

and “vocabulary” with which programming “languages” work do not even claim to be “natural”; they are, to put it a bit provocatively, *genuinely engendered*.

Let us look briefly at the development of two very strong paradigms in programming throughout the last decades. Early languages such as Fortran, Ada, or C started out with a *procedural paradigm*. The main interest was to make available for easy application, as a kind of toolbox of “instruments” in coded “form,” the precise way of how a certain organizational procedure needs to be set up in order to function well. Every step of decision can thereby be “dispersed” into constitutive procedures, and hence, an infinitesimal limberness can be introduced into organizational forms. The paradigm subsequent to this pursued a much less directly hands-on approach, and instead became more didactical. With languages like smalltalk, Java, and C++, an *object-oriented paradigm* followed the procedural one, and it strictly kept apart the levels of *what* (described by procedures) and *how* (the specification of this *what*). Through this distinction, negotiation began to be supplied by “computational augmentation” about *what is to be reached*, and about how systems can be devised that allow the instantiation of procedures (*whats*) in much wider variations. Object-oriented programming allows devising entire “libraries” of “abstract objects” that depend on no statically specified order or classification system. Yet such abstract objects are not really “objects,” they incorporate entire “objectivities”—they allow for one-of-a-kind particulars to “concretize” singularly, and optimally be fitted according to the requirements of a task.

This is what we are talking about with the generic in computation: the ambition of programmers to develop informational “coatings” as a kind of abstract packaging, as “symbolic cases” that preserve and protect the “abstract object’s integrity.” All the potential functionalities offered by it ought to be provided in a most robust and compact “manner,” and for a largest possible variety of instances. Equipped with the technological power of such “languages,” the subversive pleasure that seems to accompany the wide interest in generic design today lives, on the one hand, from a *radical affirmation* of those liberating and disciplining constraints within an economy of recognition, which dictates that the nature of a thing is to be considered in the (politically sanctioned) terms in which it is actually addressed; yet it also lives from responding to this dictate by what I would call an “expansion in dimensionality” by investing its energies into the “substantiation” of speculative notions of reality: it sets up, by means of such genuinely engendered “languages,” symbolic domains that can accommodate the objects under investigation in the terms sanctioned for describing them, but that open up further possible spaces as well—which are governed “intra-specularly,” within an imaginary locus proper to particular objectivities (or any combination of elements of combined objectivities).

#### **An abstract object’s integrity: Political subjectivization**

But what kind of integrity are we talking about here, when referring to an abstract object’s integrity? What kind

**MELINA MEZARI,  
STELIOS PSALTIS**

# GENERIC VILLA

**We deal with the notion of the Villa in a way that tries to conceive of a new kind, one that becomes descriptive of the entire group or class of villas, without a brand name, with a generic character. In other words, it is an experiment in universalizing the architectural concept of the villa.**

**Our project’s focus lies on conceiving the architectural form of the villa as an inhabitable artifact. As such, we imagine that it acquires meaning in an open and indefinite manner, through the articulations of its modularity in all its instances. In our design approach, this modularity is predicated entirely by the activities hosted (actually or virtually) in a villa’s possible compartments. Since these activities are infinite in number and manner, the generic villa can never be exhaustively articulated and actualized. Hence, in our attempt to describe it, we follow what we call “a framework of infinity inclusion”: we assume that certain configurations of its compartments express the generic yet singular, pre-specific individuality of any one villa in particular.**