GOVERNANCE OF BUILT ENVIRONMENT THROUGH
DESTRUCTION
Question: What are the genotypes of destruction?

ABSTRACT

Design, renewal and transformation of urban space along with the administrative tools in the late twentieth century in relation to evolving modes of production have been subjected to several studies in which subtraction from built environment commensurates with the accumulative facets of construction. In fact, critical studies on neoliberal ideology depict an epidemic of subtraction and destruction of the urban space within changed, altered and transformed social, political and economic contexts. This study aims at surveying the study of destruction of the built environment. It is intended to provide a framework through which the genotypes of destruction can be articulated. In other words, the role of destruction will be scrutinized considering that there are various methods, cases and consequences for the built environment to be altered that result with a subtraction, removal, dismissal, levelling of this built environment. This investigation is suggested to be initiated through a discussion of the domain on which such procedures can be made possible. While providing two consecutive discussions on governance and destruction, with the help of three conceptual elaboration on oikos, polis and the camp, a variety of physical or theoretical interventions into the built environment will be put forward. Works of Giovanni Battista Piranesi, Jalal Toufic, Keller Easterling, Eyal Wiezman and Gordon Matta-Clark are to name a few. This endevaour is aimed at the link between governance and demolition to be established and be subjected to a deeper inquiry.

GOVERNANCE OF BUILT ENVIRONMENT THROUGH
DESTRUCTION
Question: What are the genotypes of destruction?

This work is articulated as a field survey aimed at initiating the study of destruction, rather than a concise literature review. During investigations, this research field is found to be inhabited by memory and language for one to interpret, explain and approach destruction of the built environment. Destruction appears as an irreversible process. However as destructive processes can be studied in relation to memory and language, various applications of destruction, whether through actual disasters, wars, physical or imaginative interventions to the prior, present or future built environment, and even theoretical or creative engagement with the post-destruction processes, there exists a repertoire of tools to experiment. In the following two consecutive discussions on governance and destruction, three spatial or geographical domains are identified as *polis*, *oikos*, and the *camp*, each with specific inhabitants allowing different ways to affect and intervene into the built environment. They occupy the fields of politics, economy or propaganda. In these fields, 'to destroy' implies different procedures and outcomes, without necessarily entailing any ideological discussion of "intentions", "agenda" or "advancement". Through whether recording, archiving, mapping or art, destruction can be confronted with, approached, destruction in the built environment can be subjected to various studies.

1.0 Governance

Confronted with the notion of destruction, a first question that one may ask is whether destruction points to a spatial category, that no longer constitutes a *topos*? The discussion of governance throughout this investigation will refer to the tool set provided by Giorgio Agamben.[1] Elaborated in Agamben's *The Kingdom and the glory* (2011), this tool set provides for a rather theological but political take on the notion of

topos place, subject, topic, topography.

---

[1] Agamben, G., *Homo sacer: Sovereign power and bare life*, trans. D. Heller-Roazen (Stanford, USA: Stanford University Press, 1998); *State of exception*, trans. K. Attell (Chicago, USA: The University of Chicago Press, 2003); *Profanations*, trans. J. Fort (New York, USA: Zone Books, 2007); *The Kingdom and the glory: For a Theological Genealogy of Economy and Government,* trans. L. Chiesa and M. Mandarini (Stanford University Press, 2011); "On the Limits of Violence" in B. Moran ve C. Salzani (eds.) *Towards the Critique of Violence*, (Bloomsbury Academic: London, 2015).

governance. This elaboration exceeds the common assumption regarding governance as indicating a participatory mode of public administration advanced by neoliberal policies. While also present in Hannah Arendt's *Human Condition* (1998) [2] where a distinction is made between the political sphere and the private domain, Agamben's theological genealogy for the notion of governance refers to a distinct moment.

Arendt's inquiry underlines the "rise of housekeeping…-from the shadowy interior of the household into the light of public sphere" at a moment when the social realm emerges as it finds its "political form in the nation-state."[3] While this formulation still begs for further inquiry, Arendt makes it clear that the emergence of modern age and the rise of the society she identified required a certain mode of public administration that was restricted to Adam Smith's understanding of economy where "public admiration and monetary reward" could start to substitute for each other as "public admiration is consumed by individual vanity as food is consumed by hunger."[4] Agamben's take on the distinction between *polis* and *oikos* in order to explain post-Arrendt society is useful to be able to understand a less traditional notion of restrictive economy, and to introduce Bataille's elaboration of a "general economy" to speak of various approaches to destruction.[5] This perspective allows the identification of three topological instances on which any procedure regarding the built environment to can be discussed: *polis*, *oikos* and the *camp*.

The juridical system of the West, Agamben suggests, appears as a double structure. One that is normative and juridical in the strict sense, and one that is anomic and metajuridical:

> The state of exception is the device that must ultimately articulate and hold together the two aspects of the juridico-political machine by instituting a threshold of undecidability between *anomie* and *nomos*, between life and law, between *auctoritas* and *potestas* [6]

In Xenophon's work, *oikos* is put forward as a domain that falls outside of agora that is the public or the city, which needs other regulations, laws and rules in order to administer. Hence the name *Oeconomicus*, which derives from *oikos,* the basic residential unit with which the city-state is built (Antonaccio, 2000, 519) and *nomos,* the law that regulates this basic unit, or the Greek family.

[2] Arendt, H. *The Human Condition* (Chicago: The Chicago University Press, 1958); S. Benhabib, "Models of Public Space: Hannah Arendt, the Liberal Tradition, and Jürgen Habermas" in J.B. Landes (eds.) *Feminism the Public & the Private* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998): 65-99.
[3] Arendt*,* 1958, 28.
[4] Ibid., 56.
[5] Bataille, G., *The Accursed Share*, trans. R. Hurley (Zone Books, 1993); Hollier, D., *Against Architecture* (Cambridge: MIT Press, 1989); Plotnitsky, A., *Complementarity* (Duke Press, 1994).
[6] Agamben, 2005, 86.

Agamben reminds of Aristotle's criticism of the Platonic notion of the city, where the distinction between the *polis* and the *oikos* is not clearly presented: "It is not obvious that a city may at length attain such a degree of unity as to be no longer a city? -since the nature of a city is to be a plurality, and in tending to greater unity from being a city, it becomes a household."[7] For Agamben, *technē oikonomikē* "differs from politics just as the house (*oikia*) differs from the city, *polis*"[8] The *polis* is where the plurality is found, the king and the politician are found in the sphere of the *polis*. In contrast, in the sphere of the house and the family, *oikonomos* and the *despotēs* are found. Those who are to occupy the *polis* and the *oikos* have been subjected to inquiries not only by Arrendt and Agamben, but as mentioned above, along with Aristotle, Plato, early writers on architecture, including Xenophon, Vitruvius, Alberti, as well as Foucault.[9]

Agamben adds yet another domain to the discussion by borrowing from Carl Schmitt, Walter Benjamin as well as Georges Bataille: the camp. In terms of its juridical status and in terms of its spatial configuration, the camp can be understood only in "relation or perhaps rather in 'non-relation', to what is historically termed a 'city'": the space that falls geographically outside the camp.[10] Hence it is the separation from the normal order, demarcation, or differentiation between "inside and outside" that is the primary condition for the camp to exist. The law, that is, the rule, which produces the separation, simultaneously refers to the application of the rule of separation: With the "absolute impossibility of deciding between fact and law, rule and application, exception and rule,"[11] the sovereign power's fundamental activity with the camp becomes the production of bare life that pertains to the simple fact of being alive.[12]

---

[7] Aristotle, *Politics*, 1261a quoted in Agamben, 2011, Loc 457.
[8] Ibid.
[9] Xenophon, *Oeconomicus: A Treatise on the Science of the Household in the form of a Dialogue*, trans. H. G. Dakyns [https://ebooks.adelaide.edu.au/x/xenophon/x5oe/] Access Date 18.06.2017 (1897); Alberti, L.B. *The Family in Renaissance Florence: Book Three*, trans. R. N. Watkins (Waveland Press, Long Grove, 1994); Foucault, M. *The Use of Pleasure: Volume 2 of The History of Sexuality*, trans. R. Hurley, (Vintage Books, New York, 1990).
[10] Diken, B. and Laustsen, C.B., "The camp" in *Geografiska Annaler* 88B, no. 4 (2006): 443-452, 443.
[11] Ibid.
[12] Massumi, B., "National enterprise emergency: steps toward an ecology of Powers" in *Theory, Culture & Society* 26 no. 6 (2009): 153-185, 170-71.

The camp, falling beyond both *polis* and *oikos*, allows for an expansion on economy, for two reasons. First of all, it starts to define a spatial configuration that no longer sustains the dichotomy of oikos and polis, but transcends the two: hence Agamben elaborates on *technē oikonomikē* in his attempts to expose the network of relations present in the existing society. Bataille's elaboration on 'general economy' may indicate the second reason why the term economy needs a deeper theoretical engagement.[13] In general economy, unavoidable loss of meaning due to expansion, contradiction, transformation of the relationships between objects of the system expose the problems lying in the traditional sense of epistemology, what Bataille identifies as restrictive economies of "classical theories across a broad spectrum of Western intellectual history" such as "Hegel's philosophy or Marx's political economy".[14] Bataille's general economy "cannot be confined to the analysis of the structural matter of loss of representation in a formal system" which can allow destruction, removal, levelling in the built environment from multiple perspectives, hence allowing various genotypes of destruction to be discussed.[15] Identification of Bataille's elaboration on general economy in volumes of *The Accursed Share* (1993) introduces the economy of words, theories and ideas in understanding the relations, logical consequences and outcomes of procedures, that are not only theoretical but also physical, as Bataille's introduction of general economy borrows the implications of the quantum theory in his quest to introduce destruction, sacrifice, loss as a non-subtractive procedure. [16]

In this light, *Aneu Logou* becomes another concept to look into. Agamben describes the term as "a phrase that did not refer to actual

---

[13] For detailed accounts on Bataille's thought and find its threads in relation to an epistemological take on the notion of economy where writing and theory are perceived to become components of an economy of sacrifice, death, destrcution: Ffrench, P., *After Bataiile: Sacrifice, Exposure, Community* (New York: Legenda, 2007); Derrida, J., "From Restricted to General Economy, A Hegelianism without Reserve" in *Writing and Difference*, trans. A. Bass (Chicago: Chicago University Press).
[14] Plotnitsky 1994, 2.
[15] Ibid., 20.
[16] This is what Plotnitsky attempts to do in *Complementarity*: establishing a link between the anti-epistemological strand that is drawn from Niel's Bohr's "interpretation of quantum physics" and his confrontaiton with Einstein which lead to "a powerful critique or deconstruction of both classical physics and classical metaphysics." (Ibid.)

physical deprivation of the word, but exclusion from the only way of life in which language alone had meaning."[17] Outside where the plurality of speech is to be found,: i.e., the *polis*, *aneu logou* refers to a condition, state, where it is unspeakable of, or "without word."[18] In his book *On Collective Memory*, Maurice Halbwachs refers to *aphasia* as one of the instances when psychologists use the method of introspection with the individual.[19] Aphasia, the inability (or impaired ability) to understand or produce speech, as a result of brain damage, is derived from the greek word *aphatos,* which means speechless: without speech. Halbwachs makes use of the use of introspection to inquire into the extent of the objectiveness of a person's observation who is engaged in the act.[20] The limits of introspection corresponds to the possibility of recollection of individual images. Those individual images, according to Halbwachs, are in fact intelligible constructs that depend on thethe language, which "we speak of … before calling them to mind."[21] What is more, the collective thought depends on those individual images, which reconstruct our past as "the language and the whole system of social conventions" are attached to them. This allows for an approach to the notion of memory as a collective construct, that requires both the individual images as well as a reservoir in which these very images can be used for forming a framework, "combination of schemes" or, speech.[22] That reservoir can be thought to be as the very spatial configuration in which the images are acquired from, but also the spatial configuration can as well be thought of as a way to structure those images, as Cicero, or Quintilianus suggest with reference to the story of Simonides of Ceos, the poet.

The loss of space, apart from its economic consequences for those who survive the process as well as for the spectators of the violence, means more than a physical loss. What the space entailed once, that could be disclosed via the speech, is assumed to be affected in the aftermath of destruction. The complete erasure of the built

As told by Cicero, the story is told as follows:

"There is a story that Simonides was dining at the house of a wealthy nobleman named Scopas at Crannon in Thessaly, and chanted a lyric poem which he had composed in honor of his host, in which he followed the

[17] Agamben, 2011, 231.
[18] Simmons, W.P., *Human Rights Law and the Marginalized Other* (Cambridge University Press, 2011), 36.
[19] Halbwacs, M., *On Collective Memory* (University of Chicago Press, 1992), 173.
[20] Ibid.
[21] Ibid.
[22] Ibid.

environment, prohibiting the land from access, and developing it in a living which survives the process, can have traumatic implications due to the disruption in the physical built environment as well as in the reservoir in which gathering the recollected images of the past and present, as in the case of looking at the bulldozed city which once was once your home.

Halbwachs' approach to memory as a collective construct that can instrumentalize space to both recollect and configure a framework, the plurality of speech that is possible to be attached to that framework is relevant to confront the attempt of demolishing the topos. Mark Cousins suggests in his lectures on *To Destructure* (2008), in the example of grief, memory starts overlapping with identity, once the narrations start having geographical attachments, as they start having the possibility of being a topic by literally becoming *topos*. In this sense, grief might be rooted in the loss of something, your home, for example, and it is actually something that can not be transferred. Memory, on the other hand, according to Cousins, is not to do with grief, but it is what happens when you can liquidate the personal: when you can transfer to the others through language, story, topos or memory.[23] However, if destruction is assumed of depriving one off from the memory of a place, hence leaving speechless about the past, the party who is capable of total destruction is equipped with an unparalleled power, whether statecraft or extrastatecraft.[24]

Controlling the speech rather than paralyzing one's speech to leave one in a state of aphasia, can be considered as the substitution of the camp in the form of a city, rather than referring to the state of *aneu logou*. With this, I am referring to Agamben's identification of the divide between our experience of politics and that of the Greeks: the

custom of the poets by including for decorative purposes a long passage referring to Castor and Pollux; whereupon Scopas with excessive meanness told him he would pay him half the fee agreed on for the poem, and if he liked he might apply for the balance to his sons of Tyndaraus, as they had gone halves in the panegyric.

The story runs that a little later a message was brought to Simonides to go outside, as two young men were standing at the door who earnestly requested him to come out; so he rose from his seat and went out, and could not see anybody; but in the interval of his absence the roof of the hall where Scopas was giving the banquet fell in, crushing Scopas himself and his relations underneath the ruins and killing them; and when their friends wanted to bury them but were altogether unable to know them apart as they had been completely crushed, the story goes that Simonides was enabled by his recollection of the place in which each of them

---

[23] Cousins, M. *Distructure*, Seminer series (AA, London, 2008) http://www.aaschool.ac.uk//VIDEO/lecture.php?ID=3133.

[24] Easterling, K., *Subtraction* (Berlin: Sternberg Press, 2014); Easterling, K., *Extrastatecraft: The Power of Infrastructure Space* (London: Verso, 2014). Easterling introduces infrastructure as the crux of the space, while assigning extrastatecraft as the 'zone', similar to Agamben's 'camp' where the state, laws, regulations are no longer operative but instead postulate procedures that require infrastructure's control, expansion or subtraction to be affecting the design and governing of the built environment. Falling beyond the regulations statecraft imposes on, extrastatecraft is a domain on which control of the infrastructure defines the limit sor enhances one's agency in the built environment.

persuasion itself becoming "violence in certain forms and circumstances, specifically when persuasion goes beyond the free linguistic relation of two human beings, and is taken up by modern techniques of reproducing spoken and written language." [25]

2.0 Destruction

Destruction can be understood as disasters, which leave behind ruins. Those ruins have not become ruins and lost what they "used to mean through excessive use," but were subjected to intentional destruction because they have been targets whether for economic, political, military, or social reasons. Given I have been trying to suggest that the loss of built environment does not necessarily entail the loss or disruption of collective memory, but a moment of introspection, Gumpert's emphasis on the Greek term *catachresis*: "a metaphor whose metaphoricity has been forgotten, or for which there is no "literal" or "correct" term,"[26] and Virilio's notion of catastrophe[27] can impart a new knowledge: "that of objects themselves; objects built by us. It is the articulation of infrastructure itself, as it is in the process of coming apart." [28]

Jalal Touffic refers to Maurice Blanchot's *The Writing of the Disaster* when he talks about the Lebanese War and the destruction of his home in Beirut through his articulation of the surpassing disaster.[29] For Touffic, "the surpassing disaster leads to the withdrawal not of everything, but of tradition, and touches not everyone, but a community, with the caveat that this community is reciprocally defined by it as the community of those affected by it, and this tradition is defined by it as that which withdraws as a result of the surpassing disaster."[30] In contrast to what Blanchot writes about on disasters, which puts a stop "to every avery arrival,"[31] Touffic mentions the surpassing disaster as a

had been reclining at table to identify them for separate interment; and that this circumstance suggested to him the discovery of the truth that the best aid to clearness of memory consists in orderly arrangement.

He inferred that persons desiring to train this faculty must select localities and form mental images of the facts they wish to remember and store those images in the localities, with the result that the arrangement of the localities will preserve the order of the facts, and the images of the facts will designate the facts themselves, and we shall employ the localities and images respectively as a wax writing tablet and the letters written on it." (Cicero *de Oratore* 2.74.299-300 English translations by Sutton (Loeb, 1967))

---

[25] Agamben, 2005, 233.
[26] Gumpbert, M., "Catachresis; or, The Ruin" in M. Gumpert and J. Toufic (eds.) *Thinking: The Ruin* (İstanbul Studies Center, 2010), 7.
[27] P. Virilio, The Accident of Art, trans. A. Mandelbaum (New York: Bantam, 1992) 106 quoten in Gumpbert, M., "All That is Solid Melts into Air: The Collapse of the Tacoma Narrows Bridge" in *Thinking*, 23.
[28] Ibid., 24.
[29] J. Toufic, The Withdrawal of Tradition Past a Surpassing Disaster (Forthcoming Books, 2009) 81.
[30] Ibid.
[31] Ibid.

rare and not an "always already past event" but one which "continues to be ruined and left intact by the disaster Blanchot writes about."[32]

Touffic's conceptualization of a surpassing disaster, when read in light of the framework Gumpert draws, seems to echo with the kind of destruction of the built space that does not entail the loss of memory. Touffic's inquiry into a similar case of destroyed built space as a consequence of intentional destruction and violence in Beirut suggests an alternative approach to archive, while documenting the surpassing disaster:

> The exhibition Wonder Beirut by Joana Hadjithomas and Khalil Joreige (Janine Rubeiz Gallery, Beirut, July 1998) revolves around a photographer who, along with his father, was commissioned by the Lebanese State in 1969 to do postcards, and who four years into the civil war and while shutting himself off in his studio takes down all these postcards, "which no longer referred to anything" since what they showed—Martyrs' Square, the souks, policemen on camels, etc.—either was destroyed or no longer existed, and "burns them patiently, aiming at them his proper bombs and his own shells … thus making them conform better to his reality. When all was burned, it was peace." Thus the following model sequence: photographs of burned buildings and scorched walls taken by him from the window of his studio a couple of years into the conflict; then, four years into the war, burned photographs that are later exhibited (this indicating that the war was then not yet a surpassing disaster, but just a localizable catastrophe); then in 1999, undeveloped photographs, a symptom of the withdrawal past the surpassing disaster that Beirut must have become: "Today, this photographer no longer develops his photographs. It is enough for him to take them. At the end of the exhibition [Wonder Beirut], 6452 rolls of film were laid on the floor: rolls containing photos taken by the photographer but left undeveloped"[33]

For Touffic, the erasure of buildings during the civil war did refer to a withdrawal of what is ruined from the domain of recollection.[34] Whether there is archival material or not, the loss of memory is about the event, rather than what is withdrawn. The intense experience of

---

[32] Ibid., 82.
[33] Ibid., 73-74.
[34] Ibid.

destruction, for Touffic, does lead to a form of *aphasia*, at least for the artist, who

> ...did not take any photographs nor shoot any videos, waiting until he learned to look again at a leisurely pace. This period of adjustment lasted a full two years. Yet even after he became used to looking at buildings and experiencing events at the rhythm of peace, the photographs of the ruins in Lebanon taken by this Lebanese photographer, who classically composed those of his photographs shot in other countries, still looked like they were taken by a photographer lacking time to aim since in imminent danger, the compositions haphazard and the focus almost always off. [35]

The emphasis on what is destroyed, withdrawn or erased,, forming "an urgent task for the present," is made in order to become a referent for the future. The erasure needs to be stopped, if one can, or given the admitted defeat of speaking of the place of war, the erasure needs to be documented before it is too late.

In the case of an artist, or an academic to intervene and speak of what is withdrawn, the archive itself can become the inquiry itself, and the way the archive can be interpreted, manipulated, formed, burned down, lost or constructed may form a basis for the speech to find its formulation. In between the destruction and the moment of utterance, the loss of speech can be thought of the process of re-configuring the structure in which the recollection of what can had been "archived," "stored" individually or collectively becomes the artistic or intellectual endevavour as a consequence of the surprassing disaster. However, using Agamben's tool set, to approach the erasure, destruction, disaster, propaganda,: reproducing the reproduction of spoken and written language in the hands of certain gatekeeper figures can be one way of constituting the disaster of destroying the city, the *polis*, and replacing it with the museum, if not zones.[36]

Therefore, unless the introspection facilitates a collective engagement, rather than personal attempts to be able to overcome the

---

[35] Ibid., 70.
[36] See Agamben, *Profanations*, 2007 .

trauma, through recollecting what is accessible, the countering of the destruction can not really confront with the reality of the existing spatial configuration through the economic and political tools of the sovereign. Easterling refers to "active form" which indulges with contemporary modes of production via protocols, algorithms and codes in order to cope with the destructiveness of the existing state of things.[37] She assigns this active-form finding process to built environment professionals and can hardly point to any significant attempt, other than the emphasis she puts on the need to rehearse. When this is not limited to the built environment professionals, but those who are primary subjects of imposed destruction become active players in the formulation of grand narratives, agents can overcome what restricted economies' impose: being subjects of inquiry for the sociologist or the historian to gather oral history and depiction of events, narrations for formulating the "words" to speak of the disaster about. Instead, collective memory can be physically built in the form of an archive, rather than an archive constituting part of the collective memory. This, as in the case of autonomous archiving, could have belonged to the field of the *polis*, where the multitude of the speech was not confronted with utmost suppression. In such fields, one can still gather, collect, accumulate images for the expansion of the *oikouménē*. In fact, this is what we are currently doing with our facebook profiles: collecting memories, instances, documents, almost everyday archival material for the sake of positioning ourselves within the realm of "what is out there already, before they become over used."[38]

Lastly, the need of physical intervention to the built environment can also be suspended when speaking of destruction. How the notion of "destruction" can be studied through architectural theory and history can make use of the way what is destroyed, decayed, removed, levelled, subtracted, and even "altered" can be questioned in light of a survey on theories of restoration and conservation. When speaking of ruins, dichotomies between schools of thought on restoration and conservation portrayed through the works of Eugène Viollet-le-Duc and John Ruskin in the 19th century, or Goethe on ruins can be useful in

---

[37] Easterling, 2014.
[38] Agamben, 2005, 233.

order to apprehend how to approach destruction.[39] In fact John Ruskin's social theory in the victorian age in terms of the reformation he promotes along his architectural inquiries and precise attention paid to for the "ruins" is significant.[40] However, this survey needs to take into account Giovanni Battista Piranesi's take on Campo Marzio, the Ancient Rome quarters of the city in his 18th century etchings.[41] Piranesi's Campo Marzio treated as a palimpsest within the literature of architectural theory and design, has got various interpretations in terms of memory, urban design, conservation and architectural history. If treated along with his other works, such as his prisons, the author and the architects, somehow vulgar take on the ruins and imagination of the Campo Marzio as presented in his Campo Mania plan, gives a seminal case study for understanding how procedures which can be related to "destruction" such as removal, subtraction, overriding, copying, cutting, subtracting are treated and appropriated at a moment that signifies an epistemological threshold: one that is similar to what Tafuri depicts as the "tragic Albertian division:" when he speaks of the disturbance Alberti is found in the fifteenth centruy:

> …a world devoid of certainties; reason and folly, masks and true faces, light and darkness interchange so that reality becomes ambiguous, evanescent, slippery, a tragic play of appearances and illusions from which any god is banned.[42]

Whether studied within the limits of Mannerism or not, this threshold is echoed in the work of Gordon Matta-Clark who appropriated similar procedures in a different epistemological threshold that can be positioned within the George Bataille's conceptual framework on general

---

[39] Ruskin, J., The Seven Lamps of Architecture (The Electric Book Company, 2001); Viollet-le-Duc, E., Discourses on Architecture, trans. B. Bucknall (New York: Grove Press, 1959); D. Gafijczuk and D. Sayer (eds.), *The Inhabited Ruins of Central Europe: Re-Imagining Space, History, and Memory* (Palgrave Macmillan, 2013).

[40] G.G. Cockram, *Ruskin and Social Reform: Ethics and Economics in the Victorian Age* (London: Tauris Academic Studies, 2007).

[41] G.V. Piranesi, *Ioannis Baptistae Piranesii Antiquariorum Regiae Societatis Londinensis socii Campus Martius antiquae vrbis* (Romae: 1762); G.V. Piranesi, Opere varie (Paris: 1804-1807); Huyssen, A. "Nostalgia for Ruins" in Grey Room 23 (Spring 2006): 6-21; Wendort, R., "Piranesi's Double Ruin" in Eighteenth-Century Studies 34 no. 2 (Winter 2001): 161-80; Dixon, S.M., "Piranesi and Francesco Bianchini: Capricci in the service of pre-scientific archaeology" in Art History 22 no. 2 (June 1999): 184-213; Allen, S. and G. B. Piranesi, "Piranesi's 'Campo Marzio': An Experimental Design" ,n Assemblage no.10 (1989): 70-109.

[42] Tafuri, M. "Discordant Harmony From Alberti to Zuccari" in *Architectural Design* 5-6: 36-44, 36; Tafuri, M. *The Sphere and The Labyrinth: Avant-gardes and Architecture form Piranesi to the 1970s*, trans. P. d'Acierno and R. Conolly (MIT Press, 1987)

economy.[43] Violence, sacrifice, and entropy into the field of architectural criticism and theory, the existing applications of destruction and inquiries on such cases found in the work of Eyal Weizman, Stephen Graham[44] or Keller Easterling allows such works and analysis to be approached not as seminal works, but as a certain theoretical engagement with the components the made use of in the destructive procedure make use of.

This survey, therefore, is not necessarily a literature review on which a study of destruction as a tool for governance and/or sovereignty, but a field survey initiating the study of destruction. This field is inhabited by memory and language for one to interpret or explain the way built environment's destruction can be approached. Rather than understanding destruction as an irreversible process, given the destructive process can be studied in relation to memory and language, various applications of destruction, whether through actual disasters, wars, physical or imaginative interventions to the prior, present or future built environment, and even theoretical or creative engagement with the post-destruction process, a repertoire of tools are present to engage with the research question at hand. In the picture I depict, three spatial or geographical domains identified as *polis*, *oikos*, and the camp, along with specific inhabitants, allow for different ways to affect and intervene into the built environment, through either politics, economy or propaganda. In these fields, 'to destroy' implies different procedures and outcomes, without necessarily entailing any ideological discussion of "intentions", "agenda" or "advancement". Through whether recording, archiving, mapping or art, destruction can be confronted with, approached, be subjected to various studies. However, the procedure itself, given the multiplicity of the inherent sub-procedures, is not necessarily a subject of study, but a set of logic that can be dissected and exposed in order to comprehend an important mode of intervention into the built environment in the twenty-first century.

---

[43] Lee, P.M. *Object to be Destroyed: The Work of Gordon Matta-Clark* (MIT Press, 2001).
[44] Graham, S. (2004) *Cities, War and Terrorism:Towards and Urban Geopolitics*. Oxford; Blackwell; Weizman, E., Hollow Land: Israel's Architecture of Occupation (London: Verso, 2007).