

TRANSVALUATION –

Making the World Matter

Presentation of the International Symposium in Search for Alternative, Cooperative Environments of Knowledge, Creation and Invention, of “Making and “Thinking”.

May 21-22 2015, Department of Architecture,
Chalmers University of Technology, Gothenburg, Sweden

PETER DE GRAEVE

PhD, Professor in Philosophy and Aesthetics

Department of Fine Arts, Leuven University College of Arts, Leuven University

Ghent/Brussels/Leuven, Belgium

TEL: +32 494 500 397

peter.degraeve@luca-arts.be

CATHARINA DYRSSEN

PhD, Professor in Architecture and Design Methods

Department of Architecture, Chalmers University of Technology

Göteborg, Sweden

dyrsen@chalmers.se

NEL JANSSENS

PhD, Associate Professor in Architecture and Urbanism

KU Leuven, Faculty of architecture, Campus Sint-Lucas Brussels & Department of

Architecture, Chalmers University of Technology, Göteborg

Brussels/Ghent/Göteborg, Belgium, Sweden

nel.janssens@kuleuven.be

1. Initial brief

In the current measurement- and indicator-driven knowledge culture, research in architecture, art and disciplines within the humanities and the social sciences may succumb to economic or scientific models, or be separated from important contexts of invention, risking to reduce research largely to standardized reproduction.

The Transvaluation international symposium in Gothenburg, Sweden, May 21-22 2015, was a response to the current proliferation of evaluation systems and the dominant culture of measurement that comes with it. It searched for ways in which architecture, art, philosophy, anthropology and other areas of research may challenge, together, the very concept and formation of knowledge, stretching and enriching it, hence “transvaluing” material and spiritual research cultures from within, disclosing alternative approaches and strengthening their logics of argumentation within the interdisciplinary frame, with potential to change its systemic conventions.

The symposium aimed to be a high quality event with prominent key note speeches (“statement lectures”), small format seminars (“salons”) and collective forum discussions. The occasion called for an open debate, addressing fundamental strategic questions on research approaches across disciplinary borders, instigating movements for change and searching for alternative, cooperative environments of knowledge, of creation

and invention, of “making and thinking”, indicating ways to trans- and re-value research cultures from within.

Two major themes were focused upon: **Poetics** and **Politics of Value**, both referring to the (re-)making of values in artistic and architectural practice and in human scientific research, and to related political and systemic aspects implied in the topic of (trans)valuing. Both themes were examined through two conceptual lenses: **Worlding** (shaping the world, transforming matter) and **U-topos** (space for speculative thinking and making).

The key note speakers were international experts addressing transvaluation from three different knowledge perspectives: **Arjun Appadurai** from social, global anthropology; **Andrea Phillips** from art researching practice and doctoral education; and **Graham Harman** from speculative realism and material objects.

Researchers, doctoral students and practitioners were invited to submit contributions for discussion at the symposium. Abstracts of maximum 500 words were peer reviewed by the academic committee, and out of almost one hundred proposals about 50% were selected for presentation and development into full papers, some of them revised after the symposium for this digital publication.

Thank you, all participants, for your contributions and for taking the Transvaluation project further!

2. Welcome speech by Peter de Graeve

Affected by the perplexing claims imposed upon universities and art-schools by the so-called Bologna-process, a group of people started investigating the importance of *values* in the creative fields. A group of “people”? A handful of individuals, really, representing nobody or nothing in particular (not even themselves), but all involved in institutes touched by that very process: a teacher, a researcher, an architect, a designer, a painter, a poet, a thinker. That relatively insignificant “We” was in fact an encounter of two events: the insignificance of quantity and the urgency of debate. Initial discussions spontaneously orbited around the Nietzschean concept of *Umwertung*, and somehow that notion stuck. So, there it is, “Transvaluation”. A reminder more than a title. A reminiscence. Not an assignment.

Eagerness to change *all* values (“Umwertung aller Werte”) never was our primary motive, since we’re not engaged in the search for any ontological totalities. Institutional procedures of research output – how rich and scientifically refined they might be – concern us far less than the processes of creativity and inventiveness themselves. We fear the power of procedure over process. What concerned us, at the start of this project of Transvaluation, what energized us, was the question whether contemporary systems of output-measurement, claiming to control the totality of (scientific and/or artistic) value through algorithmic efficiency, can actually give meaning to value-creation. That question still stands. The answer is out there, somewhere. Anyhow, to try to free this Controlling Present (and the overall presence of control) from itself, by some “return of the future”, as Sartre once called it, comes closest to being our true motive... For us, above anything else, Transvaluation was, is and will be (must be?) that remembrance of things future.

So, we set out, on that aleatory path, to define four concepts – *values* themselves – that could, hopefully, guide us to a future turn. Four corners as it were, not so much organizing or arranging the world in itself, as orienting the one(s) travelling through.

Firstly, the *Poetics of Value*. Here, the ancient Greek word of *poièsis* served as the model for our understanding. “Poièsis” means: producing, making, creating, inventing,

imagining, composing... Transvaluation, through the Poetics of Value, seeks to re-transfigure this ancient Greek verb and unfold its original energy, to transform it into the reversal of ossifying systemic evaluation-constraints in the actual world of Academia (of economics, of politics...).

Secondly, the *Politics of Value*. The search for renewal, for originality, for the production of meaning is at the heart of what we call "research", in general. In an artist's, a designer's, a poet's or even a philosopher's view, it is, we believe, the quest for the unexpected in making or transforming matter, as an essentially culture-shaping activity which never aspires to reach stable knowledge or a fixed state, but strives for continuous evolving perfectibility, in human individuals and their interrelated world(s) of "objects", as well as in human societies at large. The relentless procedures of measurement we live and work by didn't bring us to a standstill – quite the contrary, research is more thriving than ever –, but they seem to have embarked us, nevertheless, in a "flow of immobility", compelling the multiple processes of creativity to follow the unique embedment of output-control, as snow-crystals following glaciers down the slope, pushing towards the green valley of economic worth and growth, of technological progress. "Politics of Value" raise the question whether some of the efforts should not go the other way, uphill, facing the skies.

Thirdly, and closely related to the value of politics, the concept "worlding". With it we try to disclose the larger horizon of institutionalized research, as an optical or mental lens, somehow. "World" is not simply an already existing phenomenon, but an ever-occurring "event", a coming-into-being. It is self-forming, translucent, intrinsically political, transformative. World in itself is indifferent, and encompasses valleys and peaks, up-quarks and downhill, soundbites and buildings alike. "Worlding" – as we would like to call our engagement *with* the world, our endeavor to overcome indifference – is a matter of creativity. It is basically choice. We like to think we have just that – choice. Worlding, then, would be the creation of spaces for thinking and creating, as a fundamentally political act.

On the other hand – **fourthly** – creating spaces for speculative thinking and making hopefully will allow the very processes of worlding to cross the horizon of the current systemic reality. These bridging spaces we call "U-topoi", not out of yearning for some traditional utopian grasp on future things, future states of mind, future worlds, but because we're attached, so to speak, to the openness that comes with any given poetical process (the radical "poiësis" at work in creativity). Although being real all the time, these u-topoi are almost never fully present, belonging to the very future(s) we are engaged in and, by being engaged, we put in to play. In that sense, "U-topoi" would rather be Places-of-the-Trans, harboring the desire for the kind of transvaluated, transformed, translucent world that the current university makes us wish for, or long for. They are spaces of intensities, of creative cracks and gaps, of "blank objects" in the system that can be (re)made productive in order to (re)construct and (re)affirm a "university" that fully includes arts & design, poetics and speculation. By creating spaces for speculative thinking and making, the university could once again become the place where values are forged and contested, where materials, energies and ideas are invented and transformed, a *worlding space* as it were – the kind of place *Bologna* dreamt of, but immediately forgot upon waking.

This has been, as I said, an aleatory project so far, prepared by a group of people who don't represent anyone (anymore), for other people – you – who don't represent anything (yet). *Aleatory*, not haphazard. The French poet Mallarmé wrote the famous

words: "A throw of the dice never will abolish chance". His verse can also be considered a key note in what "we" try to accomplish with this Symposium. We threw in the concept of Transvaluation, not because we knew what it means, what numbers will turn up, but because we didn't. The throw of the dice is certainly not meant to change our destiny, let alone to overrule it. For instance, the "places-of-the-Trans" we seek to create, today, tomorrow, will have nothing to do whatsoever with what is commonly called "transhumanism" these days. We do not want our destinies to become mechanical either, driven, shaped, recalculated by intelligent machines, abolishing human chance. Instead, we would like to enable humans to say, together with the poet: "Results of algorithms never will make the world matter." But we do. We *do*. So, we let's try to choose our Trans, let's throw the dice. (Happy speculating!)

3. The Transvaluation project

The overall project "**Transvaluation**", is designed to be an organized and hopefully energizing attempt to overcome the possibility of a scientific mono-culture that is actually threatening to sacrifice the whole of academic inventiveness to systems of calculable, quantitative measurement and which seems to be particularly harmful to many traditional creative disciplines, such as architecture, fine arts, philosophy, literature... Certain sources have already mentioned some kind of "creativity deficit" as a result to this evolution. The proposed debates are designed to be clear-cut: Can alternatives be conceptualized? Can they prove to be fruitful? If so, how should they be structured? How can architecture and fine arts, specifically, contribute to this effort? And how can the sciences – the so-called "hard" as well as the human and social sciences – make their contribution? Can all these sciences and disciplines be convinced to join forces on this? Can university be effectively transformed in this sense?

The project started in 2013 as discussions in a small group of concerned researchers with academic affiliation mainly in art, architecture and philosophy in Brussels and Gothenburg. The core group gradually expanded by new members in interdisciplinary exchange of ideas, and later became the working and review committee for the symposium.

All participants felt the need to develop alternatives to the ongoing measurement- and indicator-driven knowledge culture, where research in architecture, art and several disciplines within humanities and social sciences may succumb to economic or scientific models, or be separated from important contexts of invention, risking to reduce research largely to standardized reproduction. It was a continuous search for ways in which architecture, art, philosophy, anthropology and other areas of creative research could challenge, together, the very concept and formation of knowledge, stretching and enriching it, "transvaluing" material and spiritual research cultures from within, disclosing alternative approaches and strengthening their logics of argumentation within the interdisciplinary frame, with potential to change its systemic conventions.

Ideas developed through a series of small theory seminars and workshop meetings, resulted first in the 'Transvaluation manifesto' (see box) and expanded later into a larger PhD course within the Swedish Research School in Architecture, ResArc, conducted by

Transvaluation manifesto 2013-12-19

Transvaluation: the dream made real ***a manifesto***

The large-scale transformation of higher education – through what is commonly known as the *Bologna Process* – signalled the definitive breakthrough of “globalized” practices of teaching and research in the academic world. Ever since, the pedagogical performance of all institutions involved in this process was thoroughly measured through organized practices of evaluation. This process of formalization has now started to blur the origins of research and higher education, as well as its futures.

Research and education have long abided by the technologies of measurement. We now need to direct the evaluating practices back to their proper purpose and scope, and again take charge of the true challenge: practicing values. This is what we mean by *transvaluation* (as formulated by Nietzsche, Irigaray). Our purpose is to reconceive *politics and poetics of value*, to reorient research towards social, political, and poetical values able to manifest – or *materialize* – the worlds to come. This type of materialization, in turn, we call *worlding* (as examined by Heidegger, Nancy, Spivak): the desire to enact and transform the world as a space of poetics (“making”). Not only should these envisage the *future of materials* – crucial in an age of unrivalled technological discovery – but also the future of *intangibles*, of ideas and ideals, of dreams of a better world, of a more just society, of human equality and liberty... This space of poetics will be expanded by the pursuit of new transformative values that can enrich our societies, our cultures and the world itself. Institutions and disciplines might become transient “docking stations” on a journey towards cultural renovation, unleashed creativity and revitalised political ambition. In connecting the poetics and politics of value with worlding, we hope to create the conditions for a new university, the university *Bologna* once seemed to have promised.

So let us, artists, architects and philosophers involved in research, unshackle Bologna from its measurement systems by inviting students, teachers and researchers outside the routines of traditional practice and reconnecting them to speculative theory and utopian thinking. Let us call upon our competence to constantly remake, reconfigure, recompose and reinterpret complexities, through poetics and practices of value, and through the material. Let us release the creative energies needed to open up imprisoned perspectives. Let us speculate about future knowledge and future values, instead of merely evaluating existing knowledge-procedures. Let us try to invent new forms of creative knowledge and, in doing so, empower communities of common interest (instead of lingering in marketing practices such as “research by design”). To teach as well as to invent means to “learn to see the connections,” as Wittgenstein once said. This illuminates the very meaning of the poetics or politics of value: to look ahead, to see what was still hidden, and to start looking where no-one has looked before.

The future university will be the site where values are forged and contested, the place where materials, energies and ideas are invented and transformed. In that sense, the future university will be a *U-topos*: the kind of space *Bologna* dreamt of, but immediately forgot upon waking. Now the story of the dream must finally be told, because the space it held *can* be realised. We, humans, are dreamers perfected. Let’s use this unique evolutionary gift to start sharing our knowledge and transvaluating our world. ***Transvaluation: the real made dream.***

Peter De Graeve - Nel Janssens - Johan Öberg - Rolf Hughes - Mattias Kärrholm - Catharina Dyrssen

the group at the Department of Architecture, Chalmers, in 2013-2014. The course was a step towards addressing a larger community of engaged researchers across national and disciplinary borders, through a symposium aiming at "high quality conversations" in combined formats: well prepared cross-readings of papers for discussions in seminar and workshop "salons", "statement lectures" by prominent international keynote speakers also participating in the symposium activities at large, informal exchanges of ideas and a lively final debate.

4. The main concern: On evaluation

With the measurement trends, we could recognize how pedagogical and research performance of all institutions involved in this process are being thoroughly measured through organized practices of evaluation that largely stemmed from exact sciences and do not always fit the creative disciplines. By now, the process of formalization of evaluation is starting to blur the origins of research and education, *as well as its futures*. Academic research and education are increasingly dominated by a measurement-culture and the proliferation of evaluation systems that comes with it. In response to this, we feel the need to direct the evaluating practices back to their proper purpose and scope, and – possibly at the same time – *forward*, to its future mission and true challenge: practicing values. This is what we mean by *transvaluation* (as formulated by Nietzsche, Irigaray).

The need to move from "extensive" measurements (as proposed in the Dublin Descriptors and/or in the Frascati Manuals) to new forms of "intensity"-driven research clearly stresses this challenge and – at the same time – historic vocation of Art and Architecture, as for much of the Humanities (the "soft" or "slow" sciences). Hence, the symposium outlines the possibilities for *alternative, cooperative environments of knowledge, of creation and invention, of "making and thinking"*.

In the long run, the Transvaluation project envisages to conceive (critically systematic, but open-ended) frameworks for alternative forms of evaluation that, apart from being immediately applicable to artistic research and research by design, might become a source of inspiration for the humanities as well.

To move against the overall flattening "Cartesian" measurements, while looking for more qualifying and, thus, transvaluing, poetic and political ways of "assessing" creative practices is the ultimate goal of this project. This should lead to the methodological formulation of what "purely material intensities" for Arts and Architecture could look like, and how both fields could start (re)discovering their own "poetic intensities" and, finally, start shaping or, at least, disclosing, unlocking, a world of "political intensities". All this is driven by the effort to conceptualize and prepare the implementation on a wider academic level of such alternative forms of research and research-evaluation.

The first and most important concern of Transvaluation is to start a broad debate on the following subjects: (1) the consequences of the (monopolization of) efficiency-standards in the spheres of science and creativity – a tendency reinforced by the Bologna educational system – and (2) the search for viable alternatives.

Efficiency-driven systems of evaluation are less innocent as one may think. They often hide an "intellectual conformity", having nothing to do anymore with "the animating spirit of discovery" and tending towards "the mono-culture of a discipline grown too large and the accompanying failure of imagination", in one word: to the "*Big Creativity Deficit*" (Murphy 2013). The rapidly risen and universalized practices of evaluation-controlled

knowledge-production are thought to have led, during "the past forty years [to] a significant decline [of creativity] in the arts and sciences" (Murphy 2013).

"The exhaustion of creative science and arts" seems to have a hard social and political counterpart in different forms of exclusion, typical of this "age of globalization": knowledge-systems are increasingly, and anonymously, controlling us from above, whereas we actually need a "globalization from below", where imagination – no longer being "a matter of individual genius, an escapism from ordinary life or just a dimension of aesthetics" – rather becomes a manifold "faculty through which collective patterns of dissent and *new design for collective life* emerges" (Appadurai 2000).

Being part of a larger, already functioning project, this symposium seeks to initiate the debate, starting from the primarily architectural and artistic experience of working with concrete "matter" and being, as a consequence, entirely involved in "processes of making". However, we believe that these very processes of making and transforming matter are also crucial to the so-called hard sciences, and to the human and social sciences. That is why we would like to invite representatives of all of them to participate in this debate.

The implication on the politics of value is discussed by Appadurai as a profound change from a universal perspective to a "grass root" research imagination (Appadurai 2000). By exploring values and evaluation-systems from the Transvaluation perspective we aim at the invention of alternative contexts of creation and research, to be applied, initially, to the fields of Arts and Architecture.

Recognizing *poetics of value* and *politics of value* as perspectives possessing a potential to redirect and transform the current researching system of universities, a range of aspects was kept in mind to be used as guidelines and topics for panel debate. Hence, the project seeks to contribute to the development of artistic research by:

- capturing and directing the signals emerging internationally of academics resisting current research practices and evaluating measurement
- formulating alternatives to the predominant academic evaluation practices and creating new creative spaces for communities of researchers in Arts and Architecture (and beyond)
- building knowledging communities from within (communities of interest and invention)
- preparing a shift from evaluating practices to "practicing values"
- redirecting academic fields towards the original purposes of the Bologna-process
- preparing the invention of new learning and research methodologies by challenging the current formation of knowledge
- strengthening the fundamentals of creative knowledge building (poetic intensities) and of human-centred (so-called "u-topian") application (political intensities)

5. The symposium format and themes

Long abstracts of maximum 500 words were peer reviewed by the academic committee, and out of almost one hundred proposals about 50% were selected for presentation and development into full papers, some of them revised after the symposium for this digital publication.

The symposium aims to be a "call for debate", initiating a movement for change, emphasizing conversation and discussion rather than paper presentations. Participants are invited to cooperate in exercises of speculative thinking, aiming at creating new places and new spaces for future fundamental research. The ambition is to form "high

quality conversations" centered on statement-lectures delivered by top level keynote speakers, small salons where participants discuss each other's papers (the grouping will be done beforehand and members of a group receive each other's papers for reading and commenting), and forum debates on the key themes.

Our purpose is to reconceive politics and poetics of value, to reorient research towards social, political, and poetical values able to manifest – or *materialize* – the worlds to come. This type of materialization is already implied in the "mundane" activities in Art, Design, Poetics, Speculation (...), all existing as modes of "worlding" (as examined by Heidegger, Nancy, Spivak), as desires to enact and transform the world as a space of poetics ("making"). The idea of "Worlding" refers to the fundamental task of research to "think and, somehow, start living new worldly shapes" (Spivak, Nancy, White, e.a.). It entails enrichment and stretching of the concept of knowledge and the academic culture it creates

Poetics of Value. Using the – historical – familiarity with making and transforming matter of certain disciplines, we introduce the concept of a *Poetics of Value*. "Poetics" itself refers to the ancient Greek practice of poiësis (producing, making, creating, composing), whereas the focus on "values" stands for the desired reversal of systemic evaluation-practices in Academia. Thereby, Poetics of Value isn't merely describing the relation between an individual (artist, designer, philosopher, scientist) and the matter she or he is transforming; it also takes into account the inventive collective effort, communities all over the world will have to be engaged in as a "re-" and "transvaluing" response to the challenging problems of our rapidly globalizing societies and economies.

Politics of Value. That is why we simultaneously call for a *Politics of Value* (following Appadurai, 1988), which is concerned with surpassing the possibly atomic relation between researchers and their objects, towards more complex meanings and frameworks of human transactions, attributions and motivations (Appadurai 1988, 1996). "Practicing value" has an obvious ethical dimension, emanating from the making or transforming of matter. This essentially culture-shaping activity doesn't necessarily aspire to stable knowledge or fixed states, but strives for continuous evolving perfectibility. Hence, the creative processes involved lie beyond sheer knowledge-accumulation, since new or unforeseen artistic forms and designs do not necessarily increase or diminish knowledge, nor do they primarily seek to do so.

Both the Poetics and the Politics of Value are perspectives directed towards an intensive rethinking and redesigning of human relations with the world. In order to get a better view on both perspectives we propose two specific "lenses": *Worlding* and *U-topos*. They represent a particular kind of practicing values that enables the enrichment and stretching of the concept of knowledge and the academic culture it creates.

Worlding. Its purpose is to explore the political dimension of making (bringing into being) of values, i.e. the evolvment of values as something that transcends the material(ity) through the act of making. It is a dimension which involves critical rethinking, inventing, recontextualisation and other central capacities of reflection through design and art. ~~a strongly creative action, requiring design thinking.~~ These kind of activities also give art and design their specific place in the world, their identity as well as their dynamics (their diversity). "World" isn't simply an existing phenomenon, but an "ever occurring event" , a coming into being. It "forms itself". So, its political dimension is intrinsically connected to the poetical, to transformation".

The idea of "Worlding" refers to the fundamental task of research to "think and, somehow, start living new worldly shapes" (Spivak, Nancy, White, e.a.). Goodman states

that worlds are as much made as they are found and that to know a world one must make a world. Comprehension and creation happen together (Goodman 1978). Worlding can be considered a specific approach to knowledge that is inextricably linked to creative action, to poetics as a making, a bringing into being, a designerly way of knowing. Because worlding is the recognition and creation of multiple actual life worlds, a diversity of right and even conflicting worlds in the making, against ontological singularity and universalism. With Goodman we move from the idea of a world to multiple worlds being simultaneously in the making.

U-Topos. Whereas worlding represents the action, U-Topos represents the space for this action to take place. It marks a site of operation, a site for the politics of values to emerge. The concept of "U-topos" on the other hand is introduced as a site for speculative thinking-making, and at the same time a point of departure, a configuration of perspectives and set of actions (Janssens 2012). U-topos is an environmental focus on new realities to be crafted, on knowledge to be brought about through the making, through material designing, an "artefactual" reality, "a repertoire by which the world can be re-imagined, and in being re-imagined be re-made" (Law 2004).

In contrast to preset images of "Utopia", the U-topos encourages scholars and artists to think the not-yet visible and the not-yet valuable, a thinking/making propelled by individual and shared, collective curiosities, towards the formulation of future values and learning needs, allowing different topics, concepts, themes, perspectives to collide and combine. The U-topos allows the processes of worlding to expand the horizon of possibilities by consciously using syncretism (Janssens 2012), the possibilities to combine and allow elements and aspects of seemingly disparate and contradictory character to collide, within a university that again includes the art and design (De Graeve, 2010).

In the U-topos also Harman's concept of "allure" starts to play an active role as "the principle of revolution as such, since only allure make quantum leaps from one state of reality into the next by generating a new relation between objects" (Harman 2005). Typical for the U-topos is that it tests its principles by practice, showing how the theory works in the imagined practice (Janssens 2012).

6. Key note speakers

The keynote speakers are internationally highly renowned experts within their respective fields. They have expressed their concerned interest in the symposium theme of transvaluation, and with their input from three difference perspectives, their participation is most valuable for the debate.

Arjun Appadurai — world famous social-cultural anthropologist, discussing cultural activity as the social imaginary forming modernity and global cultural flows into dimensions of e.g. ethno-scapes and mediascapes. From a critical perspective on the global academic system, Appadurai has created the New School University in New York, emphasising academic freedom, tolerance and experimentation. He is also founder of the academic journal Public Culture.

Andrea Phillips — internationally renowned designer, curator and director of the Doctoral Research Programmes in Fine Art and Curating at Goldsmiths College, London University. Phillips also directs several international interdisciplinary research projects and publishes widely on art, curating, public space, and economic and social construction of publics within contemporary art, for instance how the art market shapes artists' careers and public exhibition.

Graham Harman — contemporary philosopher of metaphysics and professor at the American University in Cairo, Egypt. With outset in speculative realism and his concept of “object oriented philosophy”, Harman investigates alternatives to the linguistic turn in Western philosophy, hereby evoking extensive international debate on hermeneutic relation to the (technological) world of objects and their role in aesthetics, the market and society.

7. Core working group, review committee and session moderators

Peter de Graeve – Philosopher, Professor at Faculty of Fine Arts University of Leuven & guest professor at Chalmers University of Technology, Department of Architecture. Transvaluation research focus: Philosophy of Nietzsche, Heidegger, Deleuze, concept of transvaluation, philosophy in the arts, concepts of poetics and politics of value.

Nel Janssens – Architect, PhD, Lecturer at KU Leuven, Faculty of Architecture, Campus Sint-Lucas Brussels & Chalmers University of Technology, Department of Architecture. Transvaluation research focus: Urbanism, unsettlement, utopian thinking, architectural theory, worlding, poetics and politics of value.

Catharina Dyrssen – Professor in Architecture and Design Methods at the Department of Architecture, Chalmers. Her research covers three main themes: artistic and design based research methods; design thinking in urbanism and planning; and intersections of architecture, music, urban space and sound. Transvaluation research focus: poetics and politics of value, art and public space, (architectural) educational aspects, artistic research, worlding.

Mattias Kärrholm – Professor in Architectural Theory, Dept of Architecture and the Built Environment, LTH. Research focus: Urban studies, territoriality, action network theory, production of space, urban space and social processes, urban and architectural theory. Transvaluation research focus: Poetics and politics of value, phenomenology, Actor Network Theory, subject-object relations, territoriality.

Hélène Frichot – Associate Professor in Critical Studies in Architecture, School of Architecture and the Built Environment, KTH, Stockholm, and co-curator of the Architecture+Philosophy public lecture series in Melbourne, Australia since 2005 (<http://architecture.testpattern.com.au>). Transvaluation research focus: Poetics and politics of value, Deleuze & art and architecture, acts of writing and making, learning processes.

Rolf Hughes – Poet, Literary critic, Professor in Design Theory and Practice-Based Research, research leader at Stockholm University College of the Arts, and former Senior Professor in Research Design at the Sint-Lucas School of Architecture (Brussels & Ghent, Belgium). Transvaluation research focus: Poetics of value, writing and literature, writing into architecture and the arts, artistic processes, art theory, artistic research.

Andrej Slávik – PhD in History of Ideas, University of Gothenburg, Department of Literature, History of Ideas, and Religion, and Postdoc at Chalmers University of Technology within the strong research environment Architecture in the Making. His research attempts to survey the consequences of the application of digital technology in architecture and urban planning, with emphasis on so-called parametric architecture, from the perspective of contemporary history.

Julia Fredriksson – Main contact person for symposium content, programme, papers etc. Julia has a PhD in Architecture and urban theory, and is currently a researcher at Chalmers Architecture.

With special thanks also to **Nidal Yousif**, administrator for symposium facilities, symposium assistants **Anna Kika**, **Martina Melegari** and **Kyoung Kim**, and to **Kristina Graner**, librarian and scientific communicator at Chalmers Library, for conference support and editing of the publication.