Reflection

The conclusion of the research via mapping led to the departure point of the project that by confronting the disjunctions in architecture, it could possibly allow architects to arrive at spatial alternative and modes of architecture in the capitalist consensual environment. The commitment towards this theoretical position developed in the earlier research was later reflected in an exhaustive translation of the mapping to design. Working with projections and axonometric drawings the method of translation explores the disjunction these mode of architecture as well as its formal basis (not in the sense of its appearance but rather its operations and performance). To a certain extend, this intermediate step from research to design was rather a perverse exercise yet in my opinion it was necessary and successfully carried out. In the case of using the axonometric projection, it is sometimes extremely contrive and limited by the mode of design. Upon further development of the project, it requires critical interpretations of the translation as well as the product in order to arrive at specific architecture strategies that could be further develop into a design. In my project, it is a return to the insights from the mapping, the unsettling borders/barriers/planes in space as elements that creates disjunctions in spatial relationships, which is also coherent to the translation method of using axonometrics and the theoretical position of architectural disjunction. I also think that the commitment toward the methodology develop in the mapping (research) during the design stage forces the design to be an integral part of the research which can be further develop through the design.

For me the border condition studio’s interests are peripheral conditions in architecture, spatial alternatives and using mapping as a research and design tool. In the same vein, disjunctions in architecture are part of these non-consensual conditions and glitches that becomes more apparent in peripheral conditions. The decision to introduce a historical museum in Prishtina is to apply the architecture strategies develop to design with disjunctions in architecture during the translation stage, to a programme that could question existing spatial setup in public spaces in Prishtina as well as the notion of operative history as consensus in post predatorised capitalistic cities (such as Prishtina) to legitimise and achieved a historical perspective by systematically masking its real contradictions, crisis and actors involved. In Pristina, it is apparent that the consensus is accumulated through the people’s use and experience of everyday public spaces. Therefore in the project, it is suggested that spatial alternative by inducing both architecture and (programme) history to become unstable, inconsistent and open for humanly interpretation. This is also reflected in the integration of the historical museum to a park, which is freely accessible by the public and have proven to the site of disturbances in the earlier research. In retrospect, the intervention is therefore a series of delicate boundaries, thresholds, borders, that activates the site as well as the programme.