

# Giacomo

## INTRODUCTION

# Pala

**Y**ou think. You write a theory. You think about what to write. You write about writings. You produce and reproduce ideas. Then, you find ways and arguments useful for the legitimization of your ideas. Finally, you have something original in your hands. Yet, where is your theory situated? Isn't it – maybe – the simple reiteration of an existing argument? Maybe it is nothing more than a patchwork of rhetorical tricks (like addressing directly the reader: you). Maybe your theory is the pure figment of your own imagination: *Eureka!* Still, what is your theory seeking for? Are you looking for a truth? Are you defining a system? If not... what is your goal? Has your theory the pretention to change architecture? If yes: with whom are you planning to do so? If not: do you really believe to be an intellectual in the public debate? Isn't your theory the imaginary fabrication of a truth? Isn't it an image? Maybe it is a poetic. "Well, it might be"; you *might* say.

These are the questions of theory: is a theory a repetition of old arguments? or is it the production something new? Does it have to necessarily be one or the other? Ideally, a theoretical argument conforms to precise methodological rules. It is consistent, it is based on axioms and its arguments are referenced to precedents. This condition can be called as the mechanics of theory: an assemblage of components. The components are previous theories, which are composed to produce a new whole; a new meaning. Still, the new argument is supposed to produce novelties: ideas, images and words; in one word: concepts. How is such newness produced?

To produce it, you need a *theorem*. You cannot rely on the reductionism of mechanics. You need a deductive proposition; an idea. You have to imagine how to assemble the parts (or rather the body) constituting a new theory. In other words, you have to start with a deduction: "my theory will be about

this, because there is *such* particular problem”; a theory needs a starting hypothesis; it needs a theorem.

The objective of this critical anthology is to state that, today, theory should be addressed as a form of enquiry and invention. The word “theorem”, then, is proposed as a concept useful to imagine such a dimension of theory. What we propose is the examination of “theorems”. In order to do so, authors have been asked to couple a theory (or a drawing), with a theoretical (or poetic) comment: theory over theory. Authors, referring to texts, images, and poetics from the recent past, have analyzed the theorem beyond the theory, its strengths and its fallacies and, in so doing, they have developed concepts over concepts. Thus, theory is presented to the reader as an ensemble of productive concepts. Finally, the aim of this anthology is double faced. On the one hand, it aims at providing an anthological collections or recent classics (published after 1989); on the other, it aims at asking questions: how does our culture’s complexity change architectural knowledge?, how to use the constantly growing set of precedents? Is it possible to elaborate forms of theory over theory?

These questions are yet to be answered but, after all, *Theorem*’s aim is not to theorize a definitive answer. It wants to question. Is it possible to get along with the fall in disgrace of the discourses without falling into positivism? Is it possible to produce theory without falling into the techno-scientific pragmatics (green and smart), which hide systems that are no less hegemonic than the ones of the discourses, though masked with a liberal appearance?



**This side out (Semper' version)  
2018  
malapartecafé**