to various elements in his structure such as the diving board that he describes as being for an "anticipated function"⁴⁸ The absence of inhabitation creates an ambiguity as to what point in time we are witnessing. Is this the moment when it transforms from being a subject in the mind of its creator to becoming an object for inhabitation? The anthropomorphic form and scale of the structure suggests that this construction could continue to act

John Hejduk's Fabrications. Imagination and reality in the architectural design process.

as subject, even when inhabited. The ambiguities between subject and object cultivated by Hejduk's work shift our expectations of constructed architecture and remind us of the complex and intertwined nature of reality and imagination in the design process.

THING THEORY

In order to explore architects' awareness of subject / object ambiguity and their perception of its role in the design process, the language of fifteen interviews with respected architects was analysed. Ten interviews were conducted by Lawson⁴⁹ and five by Anderson⁵⁰. The interviews were undertaken for two separate books, both of which aimed to increase understanding of the architectural design process.

Some of the architects described the inanimate building object as a subject. In these situations they tended to explain this as a deliberate use of metaphor and analogy:

"Often we'll describe the building. We'll begin to describe its personalities and its qualities before we've drawn it." (Tompkins)⁵¹

"We're actually both of us very analytical people but we're also using things like memory, analogy, intuition...thoughts that can't be legitimated objectively. There is some resonance that you wait for between the subjective interpretation and the actual conditions. (Tuomey)⁵²

All described moments of uncertainty that were critical to the development of the proposal but they did not or could not articulate their thought process during those moments. In hindsight, most identified the building as the object and the users as the subjects. Occasionally the users were described in more objective terms:

"you know how the sun travels, you know where any water is, you know whether the site is flat, you know where people are coming from and you work out where would be the best place for them to enter the site and the building. So each programme just gets split into a series of individual tasks and it's just like little pieces of paper which you put on the table." (Jiricna)⁵³

There was little discussion of the ambiguity between subject and object during the design process. However, one word that was used repeatedly by all of the architects was *thing*. This seems to be the most favoured name for an architectural proposal as it emerges, ambiguous in its nature:

"to start with you see the thing in your mind and it doesn't exist on paper and then you start making simple sketches and organizing things" (Calatrava)⁵⁴

"The most difficult thing is to see things that you don't know are there and to get past the point where you see things that you expect to be there. (Bunschoten)⁵⁵

Bill Brown explains in *Thing Theory* that:

The word *thing* "designates the concrete yet ambiguous within the everyday: "Put it by that green thing in the hall." It functions to overcome the loss of other words or as a place holder for some future specifying operation: "I need that thing you use to get at things between your teeth." It designates an amorphous characteristic or a frankly irresolvable enigma: "There's a thing about that poem that I'll never get."⁵⁶

He describes how most people only really notice objects when they stop working and this is when they become things:

"when the drill breaks, when the car stalls". This is "the story of a changed relation to the human subject and thus the story of how the thing really names less an object than a particular subject-object relation."⁵⁷

John Hejduk's Fabrications. Imagination and reality in the architectural design process.

Perhaps Brown was knowingly echoing the syntax of Oscar Hammerstein II's 1959 lyrics for "*My Favourite Things*". As an artist, Hammerstein recognised the creative potential of such events when he described Maria conjuring up positive *things* from the present reality of a frightening thunderstorm:

"when the dog bites, when the bee stings...I simply remember my favourite things... Brown paper packages tied up with strings. These are a few of my favorite things."⁵⁸

During the design process there is a similar moment when "thing" is used to describe the design proposal. It enables designers to articulate during those moments where the ambiguity of the subject – object relation appears in our peripheral vision and nothing is what it seems. This state echoes the descriptions earlier of the architectural uncanny and Buchli's material register that includes the intangible as a possible architectural form. Although Brown describes this as happening simply when objects break, during the design process not only do architects orchestrate a break from current reality, they transform it into a *thing* that enables them to realise one of many possible future realities.

CONCLUSION

We have identified the following complexities surrounding the relationship between reality and imagination in the process of architectural design:

Architectural design is a predictive process that negotiates many different possible and as yet unrealised futures. This is equally true for students and professionals. Until a building is realised it is intangible. Although the design process can be collaborative and produces physical artefacts such as models and drawings in advance of an occupied building, our perception of the creative act itself can never be completely exposed to others. This break from the present reality is both the strength and the weakness of the design process. It makes wonderful invention and adaption to changing realities possible but also makes it easy for the architect to misjudge the imperatives of everyday lived experience. This contributes to the neglect of the creative contribution of collaborators, consultants and clients whose imaginations are also engaged in the design process and whose experience of reality is filtered through their own individual perceptions.

Empirically, designers tend to equate the physical and the tangible with reality and dismiss the intangible or theoretical as not being engaged with reality. Custom creates misconceptions about the relationship between imagination and reality in the design process and creates an inaccurate differentiation between the design process in practice and education that is disproved by the new perspective offered by live projects. Live projects offer an opportunity rarely given to studio-bound students and professional architects because they often enable participation in the construction phase and yield rapid post-occupation feedback. Student feedback and tutor reflection supported the case that live projects help students to absorb a more natural understanding of the relationship between reality and imagination into their design process as they learn. A reappraisal of Hejduk's unexpectedly realised works as proto-live projects demonstrates that consideration of the reality of construction or occupation can be embedded within the design process even when there is very little expectation that the work will be realised. Changing circumstances over time and design decisions made during the creative process alter our perception of the likelihood that a project will be realised and therefore how real it is perceived to be. It is therefore impossible to use either the architect's intention or the achievement of occupied construction to distinguish reality and imagination in the architectural design process.

The complexities that invention, intangibility, intent and change over time present demonstrates the difficulty of making any absolute or universal descriptions of the relationship between reality and imagination in the architectural design process. We observed the perception of reality and imagination for the different agents over the course of the OB1 LIVE *Fabrications* project. Although the perceptions of the different agents were contingent, diverging and converging over the course of the project, this did not necessarily disrupt it. **Our hypothesis is that acknowledgement and awareness**

John Hejduk's Fabrications. Imagination and reality in the architectural design process.

between agents of these shifting perceptions of reality are significant to the successful integration of the project's conception and realisation.

Comment [JA2]: Use of subject / object semantics to aid communication?

The OB1 LIVE projects for The Story Museum emphasised the significance of imagination for the occupants of realised and inhabited space. The imaginative realm of architecture is not only inhabited by the architect and does not cease once the architect's involvement ends. Concepts arising from that project demonstrated that reality includes the uncanny and ephemeral and that imagination relies on a subversion or inversion of reality. Reality and imagination were inter-dependent and drew meaning from each other. Hejduk observed that art is the shell of thought and therefore connects the real with the imaginative in a tangible form.

A philosophical approach to the problem of what exists (objects) and how we (subjects) perceive these objects to exist acknowledges that perceptions of reality and imagination differ in the minds of others. Tilley describes the relationship between subject and object as ambiguous because "object and subject are indelibly conjoined in a dialectical relationship."⁵⁹ Buchli explains that objects can exist in material registers that include the immaterial such as metaphor. The Story Museum project demonstrated that during the design process and when the imagination is stimulated during occupation, the building itself can shift from being an object to a subject. This was supported by Hejduk who explored the ambiguity between subject and object in his work. The analysis of fifteen interviews with practicing architects showed their conscious inversion of object and subject during the design process and their heavy use of the word *thing* to describe a design proposal as it emerges. Brown describes a *thing* as "the concrete yet ambiguous within the everyday"⁶⁰ that we don't notice until it breaks. The design process requires designers to break with present reality in order to allow possible future realities to emerge via their imagination.

The above conceptual framework of subject and object and *Thing Theory* has enabled a reassessment of the relationship between imagination and reality in the design process. Insights gained from observation of the dynamic between reality and imagination in live projects remove redundant distinctions between education and practice. Both use the device of the break from reality as a key moment in the design process that allows possible future realities to emerge. In this moment subject and object are at their most confusingly intertwined and designers can only name their work as a *thing*. This moment is strong because it is so flexible in responding to change and managing complexity. It is also weak because the designer can neglect vital everyday constraints such as occupation and ethics. Once understood, this moment is also an ideal one for the inclusion of collaborators in the design process, a development that architects are increasingly receptive to.

Acknowledgements

With warmest thanks to Tish Francis and Kim Pickin, co-directors of The Story Museum for their insight and generosity in our collaboration.

¹ Jane Anderson and Colin Priest, "Developing an inclusive definition. Typological analysis and online resource for live projects", in *Architecture Live Projects*, eds. Harriet Harriss and Lynnette Widder (Oxford: Routledge, 2014), p. 13.

² Bryan Lawson, *Design in Mind*, (Oxford: Butterworth-Heinemann Ltd., 1994).

³ Jane Anderson, *Architectural Design*, (Lausanne: AVA Academia, 2010).

⁴ The live projects discussed in this article can be viewed on the OB1 LIVE website here: < <http://architecture.brookes.ac.uk/galleries/ob1/>> [accessed 12.8.16].

⁵ Steven Shapin, "The Ivory Tower: the history of a figure of speech and its cultural uses", *British Society for the History of Science*, BJHS 45(1): 1–27, March (2012), p. 1.

⁶ Christopher Platt and Oren Lieberman, "Debate: Should architecture only be taught at universities?", *Architects Journal*, July 25, 2014, Vol.240(4), (2014), p. 34–5 <<http://www.architectsjournal.co.uk/student/debate-should-architecture-only-be-taught-at-universities/8666094.article>> [accessed 15.12.14]

⁷ Jane Anderson and Colin Priest, "The Live Education of an Architect: John Hejduk and OB1 LIVE, imagination and action", *Journal for Education in the Built Environment*, 7(2) (2012), p. 56.

John Hejduk's Fabrications. Imagination and reality in the architectural design process.

-
- ⁸ Student feedback on the OB1 LIVE programme gathered between 2013 and 2015.
- ⁹ Student feedback on the OB1 LIVE programme gathered between 2013 and 2015.
- ¹⁰ Student feedback on the OB1 LIVE programme gathered between 2013 and 2015.
- ¹¹ Student feedback on the OB1 LIVE programme gathered between 2013 and 2015.
- ¹² Anderson, J. and Priest, C. "Developing an inclusive definition. Typological analysis and online resource for live projects", in *Architecture Live Projects*, eds. Harriet Harriss and Lynnette Widder (Oxford: Routledge, 2014).
- ¹³ J. K. Rowling, *Harry Potter and the Deathly Hallows* (London: Bloomsbury Publishing, 2007), p. 579.
- ¹⁴ Victor Buchli, *An anthropology of architecture*. (London and New York: Bloomsbury Academic, 2013), p.139.
- ¹⁵ Lefebvre, *The Production of Space*. Translated by D. Nicholson-Smith, 1994. (Oxford and Cambridge, Massachusetts: Blackwell Publishers, 1994), p.39.
- ¹⁶ Schopenhauer, A., 1818. *The World as Will and Representation*. Edited and translated by J. Norman, A. Welchman. Edited by C. Janaway. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010), p.123. Available through: Oxford Brookes University Library website. Book DOI: <<http://dx.doi.org.oxfordbrookes.idm.oclc.org/10.1017/CBO9780511780943>> [Accessed 15.12.15].
- ¹⁷ Christopher Tilley, "Objectification". In: Eds. Tilley, C., Keane, W., Küchler, S., Rowlands, M. and Spyer, P. eds., 2011. *Handbook of Material Culture*. (London: Sage Publications Ltd., 2011), p.61.
- ¹⁸ Victor Buchli, *An anthropology of architecture*. (London and New York: Bloomsbury Academic, 2013), p.1.
- ¹⁹ Herbert Muschamp, "John Hejduk, an Architect And Educator, Dies at 71", *The New York Times*, 6 July 2000, The Arts/Cultural Desk; Section A., p. 22.
- ²⁰ Herbert Muschamp, "Fleeting Homage To an Architect Who Only Dreams", *The New York Times*, 9 April 1995, Arts and Leisure Desk, p. 40.
- ²¹ *Schools of Architecture*, ed. by Bart Goldhoorn, (Rotterdam: NAI Publishers, 1996), pp.12-14.
- ²² "John Hejduk: Interview with Peter Eisenman. Great interview with John Hejduk via www.arch.ttu.edu...The following was transcribed and edited from a taped interview conducted by Peter Eisenman in the fall of 1977", <<http://archtalks.com/archtalks-home/2010/6/11/john-hejduk-interview-with-peter-eisenman.html>> [Accessed 19.12.14]
- ²³ Lawrence Biemiller, "Structures to Honor a Student Martyr in Czechoslovakia", *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, 4 September 1991, 38, 2; p. B8.
- ²⁴ Herbert Muschamp, "John Hejduk, an Architect And Educator, Dies at 71", *The New York Times*, 6 July 2000, The Arts/Cultural Desk; Section A., p. 22.
- ²⁵ Douglas C. McGill, "Art People", *The New York Times*, 25 March 1988, Weekend Desk, p. 30.
- ²⁶ Lawrence Biemiller, "Structures to Honor a Student Martyr in Czechoslovakia", *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, 4 September 1991, 38, 2; p. B8.
- ²⁷ Kevin Crossley-Holland, "Testimonials" <<http://www.storymuseum.org.uk/about-us/testimonials/>> [accessed 21.12.14]
- ²⁸ Jane Anderson, "Undercurrent: swimming away from the design studio", *Charrette*, 1(1) Summer 2014, p. 17. <<http://www.ingentaconnect.com/contentone/arched/char/2014/00000001/00000001/art00002>> [accessed 26.7.16].
- ²⁹ *About us* <<http://www.storymuseum.org.uk/about-us/>> [accessed 21.12.14]
- ³⁰ *Our plans* <<http://www.storymuseum.org.uk/about-us/our-plans/>> [accessed 21.12.14]
- ³¹ Jane Anderson, *Fabrications*, (Lulu, 2011).
- ³² Karl F. MacDorman, Sandosh K. Vasudevan, Chin-Chang Ho, "Does Japan really have robot mania? Comparing attitudes by implicit and explicit measures." *AI & Soc*, 17 March 2008. Springer-Verlag London Limited. DOI 10.1007/s00146-008-0181-2 <<http://www.macdorman.com/kfm/writings/pubs/MacDorman2008DoesJapan.pdf>> [Accessed 3.8.16]
- ³³ Anthony Vidler, *The Architectural Uncanny*. (Cambridge, Massachusetts: MIT Press, 1996.), pp. 210-214.
- ³⁴ John Hejduk, and Richard Henderson with Elizabeth Diller, Diane Lewis and Kim Shkapich eds., *Education of an Architect*, (New York: Rizzoli, 1988), p. 11.
- ³⁵ Mark Linder, *Nothing less than literal: architecture after minimalism*, (Cambridge, Massachusetts: MIT Press, 2004), p. 178.
- ³⁶ *Education of an architect: a point of view*, eds. Ulrich Franzen, Alberto Pérez-Gómez and Kim Shkapich, (New York: Monacelli Press, 1999), p. 23.
- ³⁷ *Education of an architect: a point of view*, eds. Ulrich Franzen, Alberto Pérez-Gómez and Kim Shkapich, (New York: Monacelli Press, 1999), p. 23.
- ³⁸ *Schools of Architecture*, ed. by Bart Goldhoorn, (Rotterdam: NAI Publishers, 1996), p. 21.
- ³⁹ *Schools of Architecture*, ed. by Bart Goldhoorn, (Rotterdam: NAI Publishers, 1996), p. 21.
- ⁴⁰ Extract from *Fabrications* project brief written by Jane Anderson and Colin Priest, Oxford Brookes School of Architecture, 2011.
- ⁴¹ John Hejduk, *The collapse of time and other diary constructions*. (London: The Architectural Association, 1987), p. 51.
- ⁴² John Hejduk, *The collapse of time and other diary constructions*. (London: The Architectural Association, 1987), p. 56.
- ⁴³ John Hejduk, and Richard Henderson with Elizabeth Diller, Diane Lewis and Kim Shkapich eds., *Education of an Architect*, (New York: Rizzoli, 1988), p.340
- ⁴⁴ John Hejduk, *The Lancaster / Hanover Masque*. (London: Architectural Association Publications, 1992), p. 38.
- ⁴⁵ John Hejduk, *The Lancaster / Hanover Masque*. (London: Architectural Association Publications, 1992), p.17.
- ⁴⁶ John Hejduk, *The Lancaster / Hanover Masque*. (London: Architectural Association Publications, 1992), p. 13.
- ⁴⁷ Katja Grillner, "The textual artefact in research by architectural design", *Working Papers in Art and Design* 3 (2004) <https://www.herts.ac.uk/_data/assets/pdf_file/0017/12356/WPIAAD_vol3_grillner.pdf > [accessed 29.1.15].

John Hejduk's Fabrications. Imagination and reality in the architectural design process.

⁴⁸ Ana Betancour, Peter Hasdell and Ylva Tegner, *Writing the city. An architectural project.* (Stockholm: Thekla Kulturförening, 1998), p. 18.

⁴⁹ Bryan Lawson, *Design in Mind*, (Oxford: Butterworth-Heinemann Ltd., 1994).

⁵⁰ Jane Anderson, *Architectural Design*, (Lausanne: AVA Academia, 2010)

⁵¹ Jane Anderson, *Architectural Design*, (Lausanne: AVA Academia, 2010), p.156.

⁵² Jane Anderson, *Architectural Design*, (Lausanne: AVA Academia, 2010), p.107.

⁵³ Bryan Lawson, *Design in Mind*, (Oxford: Butterworth-Heinemann Ltd., 1994), p.54.

⁵⁴ Bryan Lawson, *Design in Mind*, (Oxford: Butterworth-Heinemann Ltd., 1994), p.26.

⁵⁵ Jane Anderson, *Architectural Design*, (Lausanne: AVA Academia, 2010), p.94.

⁵⁶ Bill Brown, "Things", *Critical Enquiry* (Vol 28) No. 1, Autumn, 2001 p.4.

⁵⁷ Bill Brown, "Things", *Critical Enquiry* (Vol 28) No. 1, Autumn, 2001 p.4.

⁵⁸ Oscar Hammerstein II, *My Favourite Things*, lyrics. 1959. Metro Lyrics. <http://www.metrolyrics.com/my-favorite-things-maria-lyrics-the-sound-of-music.html> [accessed 12.8.16]

⁵⁹ Christopher Tilley, "Objectification". In: Eds. Tilley, C., Keane, W., Küchler, S., Rowlands, M. and Spyer, P. eds., 2011. *Handbook of Material Culture*. (London: Sage Publications Ltd., 2011), p.61.

⁶⁰ Bill Brown, "Things", *Critical Enquiry* (Vol 28) No. 1, Autumn, 2001 p.4