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Chapter 10: Emigration/immigration

Maps, myths and origins
Mirjana Lozanovska

This chapter investigates the vernacular built forms of the village of Zavoj, in the Republic of Macedonia. It is concerned with the way these built forms are configured within a particular migratory dynamic, and with the ways they come to be understood within a particular range of architectural field research techniques, representational systems and knowledge regimes.

A PLACE OF ORIGIN AND A SITE OF DEPARTURE

The village of Zavoj is configured here as a site of emigration, a site of departure and a place of origin that is significantly mediated through a particular site of immigration, namely Melbourne, Australia. These terms ‘emigration’ and ‘immigration’ make explicit a troubling dynamic between places that often remains unrecognised within the more generalised term, ‘migration’ since they connote common movement. Together, these terms can reveal the ways that places appearing to be disparate – such as Zavoj and Melbourne – are, in fact, linked by the migrant’s departure and arrival.

In the particular case of migration between Zavoj and Melbourne, these terms immediately activate a number of other distinctions. Zavoj can be perceived as Other to the settler-west of Melbourne, as a place of the non-western subject, a place seemingly off the map of the globalised economy, a place amenable to specific rather than generalised knowledges, a place not normally registered in the canons of architecture. But here, the ‘em-’ and the ‘imm-’ of migration seek to bind together these apparently diverging distinctions so that west and non-west, city and village, place and subject, case-study and theory, building and architecture are brought into more intimate and complex relationships. The migrant is centrally germane to this dynamic, his/her imaginative and existent mobility sets up, and then complicates, these oppositional relationships.

The migrant departs from a place of origin and embarks on a journey to a site of promise and growth. Any place of origin can be configured in terms of a temporal immobility, of stasis, in the memories of those who leave it behind.
As a site of emigration, however, Zavoj already absorbs the image of the new city of Melbourne, the migrant's destination. The promised city is imagined through stories, through fabrications by those who have already made that journey and have returned, through a strange mixture of the experience of a journey in space and its narration in language (Berger and Mohr 1975: 23). The process of emigration radically alters places of origin. Such places are not necessarily fixed or stable or passive or mute points of departure.

In this context, there are two questions to be approached. The first asks 'What becomes of Zavoj, the place of emigration, after the departure of the migrant?' The second question is methodological. It is concerned with the styles and manners for examining built and urban forms that are overcast by an ahistoricity of the vernacular, inherited in both migration and architectural discourse. Here we can ask, 'If disciplinary boundaries are produced through a mapping of canonical sites of significance how does migration (as a practice of mobility) impact upon this?'

It is clear that Zavoj needs to be examined, initially, as a problematic of geographic mapping, of locating (and siting) a non-canonical site. Furthermore, Zavoj poses a particular set of problems of architectural representation, of sighting, measuring and documenting. What does it mean to produce a plan of the village of Zavoj? The drawing practices required for the production of a plan are themselves heavily implicated in the norms of the architectural canon. How are these to be negotiated in the representation of Zavoj? Finally, the study of Zavoj is a problematic of citation. As academic producers of the canon, what do we address within the borders of writing, research and teaching? In other words, once we decide to turn our gaze somewhere else, what do we make of and for that place?

ABJECTION

Society depends on an established order and a stable human subject, and yet psychoanalytic theories of abjection analyse 'the ways in which "proper" subjectivity and sociality are founded on the (impossible) expulsion or exclusion of the improper, the unclean and the disorderly' (Grosz 1986: 108). The abject is a pre-condition to the human subject and to the symbolic order of society, but my emphasis here is that it accompanies that order, it 'hovers at the edges or borders of our existence, haunting and inhabiting regions supposedly clean and free of any influence or contamination' (Grosz 1986: 108). It can reappear when triggered by a traumatic event like migration. Migration invokes the abject in two ways: individually, in which the child is differentiated from the maternal space and constructed as a unified, independent subject; and socio-culturally, in which proper places (the city) is divided from improper places (the village). The not-yet-migrant often speaks of a compulsion to leave the village, pre-empting the
journey of migration. As such, this kind of theory is useful for examining the figure of the migrant, as well as the site of emigration (the vernacular architecture of the village, Zavoj) and the site of immigration (the migrant house and the city of Melbourne, Australia) (Lozanovska 1997).

The village is redefined as a maternal space. The village haunts the migrant as a ‘return of the repressed’, the guilt associated with a disavowal of the debt owed to maternity (Grosz 1986: 107). Spatial boundaries between the migrant's body and the migrant house, and between the village and the city are put to question. Kristeva obliquely points to this, for example, when she refers to abjection as the ‘degree zero of spatialisation’, adding ‘abjection is to geometry what intonation is to speech’ (cited in Burgin 1991: 26). If the city is site of immigration, it is built on the pre-condition of the village. As a primordial spatiality, the village haunts the city's geopolitical structures. Migrant houses attest to an intense relationship between the migrant's body and the house. The migrant is, ‘a tireless builder, the deject is in short a stray. He is on a journey, during the night, the end of which keeps receding’ (Kristeva 1982: 8). The house is not an architecture that can sublimate the condition of the abject, rather it becomes a relentless process of rebuilding and maintenance.

At stake for the migrant is ongoing abjection, s/he might fall into the gap between the subject and the object (Kristeva 1982). The migrant's incapacity to sublimate this abject condition is exacerbated by the ‘foreign’ symbolic order s/he is inserted into. S/he is perceived as the site of the abject within the symbolic order of the proper city, because the proper city cannot fully expel its pre-condition of immigration. The migrant has an ambivalent role in relation to both the western subject and the (non-migrant) peasant, revealing a complexity within subject positions (Deleuze and Guattari 1987; Chow 1993).

Further, this spatial condition of the abject is also implicated in the ways the migrant attends to a map of the world. If for the migrant, the ‘other place’ already has a presence and hovers at the edge, the migrant's techniques of mapping offer a limit to the fantasy of the ‘other place’ as unknown, a limit to the exoticisation of the ‘other’. Rather, the location of sites (as a practice of the migrant) is connected with the continual making and remaking of the self. This practice, then, is a process whereby the migrant constructs, and is constructed by, a location, a place, a space. It may be named an abject geometry, a fluid time-space representation. Layered upon this abject space-time of migration, almost as a superstructure, appears the formal measurement and documentation of maps and plans. Geographic space and geometric space given to us in this way, by maps and by orthographic projections, emerge as an overlay on something altogether more opaque.

Boundaries between disciplines, between language, the body and architecture are contested by an abject condition of migration and, becoming blurred, result in a complex spatial field, rather than a disciplinary platform. How might
we characterise the disciplinary boundaries of architecture whose parameters enclose the living spaces of the migrant both before and after migration? In the next section two aspects of the architectural canon are identified as significant points of intersection between architecture and migration.

THE CANON(S)

The primitive hut and the vernacular-classicism conception significant to the canon of architecture are identified as sites of the abject. Each contains the ways in which the canon of architecture cannot completely exclude or expel that which it regards as improper and contaminating. The classical canon dominates architecture as a superior and universal tradition, and also as something that has been challenged, since the eighteenth century by the notion of historicism (Colquhoun 1989). Alan Colquhoun deals with this binary conception of architecture in his essay entitled 'Vernacular Classicism'. Here, he discusses the rise of the idea of the 'primitive hut' in eighteenth-century European architectural theory, principally through the writings of French cleric Marc-Antoine Laugier. Colquhoun suggests that Laugier's citing of the 'primitive hut' was not concerned with the 'real' Mediterranean vernacular, positioning Laugier precisely and centrally within the classical canon. Laugier's concern, Colquhoun argues, was with the dissemination of the classical doctrine - at a time when other architectural cultures had already started to influence (and undermine) the traditional certainties of the classical.

Laugier's interest in the Mediterranean was a search for the symbolic origin of classical architecture rather than the exploration of contemporary Mediterranean vernacular. Colquhoun argues that 'when we define vernacular in terms of the eighteenth-century notion of the primitive, we are involved in an argument that is characteristically classical', and that 'this process entailed, not the discovery of vernacular building, but the revernacularization of classicism with which to substantiate a myth of origins' (Colquhoun 1989: 30). The distinction made between the vernacular and classicism is problematic - it is neither clearly delineated nor overcome. It may be possible to argue, for example, that the origins of Zavoj (and the origins of architectural discourse) might also be related to the idea of the 'primitive hut'. Yet, at issue here is the negotiation of a space for vernacular architecture, attempting to resist its appropriation within the discourse of the classical canon and, simultaneously, addressing unresolved tensions within the classical discourse.

HISTORIES

It is to the improper within the proper that I now turn. The configuration of space as an associative field between geography, geometry and dwelling confronts the
traditional definitions of place (the place of origin, the place of settlement, the place of the home). To locate architecture within this particular intellectual context raises the question of a history of architecture as a history of (social) space. As such, this is investigated in the writings of Michel de Certeau (1984) and Henri Lefebvre (1991), among others.

Lefebvre's notion of 'social space' and de Certeau's concepts of spatial practices and dwelling, suggest a much more complex and interactive relation between space and its physical order than that normally entertained by traditional architectural discourse. Furthermore, together they support a role for time in relation to space, in particular by giving space a specific temporality. It follows from this that one way of defining a field of the vernacular, an ontological field of dwelling and spatiality, is to see social space as a condition within architecture from which to speak to the classical canon.

**MIGRANCY**

The figure of the migrant is constrained by a specific historical time (1950–75), place (from a village in the Balkans/Southern Europe to a city in Australia/Canada/US), and a specific local/global economics (from one type of working class to another type of working class). For the path of migrancy explored here, there were a number of superstructural formations.

Perhaps the most crucial of these was the 'White Australia' policy. The intention of this policy was to control non-British immigration to Australia over the period between federation in 1901 (the moment that brought together the former colonies into the modern nation state of Australia) and the Whitlam government in 1972. While simultaneously advocating the superiority of British culture the 'White Australia' policy also, paradoxically, produced one of the world's most ethnically diverse countries. The purpose of the policy, however, was to select immigrants from specific socio-cultural – and even racial backgrounds – for their particular capacity to assimilate into Australian society. It was an exclusionist policy conceived along explicitly racial lines. In particular, it sought to eliminate Asian immigration, which had been fairly widespread in Australia for over a hundred years. In practice it also differentiated between northern and southern Europeans, with an institutional preference for Nordic, Aryan types (Kunek 1993). These policies constructed Australia as a nation with clearly established British origins, and with a monolithic frontier of Anglo-Celtic culture (Gunew 1988).

Clearly, such immigration policies are also obliquely designed to assure members of the dominant culture that the migrant is unthreatening. The desire for such reassurance stems from the host culture's memories of its own prior acts of colonisation and processes of settlement, of its own Anglo-Celtic histories of departure and arrival. Nostalgia for origins is common among all migrants, yet
when origins such as Macedonia are invoked, and they do not coincide with the 
origins of the host culture (England and Ireland), there can be a sense of disjunc-
ture and disquiet. The migrant who is associated with origins which differ from 
those which the host culture promulgates inevitably turns into the (transcen-
dental) foreigner, the figure of the dislocated subject, the bitter/sweet sense of 
the stranger within each one of us. This figure of the migrant (Berger 1975) 
is pivotal to recent theories of identity construction and human subjectivity as 
explored, for instance, by Julia Kristeva (1991), Edward Said (1993) and Stuart 
Hall (1996). Tracing the complex and interlinked relationship between self and 
place (both imaginary and real) we can see that Macedonia and Australia 
are constantly renegotiated through histories of migration, through collective 
memory and through imaginary projections between the sites of emigration and 
immigration. The history of Zavoj is entangled with the history of Melbourne. 

Like many other villages in Europe in the process of industrialisation, Zavoj 
came to be seen as ‘underdeveloped’. Many of its residents simply had to 
leave in order to live (Berger 1975). In contemporary global economic contexts, 
villages like Zavoj have no reason to continue existing. And yet the vision of 
the global village is both contingent on, and constituted through, actual villages, such 
as Zavoj, as its unacknowledged place/space. The unembellished story of the 
migrant is one instance of this unacknowledged relationship. The host-citizen, 
perceiving and representing the metropolis as a village – a site with social and 
racial frontiers, turning cities into villages – is another. We see these boundaries 
shifting in Australia (and other sites of the Diasporic and Old Worlds), projecting 
the myth of place through strategies to remove the guest, the migrant and the 
refugee. The concept of the global village presents dire consequences – who 
will be cast outside of the global village – who will be rendered invisible in its 
representation?

THE PLAN(S) FOR ZAVOJ

It perhaps comes as no great surprise that Zavoj lacks architectural visibility and 
location on the great map of architectural cultures. But when thinking about 
maps as tools of travel, it is perhaps possible to introduce a ‘non-place’ onto the 
architectural map. Zavoj, then, is bought into visibility and focus, and thus 
becomes an object of desire – traced by a line between itself and Melbourne, 
Australia (Figure 10.1). Desire, in this context, is the line of myself as author 
located within the text and here oscillating between architect, academic and 
migrant: siting Zavoj, mapping Zavoj, representing the built environment of Zavoj, 
telling the story of Zavoj.

Zavoj was paced, measured, checked through orientations to the sun, and 
adjusted by the angles of walls. Fragments of Zavoj recorded on A3 sheets were 
overlaid into a single smooth orthographic plane, and these were taped together
to give a comprehensive sense of the whole village. Additional adjustments were made with drafting tools – crosschecking according to observations and photographic documentation – before it was integrated into a single, smooth, orthographic plane. Discrepancies were present but were erased from the representation of the final drawing.

Luscombe and Peden, discussing architectural representation, argue that plans and sections make it possible to see a building’s interior from a distance (Luscombe and Peden 1992: 9). Conversely, architectural drawings of buildings and cities after the fact of disintegration and change act as historical documents that inevitably participate in the circulation and citation of architecture. As a corollary of having a plan, Zavoj is subsequently able to participate in discursive practices. The plan makes the village representable, visible and legible.
Robin Evans, architectural historian and theorist, explores another type of pleasure in the plan (Evans 1995). He argues that there is an 'active imagination in the drawing' and that while drawings themselves do not think, imaginative intelligence lies dormant in the plan (and the section and elevation) because orthographic projection, itself, the product of intense imagination (Evans 1986). He is referring here to orthographic projection specifically as a peculiar method of representation, where the imaginary lines from the object are perpendicular to the picture plane, and are always directional and parallel within themselves. Such a characterisation offers precision and measure of the object, but in order to avoid too much disfigurement, the buildings that are frontal, rectangular and flat are most accurately represented due to their affinity with the surface of the paper.

The plan of the village thus both reveals and conceals a truth about the relationship between reality and representation: it has no reference to the real and yet inherent within it is the ability to perceive the thing represented. The making of a plan of Zavoj – a village site that is, in reality, abandoned and disordered – produces the village as a unified and preserved whole, that the village both is and is not. The plan, in this sense, alludes to an imaginary field of the village, not the representation of a reality, but something that is envisioned through our imaginative extraction from the drawing: an image of the village as an ideal place, a place of (the author's) idealisation (Colquhoun 1989: 12, 28). The plan also becomes a site of encounter between Zavoj, author and (migrant) reader(s), weaving dialogues of personal and intellectual histories reinforcing the interrelated history of Zavoj and Melbourne. Such pleasures in the plan might again turn it back into an abject geometry between improper and proper places (Figure 10.2).

Desire, seen as the architectural academic's projection, has the uncanny effect of destabilising the (western) subject partly through (dis)placing the self onto a foreign site of fieldwork. A panoramic black and white photograph can complement the empirical representation and can offer a breadth of vision and an atmosphere of an impossible perspective. The village is on a mountain, a few buildings are dotted on its topography, a white cube-church reflects the light and is, itself, illuminated. To gaze at the image exemplifies the unleashing

Figure 10.2
PANORAMIC VIEW OF ZAVOJ
IN THE SHADOWS OF RATIONAL PRACTICES OF FIELDWORK IS THE AESTHETICS OF NOSTALGIA. THE IMAGE SPEAKS OF A LACK OF EVIDENCE AND A LACK OF DISCIPLINE. AND YET, THE AUTHOR INVESTS IN IT, CITING A MOMENT OF IMAGINARY MATERNAL ORIGINS.
of nostalgia, a nostalgia that ‘may paradoxically undo the concept of the unique and unitary self’ (Gunew 1994: 115). In the shadows of rational practices of fieldwork is the aesthetics of nostalgia. Critiques of the politics of fieldwork, in particular the technique of participant-observation, are well known (Clifford 1997: 19–27). But this image conjures a snapshot from a travel diary. It speaks of a lack of evidence and a lack of discipline. And yet, the author invests in it, citing a moment of imaginary maternal origins. The everyday lives of the villagers engaging in their own travels also view this panorama. They are not always in the village centre. The object of study, the place, Zavoj, has another narrative and other histories that negotiate the discursive boundaries of the discipline.

A plan/map of the village of Zavoj also attests to the complex arguments of de Certeau. The map is ultimately a product of (architectural) discourse. As a master discourse of proper places, it thus ‘collates on the same plane [plan] heterogeneous places, some received from a tradition and others produced by observation’ (de Certeau 1984: 121). While tradition is included within the logic of the plan, its form of representation alters its constitution. The inhabitants always already know the village and its context. Spatial and geographic knowledge about the village for its inhabitants is generated through multifarious means other than plans and maps; daily itineraries are organised within and in relation to the layout of the village; everyday practices produce an associational sense of the relative location of things; people’s movements are interlaced with mental, cultural and territorial charts accumulated over time. The purpose of the plan is to consolidate memory, to make history.

So it is that the field academic wishing and intending to fill the gaps of history and knowledge about Zavoj is compelled to produce a map, to make a plan, before everything is lost. Making history, in this context, is a crucial and imperative exercise. To not act is to disown the place.

But do the black solid lines on the white surface of the architectural plan cast into oblivion all the labours, the movements, the bodies, the histories on which their inscription is contingent? The plan, together with other drawings and representations, constitutes an architectural frontier, a system of representation in which temporal relations are reduced to (and reconstituted as) spatial relations and the strange realness of the everyday is gone: ‘the map gradually wins out over these figures; it colonizes space; it eliminates little by little the pictorial figurations of the practices that produce it’ (de Certeau 1984: 121). It is in this context that the consequence of visibility and invisibility of the plan as representation becomes relevant to a study of Zavoj (Lozanovska 1995, 1999).

Architectural discourse, embodied as it is in graphic representations, casts these spatial practices into pre-history, into a pre-architectural era. They are frequently scribbled as notes in the margins of the plan, the section, and in the footnotes, they are displaced from the central discursive site. The trace of architecture is not the site of memory, but something much more absolute. Is it ‘actual
repression (the forgetting of what one has forgotten)?' enquiries Sneja Gunew in another context (1994: 115). Representations of vernacular architecture signal that the discipline repeatedly and repetitively avoids the site as a discursive history. Is this, then, the site of indifference to other co-existing architectural cultures? (Grosz 1989; Lefebvre 1991: 70).

Drawing the vernacular building of Zavoj does not guarantee the universality of the classical canon. More useful is Evans' argument that there is a blind spot between drawing and its object – how will things go, how will they travel in between, and what will happen to them on the way? 'To draw from' and 'to be drawn to' better describe the processes of translation, transportation, transfiguration, transition, transmigration, transfer, transmission, transmutation, transposition, that mediate drawings and buildings. The imaginary field of drawings affects knowledge and human subjects, as well as their object.

**LOGS, CARTS, BENCHES, HOUSES**

But where on the plan of the village are women's meeting places? Where are the sites for women's gatherings? Often the women amble somewhat distractedly within the village; they meet spontaneously and find somewhere where they can sit together. This might be on a pile of logs, an unused cart, or some benches by a house (Figure 10.3). There are no organised or even recognised places for women to meet. Each day, and in contradiction to their apparently pre-destined, pre-mapped lives, there are stories and contradictory movements, spatial trajectories, meanderings that traverse across paths and places, that weave places together.

![Figure 10.3](image-url)

WOMEN'S MEETING PLACE. IN CONTRADICTION TO THEIR SEEMINGLY PREDESTINED, PRE-MAPPED LIVES, THESE WOMEN TELL STORIES ABOUT TRAVELS TO MOUNTAINS, OTHER TOWNS AND COUNTRIES.
The effect is a proliferation, an abundance of meeting sites, a plenitude of spaces that are impossible for the plan to constitute. Such sites have no definition as a notable place per se – until the women meet there. It is through their meetings, their conversations, that spaces are transformed. So it is that women's meeting sites are at once non-existent, not on the plan, and yet exist everywhere in space. They cannot be marked on the plan and cannot be represented within the transparency of the rational white surface, but this does not mean that women do not meet in the village. 'They are at work everywhere', intertwining with the architectural frontier as its spatial Other. Conversations with the women moved from themes of work, poverty, family to the secret pleasures of walking, and walking alone in the mountains. They prefer to live in the village, even after their husbands have died, and their children have left. Why? They have not led such parochial lives. Many travel regularly to small nearby towns, and some have travelled to the shores of other continents, to the dream cities of Diaspora. One woman described her impressions of Melbourne during her visit to her daughter's house: zatvor, 'prison', she stated emphatically, always locked up inside, nowhere to walk. The women of the village are, themselves, travellers and their travels suggest a poetics of freedom, rather than the constraints of tradition and locality.

De Certeau proposes that space is in contradistinction to place. While strategic technologies of power and knowledge have already acted in the production of a place, space occurs as the effect of a number of intersecting forces which may be in conflict. Yet, for that time these forces produce a multivalent space, a space produced by a specific situation and a specific moment. A space cannot be simply identified as a stable place. While the strategic means (of the strong) invest in the 'mastery of place through sight', the tactical movements...
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(of the weak) carry out a labour that constantly transforms places into spaces (de Certeau 1984: 118). We may call these ‘spatial practices’, and a narration of them, ‘spatial stories’. This labour is persistent, subtle, tireless, ready for an opportunity, and scattered over the terrain of the dominant order (de Certeau 1984: xix, 34-8, 117). The architectural project is concerned with the documentation of the physical, presenting an order and division of space in its manifestation as a place. Spatial stories, argues de Certeau are ‘treatments of space’, a way of thinking about the built environment that complements the architectural tradition (de Certeau 1984: 122). The inhabitants’ words and stories both distract from and compel the architectural documentation of place (Chow 1993: 52; Gunew 1994: 119). The writing of the ‘inhabitations’ (Irigaray 1993), ‘uses’ (Lefebvre 1991), ‘practices’ (de Certeau 1984), the ‘making do’ in and of space are gestures towards a representation which stages an archi-textual field between image, orthographic projection and narratives of daily life (Figure 10.4).

VILLAGE MYTHS

The tale about the origin of Zavoj speaks of the horror and sacrifice that preceded its founding and construction. Everyone in the village knows the story, which goes like this: one day, a few hundred years ago, the woman serving at the inn laid the table ninety-nine times for hungry travelling merchants. At the end of this she had run out of food and had nothing left to feed anyone. A group of Turks² broke their journey and went to the inn demanding food and drink. Angered by what they saw as her inhospitality they slaughtered her, put her in the sac³ and had her for dinner. At this the villagers protested, fighting broke out and the village folk eventually disbanded towards Prilep, Bitola and Ohrid (three towns in the vicinity of the village). Three brothers stayed behind and settled at the site where they had overnight koshari⁴ to shelter in. The brothers established the present village of Zavoj.

It is clear that two pre-eminent stories precede the founding of the village. The first is one of cannibalism: the foreign men devour the woman’s body. In doing so they take more than they are offered; they are no longer the guests of the woman, they are her murderers. But they are also no longer strictly foreign. Through eating the woman they appropriate an identity that is part familial and part foreign, the bloodlines are mixed. The second foundational story is that of the battle between these foreign and familial men over territory. Once her body has been devoured, the men must battle each other. The battlefield itself is marked by the spilling of blood and flesh. In this battle, the men are also sacrificed and both familial and foreign blood soaks into the earth. It is up to the myth to resolve/correct such impure mixtures of the ground and foundation for reconstruction. Where is the woman? She disappears in the text.
The woman's evaporation and the battle between the men facilitates a third 'scene': the founding of a site and the construction of the village. The koshari are huts known only to men. Conversely, women have no access to the knowledge of how to claim their territory. The body of woman is also food for thought; she is the stuff (the original inspiration) of spatial origins. In this sense, space prior to the establishment of the village is defined as female in contrast to the 'hut', which is defined as male. The shepherds are travellers; they return to their huts for a protected place to rest and sleep. In replacing the female space, the (m)other space, the hut is sometimes engendered as mother. The koshara mediates a man's relationship to space and territory (Figure 10.5).

The classical canon of architecture is entangled with the field and frontiers of this myth of the origin of the village. This occurs via the architectural edifice, which associates Laugier's Primitive Hut with the koshari/shepherd's huts. This tale speaks to us from the mythical unconscious and involves the dichotomies of male/female, body/territory, food/village, familiar/foreign, offering a kind of primordial texture to the primitive hut as the canonical object of Laugier's essay. Significantly, the hut as architectural edifice is a strategy for settlement. It transforms the environment from one type of space to another type of space, from an uninhabitable forest to a space defined through the logic of the architectural edifice. The construction of the architectural edifice renders space into place, renders a forest into a 'system of frontiers, which effects a division of spaces', a territory. The hut in the foreground of the image frames our view of the vast space above a mountainous landscape. While the gable form poetically mimics the mountain peaks and its woven roof makes associations with baskets, its central vertical post indicates that this structure is as much about surveillance of
the land as it is about the poetics of journey. The hut acts as a fortress, a site with frontiers.

Laugier's Primitive Hut is a return to the primitive as a way to substantiate the myth of origins for the classical language. But, as this myth of origins of the village reveals, it is also a return to territorial claims and conquests, and these are historically evident in the processes of European colonisation. Cultural and blood lines are intermingled – as suggested in the myth. If the canonical texts of architecture and urbanism are intertwined with primordial myths and peasant tales, they also participate in scenes of cannibalism, the battlefield, and the original territorial gesture of architecture, a site where urban construction and borderlines are established on obscene yet uncertain grounds.

EMIGRATION/IMMIGRATION

Let us return to the 'em-' and 'imm-' of migrancy by examining the return journey migrants undertake to their place of origin, the village of Zavoj, for a celebration. Holidays associated with such celebrations are what de Certeau calls a turn: a migrational return to the site of emigration, departing from the city of immigration. In de Certeau's terms this return can be described as a tactic: a way of operating for people who are displaced, for people who are 'Othered' by the forces that establish dominant regimes of place. It is a mode of action determined by not having a place of one's own: 'The space of a tactic is the space of the other. Thus it must play on and with a terrain imposed on it and organized by the law of a foreign power.' The tactic though 'is neither a pathetic nor a romantic response to an analysis of power, it is always in an active relation to strategic forces' (de Certeau 1984: 34-8). The migrant must be reactive and organised to enable this return to the place of origin (Figure 10.6).

The house in the village that provides a proper place for the return of the migrant is a maternal space in relation to the other cities of immigration, but a patrimonial house in relation to the village and its myth of origins. Although there are limited documents of the ownership of the land, the land in the whole vicinity is mapped according to ownership and paternal lineage. Migration is a global force that interacts with existing property laws to produce an incongruous built environment. The village comprises more than 100 houses of which about 80 are old and in a state of disrepair. Scattered through these are new houses, small and minimalistic, corners of an old house demolished and a new fragment rebuilt, new houses left eternally incomplete and sites of ongoing construction. These are uninhabited. In the image the old part of the house indicates inhabitation and dwelling by the strings of peppers hung on its sunny wall. The newly built part remains unfinished and uninhabited. The image presents an aesthetics that result when migration drives intersect with property and expedient construction. New veneers and empty houses make explicit an estrangement between the
migrant and the village. Architecture’s objective is absolutely complicit with property. Its apparent purpose is to claim the rights of territory and, literally, to put a stake in the land.

In an essay titled, ‘Abjection and architecture: the migrant house in multicultural Australia’ (Lozanovska 1997), I examined the migrant house in Melbourne. Zavoj and Melbourne are associated through the house(s) built by migrants in each site of emigration and immigration. In Melbourne, the immigrant house is divided between its formal exterior appearance and presentation, and an interior constituted through a mixture of cultural paraphernalia, customs and languages. It is also divided between its role in relation to the migrant inhabitants and its role in relation to the dominant culture of its host context. Distinctive territorial forces determine the architectures of both the Zavoj and Melbourne migrant house. The Melbourne migrant house articulates a symbolic architectural aesthetics. Its claim for territory might be perceived as architecturally excessive in various ways: in scale, in the duration of the materials (concrete, brick), in the security marked by the fence, gateways and doors, in ornament (lions and eagles), and in an extreme order marked by the control of nature (Lozanovska 1997: 113). It insists on ongoing maintenance and inhabitation. In contrast, the house in Zavoj is a project of incomplete construction, of expedition and fleeting visits. It is a site of the abject because the migrant does not dwell in the village.

In the village the migrant formalises space; converting it into property. This is no tactical movement; the migrant is much more strategic in relation to the space of the village. The women and men who have not emigrated move in and around the property of migrants, often using them tactically, turning them back into spaces. Animals, too, like the pig shown traversing the path, and nature, act
onto these semi-abandoned buildings. To dwell indicates the treatment of architecture. Images of unfinished houses with steel rods protruding up into the sky and down into the concrete structure present a parody of Coop Himmelblau's project House Vektor II (Haus Meier-Hahn), Dusseldorf. Anthony Vidler states that this project:

with its impaled roof, illustrates almost too directly, but uncomfortably enough, the will to destroy the house of classical architecture and the society it serves | . . |; [it] encapsulates didactically, if not architecturally, the twin ambitions of Himmelblau to drive a stake at once through the house and through the specific humanist body it represents.

(Vidler 1992: 80)

It presents a metaphoric rendition of the battle between familial and foreign men described in the myth of origin.

Could the discourse of migration and the poststructuralist discourse of the death of classicism converge over the loss of this other forgotten body, a body of another spatiality? The maternal body that makes food but that is, herself, consumed is entirely repressed by Coop Himmelblau and dominant architectural discourse. The migrant must build to believe in a fiction about ownership and territory, a scene that repeatedly suppresses the loss of this other spatiality and body (Lefebvre 1991: 355).

Building practices cover over memory and produce architecture as speculative and aspirational. A proper architectural edifice, like Laugier's primitive hut for example, transfers the processes of building into a metaphysical realm, a rational system of knowledge that overcomes both memory and amnesia. Coop Himmelblau's House Vektor II, reveals that a return to humanism 'is a movement backward within a closed episteme' (Colquhoun 1989: 31); a way to close the circuit of the architectural canon and again renew its origins. The Zavoj migrant house reveals an economics of construction in which the building of a new house to stand for the 'place of origin' remains an empty house, a house void of dwelling.

In migrant houses in both Zavoj and Melbourne, the loss is the space of dwelling, the space of inhabitation, the field of spatial practices and spatial stories. It constitutes an architectural loss presented as an unresolved tension within the dominant architectural canon: the place of dwelling and the ontological within architecture. What can we call this architecture? In architectural discourse it goes by the term 'vernacular'. In this chapter it is signalled by the vernacular architecture of the village, the other 'non-migrant' architectural context of Zavoj. It reflects back a history that is traditionally non-discursive, a history that is descriptive and that does not participate in a history of the present. Vernacular architecture is left out of critical discourse falling in the gap between
the classical humanist house and its deconstruction and the migrant house and its construction. And yet it constitutes the spatiality on which they are built.

The migrant is unable to fully forget. Internally, the migrant house in Melbourne, the site of immigration, is in a dialectical relationship with the vernacular architecture of ZavoL it struggles with its role in relation to the loss of this vernacular, this space of dwelling (Lozanovska 1997). It might be called 'little Macedonia' and offer the spatiality for the practice of the other language that is identified as a 'mother tongue' in relation to the hegemonic culture. But, these are gestures that signal the loss, rather than ways of reconstructing a vernacular. They have a temporal limit to their real practice, and they are a strange hybrid form of cultural and building practice. The migrant house has severed its relation to the myth of origins of the village and it has no other myth of origin to substitute it. The migrant must move on.

ZavoL, the site of emigration, is cited momentarily in the context of canonical discourse through the site of immigration, Melbourne. But this specific moment of citation signals that which cannot be included in a critical discourse on architecture: the co-existence of a village like ZavoL, a place of another origin, contemporaneous with Melbourne. This other place is constituted through a vernacular architecture and it is a site of ongoing dwelling and inhabitation. ZavoL is both a specific reality which represents the limit of the universalising canon, and an idealised village which represents the place of other architectural cultures.

NOTES

1 An earlier version of this essay was presented at the 3rd ‘Other Connections’ conference, Building Dwelling Drifting: migrancy and the limits of architecture, Melbourne, 1997. It introduced to the architectural forum the idea of ‘migration’ in its divided form between emigration and immigration.

2 This is a reference to the occupation/colonisation of Macedonia, by the Ottoman Empire, for 500 years, from the 1400s to the 1900s.

3 Sac is a traditional cooking pot set into the earth with hot coals placed on the lid and underneath.

4 The word ‘koshari’ (plural) was used by the villagers for ‘shepherd huts’ scattered over the agricultural land. Its other meanings include basket ‘koshara’ (singular) and fortress. The word ‘koliba’ is also a term that means ‘shepherd hut’.
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