

Paulo Reyes

a

MINOR INHABITING

pós- | 1

ABSTRACT

This paper problematizes living the city from the design dimension, using as theoretical approach the notion of 'minor' as in Gilles Deleuze and Félix Guattari. For the authors, 'minor' is related to minority notions as a form of resistance to larger logics – macropolicy and metanarratives that constitute disciplinary fields – functioning as a micropolitical power to produce some sort of disruption to the Major Logic. In this paper, this conceptual notion is shifted to the field of Architecture to think the design in its dimension of know-how to produce the city. The text is built in between a know-how from the disciplinary field of Architecture that produces a Major Inhabiting fully coordinated with the socioeconomic and legal systems of land rights, and, other non-institutional, informal, often irregular, know-how that creates outside the precepts of the academy, a minor living. The intention here is to produce a critical look at the design processes of living. That is, by focusing on the design act as efficiency of solving space problems, we propose to introduce some noise in this know-how.

KEYWORDS

Urban design. Minor. Living.



[HTTP://DX.DOI.ORG/10.11606/ISSN.2317-2762.POSFAU.2019.159015](http://dx.doi.org/10.11606/ISSN.2317-2762.POSFAU.2019.159015)

Pós, Rev. Programa Pós-Grad. Arquit. Urban. FAUUSP. São Paulo, v. 26, n. 49, e159015, 2019.

UM HABITAR MENOR

RESUMO

Este artigo problematiza o habitar a cidade a partir de sua dimensão projetual, utilizando como abordagem teórica a noção de “menor” proposta por Gilles Deleuze e Félix Guattari. Para eles, “menor” se relaciona a noções minoritárias como resistência a lógicas maiores – macropolíticas e metanarrativas que constituem os campos disciplinares – e funcionam como uma potência no âmbito do micropolítico ao produzir uma espécie de ruído em uma lógica maior. Neste artigo, essa noção conceitual é deslocada para o campo da arquitetura para pensar o projeto na sua dimensão do saber-fazer a cidade. O texto é construído entre um saber-fazer oriundo do campo disciplinar da Arquitetura que produz um Habitar Maior totalmente concatenado com um sistema socioeconômico e jurídico de direito à terra, e um outro saber-fazer não institucional, informal, muitas vezes irregular, que cria um habitar menor fora dos preceitos da academia. O que se pretende, aqui, é produzir um olhar crítico aos processos de projeto do habitar, ou seja, ao colocar em foco o ato de projeto como eficiência de resolução de problemas espaciais, propomos introduzir um ruído nesse saber-fazer.

PALAVRAS-CHAVE

Projeto urbano. Menor. Habitar.

A PLACE OF SPEAK

This text emerges as a slip into the field of architecture and urbanism from a text by Gilles Deleuze and Félix Guattari (2015) – *Kafka: for a minor literature*. For them, the notion of minor literature is related to minority notions, such as resistance to larger logics – macropolitics and metanarratives that constitute the disciplinary fields –, and function as a power within the micropolitics by producing a kind of noise in a major literature. The intention here is to produce a conceptual shift to think about what would be “a minor literature” in the field of architecture and urbanism.

It is assumed that if good *writing* builds a major literature in the language, it is also possible to think that the *project* as good writing produces a major inhabiting in the sphere of architecture and urbanism. It is within this field that this text comes in. Therefore, it is from this that one thinks what, in architecture and urbanism, can be considered as a “minor literature”. To this end, it focuses on the *project* of inhabiting as a possibility to produce a closer look with the meaning given to *writing* in relation to a minor literature. Housing has always been a costly issue in the field of architecture and urbanism – and in this particular case, we opted to think of *inhabiting the city*. What in the city can be thought of as a *minor inhabiting*?

The challenge is to think to what extent a minor inhabiting is announced within a disciplinary field that produces a major inhabiting with excellence. For architecture, inhabiting is the necessary action so that, from it, everything else is organized in the city. The protection of an individual is spatially organized to then establish of this protected being with others a body that requires protection and which, when protected, is able to remain there as a sedentary being. Living is directly linked to this need for protected rest. Several images have already been constructed in this sense, but perhaps Bachelard (2000) has immortalized, in *The Poetics of Space*, the different forms of protection – from the drawers, which shelter things, through the nests, the shells, and our homes, as essential protection of a fixed being, of a being in the world.

We will leave an image of dwelling as a protective object to think critically about the *action of elaboration of this inhabiting*, that is, the dimension of *know-how*. Therefore, the inhabiting here is placed less as a desired and acquired object and more in what immediately turns it into writing, the *project*. The project is the process by which inhabiting is part of a territorial agenda. It is through the *know-how* of the disciplinary field of architecture that the project gains prominence and resolving power towards socio-spatial problems.

Provided by this demand and by placing the lens on the project, this paper seeks to build a critical reflection on the power of the project as a solution to social problems that are directly connected to spatial issues, which, in this specific case, look at the scale of the city's territory in its urban sphere - and, more specifically, about inhabiting the city.

The text is built in between a know-how from the disciplinary field of Architecture that produces a Major Inhabiting fully linked with a socioeconomic and legal systems of land rights, and, another non-institutional and informal know-how, often irregular, which creates a minor inhabiting outside the precepts of the academy. The intention here is to produce a critical look at the design processes of living. That is, by focusing on the *design act* as efficiency of solving space problems, we propose to introduce some noise in this know-how.

A MAJOR INHABITING

We inhabit our cities through a process of law and economic permission in relation to what will be our cocoon object, the house. We bought this right. We bought a right to inhabit the city. With this right bought, we become legal citizens.

The city is made up of these arrangements and accommodations expressed as rights to inhabit by economic power. It is through this agreement that we transform the city into a collective arrangement of coexistence with the other as "equal", formally and officially establishing a kind of legal writing that is shared collectively. The "equality" of this process only manifests itself as a premise, because if equality is linked to a kind of right that is bought, we are always in an absurdly unequal process. We start from a debt that is social.

This process of structuring the city as acquired parcels is being built according to the social demand and the availability of lands to be distributed. The land is shapeless and so is its occupation. Portions of the city are occupied by homogeneous social groups on a small scale and differentiated among themselves on a large scale. In a deformed and unequal way, in the social and economic sphere and, above all, in the space sphere, the city defines itself. Anyway, we inhabit the city.

In inhabiting the city, we construct it as a collective writing - a great narrative that is constituted with its differences, but which, above all, asserts itself as an acquired and formalized right. We buy lands according to our purchasing power. The distribution of social differences throughout the city marks these also different territories that are arranged within this formal logic of access to land as an acquired right.

To this formal and official writing, we will name *major inhabiting*, inspired by Deleuze and Guattari (2015) in their book *Kafka: Toward a Minor Literature*. For them, the major literature is that established by grammatical norms and passed on by formal and official processes. By analogy, a major inhabiting is that

acquired by formal and legitimate processes that occur legally and officially in the sphere of law in the composition of cities.

Architecture, as a disciplinary field, produces this major inhabiting through a know-how that is represented by the project. The project produces city. It appears as a way of writing that organizes and adapts each individual part in relation to the collective, in its processes of “drawing” the city. The legal citizen not only buys the right to live in the city but also buys the project of his new inhabiting.

The project comes as the bet of a better living and presents itself as one of the legal instruments that produce the ideal conditions of this new inhabiting. It is the project that opens up urban plots, which produces livable lands, that creates conditions for infrastructure implementation – all prepared waiting for the resident. *Everything is designed* as long as permitted by law, and possession of the deed is the authorization of access to inhabit.

“A major or established literature follows a vector that goes from content to expression: given a content, in a given form, finding, discovering, or seeing the form of expression that suits it. What is conceived well, is stated”, affirm Deleuze and Guattari (2015, p. 58). This seems to be the logic of architecture as a disciplinary field that organizes form through projective processes so that something can be expressed as expression. The project legitimately organizes the space to then receive the subjects who will transform these spaces into a new inhabiting.

The project as the major writing in the city produces a formal logic that allows us to position the major inhabiting as the one that emerges from legal bases, being recognized by the system. The project itself is not a sufficient instrument to be designated as the major inhabiting producer, but it is necessary for the legitimacy of ownership to occur. Here we are talking about different scales of inhabiting, from the transformation of the plot into lots or condominiums to the occupation of these lots by the building.

It is in the sphere of *solving* or *resolution* problems that the project is installed. It is in the sphere of solving or solving problems that the project is installed. The project always comes into play with the prospect of finding a solution to a problem posed. Not only as a reality intervention technique, but the project also presents itself as a way of thinking. Project scholars, such as Lawson and Dorst (2009), and Cross (2010), consider that there is a specific way of looking at the reality given by project *expertise*. This is called a *designerly way of thinking*, that is, a way of thinking about design.

Cross (2010, p. 2) believes that disciplinary areas produce very specific methods and procedures for understanding reality – for science it would be control procedures such as experiments and analyses; for the humanities would be analogies, metaphors and evaluations; and finally, for the project areas would be modeling procedures, such as pattern formation and synthesis processes.

The project moves in this binomial “problem-solution”, with special attention to the solution. It always seems to be captured by a “solution image”. From this perspective, the problem is merely a process trigger that will result in an efficient solution. The problem is a flexible stage that is being built along the

resolution process. Starting from a misplaced problem and moving toward an ideal solution, the project will model itself on these comings and goings, assigning a function, a precise destination.

Modeling serves as procedures that allow a greater understanding of the problem, but always visualizing the solution. If this way of operating produces room for creativity, it also makes room to conform to what is already taken for established. In the search for certainty, the project relies on references that position it as installed in a pre-established and instituted order.

The idea of a perfect solution produces a kind of blindness in the designer for possible route distortions, reducing the possibility of alternative routes that, when producing variations, present a new radicality. Thus, the project is seen as an instrument that produces, with efficiency and without error margin, a major inhabiting.

However, if it is true that the city is organized by this major writing, it is also true that not everything expressed in the city is of the order of acquired formality. Something escapes the formality of the city as something escapes the formality of language. Over all formal writing there is always an erasure – what insists on presenting itself, questioning formal writing as an out of joint, as a kind of misfit. We are always aware of something that cannot be formalized and that insists on non-formalization as a point of resistance to the established order.

There is another type of spatial organization that presents itself in the city as an experience of a inhabiting that does not expect the formal and official organization of the law. Life is urgent, there is no waiting time. Life arrives before any formalization. If the major inhabiting, as explained by Deleuze and Guattari (2015), follows a vector that goes from the content to the expression, in the minor inhabiting the expression arrives before any formalization. Life comes before the law, subverts it. We went to recognize in the city this inhabiting. Let us now concern ourselves with this kind of erasure that a minor inhabiting makes about the logic of a major inhabiting.

AN ERASURE IN THE MAJOR INHABITING

Thinking about what, in the major inhabiting system, produces an erasure as something that denounces a failure of the model built by a larger logic, comes to me the questions posed by Deleuze and Guattari (2015, p. 40): *“How many people today live in a language other than their own? Or do they not even know their language anymore, or not yet, and misunderstand the major language they are forced to use? Minority problem”*.

They claim that we should pull out of our own language a minor literature. It is certainly from within a major language that a minor language announces itself. Let us not forget that a minor language is never external to an instituted process, but, above all, it presents itself in the internal tensioning of the language itself. From this perspective, there is no separation between excluded and included, like parallel spheres, but both feed back into constant tension in a single process, producing one included and one excluded-included.

Unlike major literature, which is the result of formal, official, and grammatical norms, minor literature *“is not that of a minor language, but rather that a minority does in a major language”*, Deleuze and Guattari explain to us (2015, p. 35). Therefore, by analogy, a minor inhabiting is not one that has an architecture with lower value, but, above all, it is what a minority does in a larger architecture through a minor inhabiting. We must also think of what within one’s major inhabiting establishes itself as a minor inhabiting.

Therefore, if the major inhabiting is all that is in conformity with the law and its fundamentally economic and legal assumptions, a minor inhabiting is all that leaks and escapes these processes of jurisdiction. The minor inhabiting is not outside a major inhabiting. On the contrary, it demonstrates, within a major inhabiting, when and how it is always excluded, and has always been included as the excluded. That is, it always inhabits inside in a manner included with its exclusion mark.

For this excluded-included individual, life is urgent and the need for protection does not wait for the law. The individual on the fringes of formality has no waiting time. The body requires protection. Unlike the fully included, which can wait and pay for this wait comfortably, the excluded-included has no such right to wait. He has urgency. For him, the law is not a protection.

The subject is never isolated in this situation, but a large part of the social environment lives in these conditions. There is a social demand for the production of an inhabiting that is unable to enter the formal logic of the market. The excessive value of land forces the poorest social strata to search the city for sites in alternative conditions of urbanization and which, in most cases, do not present minimum conditions for decent housing. This body that requires protection seeks in non-habitable areas (legally) a place to settle, producing new settlements.

Informal settlements are considered irregular by law because they settle in sites unfit for construction, mainly due to the geomorphological characteristics of the site and the absence of land tenure. In general, they are hillsides or streams, which can cause landslides and floods, respectively. The Major Law seems to protect them, but in fact, it has no alternative of inclusion, only excludes. Even if considered unsuitable for a housing, these settlements are structured in any way, in a hurry, outside the Major Law and try, in one way or another, to give the individual minimum conditions to participate in a dignified manner in the city.

The under-housing conditions that these areas express position this inhabiting in a smaller logic, not because of its precarious conditions, but above all, by the inability of the system to incorporate them into a larger system. The formal city project leaves cracks impossible to be resolved through the law, but available for actual occupation. It is precisely through these cracks that the Major Law allows the minor inhabiting to be established and produce an existence.

In the major inhabiting, the law comes earlier. The law is imposed as the ultimate law, by virtue of the law. Recognized by law, the grounds for choosing

a new inhabiting are completely on display. Available to the market, they appear as the only possibility. Then, the land is acquired individually through a buying process in the real estate market. The deed that gives legitimacy to this act of purchase comes as a recognition of ownership and right.

In possession of the deed, a professional is hired to design a project to inhabit the land. Legalized ownership of the land, a request is made to the government for the installation of infrastructure. Once the land has all the technical and legal conditions for housing to settle in, the housing design process begins.

The project completed and recognized by law allows the individual to start the process of building his housing. The ready housing allows the individual to realize his protected existence in this place and, from this purchased right, settles definitively as a legal citizen.

In the minor inhabiting, on the contrary, the individual arrives before the law. There is no law that receives him, only the urgency of a body that requires protection. He chooses outlaw a residual space to build his housing. Residual land, excluded by the market and the Major Law, is the only alternative to a minor inhabiting. Without any permission or project, he begins the construction of his housing. He builds his housing and inhabits it. Still without any legal recognition, he settles in his new housing. Infrastructure does not wait for him either. There is no type of infrastructure. It is necessary to adapt to the pre-existing reality and absent from any conditions worthy of a housing. However, there is no alternative, he installs himself.

After some time living under these irregular conditions under the Major Law, he seeks, before the State, recognition of his right to live as any citizen before the Constitution. His struggle is within the system of a major inhabiting. This struggle for recognition at all times erases the biggest logic, since it presents itself as a denunciation of a failed process. Faced with this smaller reality, the larger logic stutters. Cannot answer the problem posed. The force of the law manifests the impossibility of dealing with the real.

Here we have a first type of erasure that a minor inhabiting does in relation to a major inhabiting. These types of settlements constantly and visibly announce the failure of a socioeconomic system that cannot produce decent housing (at low cost) to reduce social difference. If the system is flawed, in this perspective the thought processes within the academy regarding these realities are flawed as well. Failures are also the design processes that seem to refuse to look at these realities.

The excluded-included from legal process seems to have no right to a form of housing expressed by the project. He requires a project or, rather, exposes the inability of the project to respond to an already posed problem. The project does not prepare the settlement. On the contrary, the settlement pre-exists the project. If the project thinks the major inhabiting in ideal conditions, in the situation of the settlements, the project is silent.

Although the morphological results are precarious and in minimum conditions of quality of life, there is still an attempt by this social group to produce a inhabiting that merges in the order of a major inhabiting. There is a need, which

presents itself legitimately, of recognition of value as a social individual, which demands an inhabiting of the city in an equal way as anyone, regardless of his economic capacity.

In the conception of Deleuze and Guattari (2015), a minor language presents specificities that can be described as the deterritorialization of language, the transformation of individual processes into collective and the linking of the individual to the political.

As for deterritorialization, Deleuze and Guattari (2015) explain to us that this process done by a minor language over a major language is what Czech Jews do with the use of German or what blacks can do with US English. In the analogous case of inhabiting, what the settlement does in relation to a larger system is always to produce a shift in the logic of formalization and legal processes.

What the settlement says and, above all, denounces is the lack of legal and academic competence in relation to a process of producing a decent low-cost housing that can break with the logic of the market – not only as a complaint but, above all, as a political act in the face of the different processes of space production.

With regard to the notion of collective, in the larger logic, the individual has supremacy over the collective precisely because of his economic power that is independent of a grouping. The individual speaks for himself individually, having legal and economic power for it, while the collective appears only as a background of the scene that is always individualized.

In smaller logic, the situation is totally reversed. The collective is the force of an ideal represented and protected by the strength of the group, because the individual alone does not face a market and a law that little protects him individually. The pain is the same, therefore collective and, being the same, produces the strength from an equal. Under these conditions, what is at stake is the possible agencies that are formed from a notion of collective bodies. On the other hand, as Deleuze and Guattari (2015) would say, this collective will be produced within the system and, at the same time, contrary to it, as a body without organs, that is, by a multitude of open and external agencies to a single individual.

Another aspect of this erasure is the individual's attachment to a political process. In the larger logic, as we have seen, access to housing is always individual as an economic and differentiating power in a collective that appears as a background, always apart. By contrast, in smaller logic the politician is the expression of a joint force. The collective embodies a process of dispute that is itself political, as it defends the common interests of a social group. In these settlements, the sense of belonging to a community is very strong due to the pursuit of a common ideal. The fight is collective. The politician always functions as a process of dispute within an unequal system.

The specificities of deterritorialization, the collective and the political establish the core of a smaller situation. Deleuze and Guattari (2015, p. 39) state that the term *“minor” no longer qualifies certain literatures, but the revolutionary conditions of all literature within what is called major (or established)*. This revolutionary force moves

the larger system inside. It is almost like a vibrator that tenses the established order all the time. All this throws a kind of noise that produces a crack in the larger logic, because it is instituted within what is already constituted.

If these collective enunciation agencies produce this strangeness in the larger order, it is because they must *“always go further in deterritorialization... by virtue of sobriety. Since the vocabulary is dried out, make it vibrate in intensity. Oppose a purely intensive use of language to all symbolic use”*, reinforced Deleuze and Guattari (2015, p. 40).

The logic of settlement seems to be a logic of the mark of difference in the form of denunciation of a larger process that is increasingly unfair, but in any case does not break completely with this system. We need to go deeper. There is yet another type of minor inhabiting that not only erases the major inhabiting, but above all is totally excluded from this process. It is necessary to recognize these other forms of agencies that not only make a noise but also are able to put the larger system in check. And by putting it in check, they make the larger system shut up in the face of its inability to resolve.

AN ABSOLUTELY MINOR INHABITING

There is a type of inhabiting the city that expresses itself as absolutely minor. This inhabiting is one that does not present itself with the references of the house as a sign of protection, but with the street, being the only alternative to a tax-free inhabiting. The street becomes the only place that can receive a body that requires rest and protection. The street becomes the only place that can receive a body that requires rest and protection. Therefore, the city is inhabited from a process of necessity, without permission and without the right to a house. The street is the only way out. A right to inhabit the city is required. In possession of this required right, they become excluded from law. Here comes the last chance for a minor speech – the presence of the body of a homeless person.

He arrives. He carries with him a body and all that body can carry with it. Just as in the minor inhabiting expressed by the settlement, the individual arrives before any legal formalization. There is no possession through a street deed. There is no legal remedy to formalize his new situation. It is outlawed. His body demands it. Requires urgent protection. There is no waiting. Absolutely, there is no waiting. There is no law that receives him. He chooses outlaw a residual space that allows to install his inhabiting, his body and his belongings. There is no house, just a blanket or a cardboard. Without any permission, no deed, no project, the installation of his inhabiting begins. He does not build his inhabiting, he installs himself. When settling, he inhabits the place. The only thing that demonstrates his place is the presence of his body and his few belongings.

Still without any recognition, he settles in his new inhabiting. Infrastructure is minimal, perhaps a sidewalk as a bed, a marquee as the roof of the house, the underside of a viaduct as a new way of living. It is necessary to adapt to the pre-existing reality. There is no project. There is absolutely no project. There is no creation, no alteration of physical reality, only submission to a pre-established form. He is looking for the places with the largest flow of people to, perhaps, receive some donation, food, clothes, money.

There is no waiting time. Unlike the reality of the settlements, there is not the slight possibility of seeking, before the State, recognition of his right to live as any citizen, according to the Constitution. There is no speech. Only a body that denounces the failure of a larger system. His struggle for recognition does not erase the larger logic, denies it. It exposes the ineffectiveness of a major inhabiting system.

As already stated, Deleuze and Guattari (2015) understand that a minor language produces the deterritorialization of language, the transformation of individual processes into collective and the linking of the individual to the political. It remains to be seen how homeless people mean these three processes in a major inhabiting from a minor inhabiting.

The deterritorialization of a major inhabiting is its first condition. Homeless people are in a permanent process of deterritorialization – reterritorialization. The lack of a fixed, formalized and legal site by law causes them to expose their bodies to a situation of always irregularity and illegality – sedentary in nature, nomadic under the law. It is always a body that is exposed to the intolerance of the other, in this case the other-major.

The non-permanence in any place and the constant need to change places due to the expulsion processes denounce the impossibility of being accepted by the other, who arrived before and bought, through the larger system of legality, his legitimate space. The chosen place is always an ephemeral temporary option and their permanence is also fluid. They are constantly in a process of change. Territorialization, when effective, only occurs as a stopping point for rest or until someone expels them.

There is no tolerance for the other. They are in a permanent process of deterritorialization – reterritorialization, always out. Always for an out. Moreover, it is precisely on the outside that they can question the major inhabiting. They do not question the law, but the presence of a territorialized body exposed to the eyes.

The collective dimension announced by Deleuze and Guattari (2015) as one of the strengths of a minor literature, in the minor inhabiting, produced by homeless people, is fundamental. Their individual bodies do not produce force against law, but a set of heaped bodies, yes. Bulky, with their bodies organized in a kind of pack, express only one body. They survive as collectives. They organize in packs not to get some return from the State, but to survive. They only stay alive, or as eternal survivors, because they protect themselves in the collective. Like threatened animals that protect themselves in the pack, homeless people seek their dignity in the collective. Fully visible through the accumulation of territorializing bodies, they become invisible to the eyes of the major inhabiting. Not seeing the major inhabiting “annuls” the social problem in some way. The logic is: I do not see, so it does not exist.

With this invisibility, we announce the third specificity of a minor inhabiting: the link between the individual and the politician. It seems a paradox, but precisely because of the “invisibility” built by a larger system where homeless

people produce a political act. There is a process of devaluation of subjectivity that transforms the individual into an object by the larger logic.

This process, by removing from the individual what makes him human – thus equal – produces an invisibility capable of removing the body-subject from the scene, leaving only one object-body. The coexistence between the different or even the tolerance of the included through the excluded-included is only possible within this invisibility pact. Nevertheless, in this process there is a kind of repression of the repressed. Moreover, this return is political.

It is the return of a body that demands to be seen as body-subject. A body that manifests itself, perhaps in the last mark of its humanity, in the look. It is precisely in the look and, more precisely, in the exchange of glances, in the contact of differences by the look, that the body-subject resists and does not allow itself to become an object, it is included. We have here an excluded-included. In addition, the inability of the major inhabiting to deal with this reality automatically produces a political dimension.

The presence of a body that looks already presents itself as political action. The body exposed in its extreme fragility is political. Explicit vulnerability is political at its base. There is no body that in its ultimate form does not present itself as a political act. The political act here has no speech, nor an organized speech, but is expressed in the weakened body and a subjected body, above all by that body that looks.

A PLACE OF THINKING

Faced with this reality, the project is silent. Not *everything is designed*. There is no deed, so there is no project. There is nothing to do. Architecture seems to give no projective answer to these street situations. The problem-solving project that solves everything in this situation fails. It produces no alternative. Provided with resources learned at the academy for the major inhabiting, here, in the absolutely minor one, it seems to fail completely.

The project does not speak, it is silent, perhaps it should listen. Better to listen to Beckett before designing. This reality is so brutal that we seem to be inside Samuel Beckett's fictional reality. It is necessary to go, together with its characters, to the background of what this reality of a body exposed on the street means. Immobilized characters and survivors, exposed individuals and incredibly hopeful in their last moments, Beckett (2012) exposes the fragility of life and the chaos of experience in its forms of incommunicability and impossibility of living.

Beckett (2012) produces in his texts a noise in the larger system. By making life an (im) possible experience, he builds a sense of boundary. Limit in living, but also a possibility that opens to thought. Beckett always exposes this discomfort of a body and its place. He reflects:

First the body. No. First the place. No. First both. Now either. Now the other. Sick of the either try the other. Sick of it back sick of the either. So on. Somehow on. Till sick of both. Throw up and go. Where neither. Till sick of

there. Throw up and back. The body again. Where none. The place again. Where none. Try again. Fail again. Better again. Or better worse. Fail worse again. Still worse again. Till sick for good. Throw up for good. Go for good. Where neither for good. Good and all. (BECKETT, 2012, p. 65).

Try again. Design again. Fail again. Given this reality of homeless people, the project fails and stutters. It stutters, because of its inability to deal with this problem (lack of possession), its speech fades and empties. It can only be restored by positioning it as a listening place. Perhaps the only possibility to think of the project in this reality was to think of it not in action but in potential, in its former moment, in its virtual nature.

Lapoujade (2017), in his text *The Minimal Existences*, revisits Étienne Souriau's thought to think about the "modes of minimum existences". His interest is to think of a philosophy that is concerned less with the foundations of existence and more with the ways in which these existences are expressed in their sketches in what sketched a reality. It would be a philosophy of art because it would be interested in the formal principle that organizes existence, considering that the formal is a structuring principle of its relations, unlike the notion of form, which is what gives shape to matter.

Then the project would be in this place of existence – a place to sketch before formalizing. The virtual is what presents itself as the power to actualize itself. Virtual beings "are beginnings, sketches [...], appearance of a range of new possibilities, dictated by some fragments only sketched" (LAPOUJADE, 2017, p. 37).

In Lapoujade's (2017) view, Souriau's importance to virtual beings is precisely because they constitute themselves as operators of the transition from one being to another, in a transmodal way. We left the modal and entered the transmodal with the virtual ones. Getting out of the modal and not identifying with the resolved act is, above all, staying in the potency of a transmodal flow of thought. Here is the rescue of the project as a place of speech.

Therefore, it is necessary to impose on the project an interdiction to the act. To the resolute act, one must say, "Enough!" It is time to make room for thought. In this approach, the project imposes itself as a thought. Moreover, as a thought, the project, no longer directly committed to problem solving, is fully open to dealing with the problem.

Given our basic question, everything is designed, provided the permission of the law is given, and the possession of the deed is the authorization of access to inhabit. We could rewrite it this way: everything is designed, as long as it does not go directly to the act of design as resolution, but to the power of the project as the force of new thinking, which is the authorization of access to another inhabiting

This premise, by shifting the sense of design from act to power, produces in power the possibility of its negation as resolution. In other words, "every power of being or doing something is, in fact, for Aristotle, always also a power of not being or not doing, since otherwise the power would always pass to the act and would be confused with it" (AGAMBEN, 2015, p. 14).

To create space for another thought about the project to be established, in Lapoujade's (2017) sense, is to give the time of reflection less distressing than the rush of resolution. We need to think of the project less in its resolute position and more in its potential position. Power here in the Aristotelian sense of a blank sheet in which everything is open and nothing is written yet. There is no writing not for an impossibility, but precisely for a possibility of writing or not. Writing is suspended. Similarly, the project must be suspended.

REFERENCES

- AGAMBEN, Giorgi. *Bartleby, ou da contingência*. Belo Horizonte: Autêntica, 2015. 105 p.
- BACHELARD, Gaston. *A poética do espaço*. São Paulo: Martins Fontes, 2000. 242 p.
- BECKETT, Samuel. *Companhia e outros textos*. São Paulo: Globo, 2012. 134 p.
- CROSS, Nigel. *Designerly ways of knowing*. London: Springer-Verlag, 2010. 114 p.
- DELEUZE, Gilles; GUATTARI, Félix. *Kafka: por uma literatura menor*. Belo Horizonte: Autêntica, 2015. 157 p.
- LAPOUJADE, David. *As existências mínimas*. São Paulo: n-1 edições, 2017. 128 p.
- LAWSON, Bryan; DORST, Kees. *Design Expertise*. Oxford: Elsevier, 2009. 321 p.

Acknowledgments

I am grateful to the Coordination for the Improvement of Higher Education Personnel (Capes) for its research support and to the Capes Program for Institutional Internationalization – PrInt, Notice: Visiting Professor Abroad Senior.

Editor's note

Date of submission: 17/06/2019

Acceptance: 21/11/2019

Review: RMO Empresarial

Paulo Edison Belo Reyes

Universidade Federal do Rio Grande do Sul. Faculdade de Arquitetura. Rua Sarmento Leite, 320, Centro Histórico – 90050-170 – Porto Alegre – RS

ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-0198-1800>

paulo.reyes@ufrgs.br