

Manfredo Tafuri and the Critique of Architectural Production

ELIE HADDAD

Lebanese American University

*The cards can be reshuffled and to them added many that were intentionally left out: the game is destined to continue.*¹

If there is one figure of architecture in our times whose name is intertwined with the problematic posed by architecture in relation to other fields of cultural production, then this would be Manfredo Tafuri. Tafuri's work through four decades of research, teaching and writing, has been fundamentally based on this understanding that architecture forms an integral, although never simplistically delineated, part of a larger whole that encompasses the aesthetic, political and social dimensions of human existence, a whole that is subject to the forces of history, and to the ideological winds that permeate and transform human praxis, all this latently based on a dialectical model inspired by the related yet conflicting Hegelian, Marxist and Nietzschean visions of history. Although I do not pretend in this short paper to summarize Tafuri's complex theoretical positions, the aim is to re-trace some of these Tafurian paths in attempting to address the question posed by the conference organizers, which hits on the essential issues addressed by Tafuri in his writings.²

To the question of borrowing ideas or methods from other fields for the purpose of adding a superficial layer to the practice, Tafuri would have answered with his intransigent disapproval of the mixing between the tools of the architect and those of the historian, the latter being solely entrusted with this interpretation of the historical significance of architecture.³

Yet to the more complex question of the relation of architecture itself to other forms of cultural production, Tafuri's writings in themselves are indicative of the layering of multiple cultural sources, transcending the boundaries of normative architectural histories to sug-

gest an indissociable link between architecture and other fields of human culture, attempting to re-assert architecture's role within a comprehensive vision of aesthetics and politics.

The question that follows is: can this Tafurian "project", in its complexities and often pessimistic tone, still provide a model through which to understand and reflect on the developments of architecture in an era when the political and economic have merged to offer a single system to which no realistic opposition can still be waged, unlike the 60's and 70s when resistance to leveling discourses and practices seemed still possible? Can Tafuri's discourse still offer us possible means by which we can gauge the transformations of contemporary architecture in the light of worldwide globalization in cultural productions of all kinds?

The continuing validity of the Tafurian critique could be argued by the fact that the current trend of globalization is not a recent phenomenon, but can be traced to the Eighteenth century, with its developments in mechanization that triggered the process of industrialization across the nations of Europe, subsequently spreading throughout the world. The same process which served as the framework for Karl Marx's critique of Capitalism and of the rising Bourgeoisie class can be applied today to the critique of Globalization and the new class of world entrepreneurs which has replaced the old Bourgeoisie. Yet the new class of entrepreneurs has not only stripped the Bourgeoisie of its economic privileges, but more substantially altered the very conception of the "city" as the natural repository of capital and the locus of powers. This transformation has resulted in urbanistic terms in an opposition between the city and the spreading suburban centers, which replaced the city by a constellation of "hubs". In some cases, this simple opposition between center and periphery no longer

accounts for the actual patterns emerging within this "global" economy, but rather simplifies a more complex condition which may be better understood as a superposition of different layers operating sometimes within the space of the old "city" itself, rather than as distinct geographical entities.⁴

Architecture as a discipline finds itself today at the margins of these important changes, unlike the previous centuries, where it found itself at the center, solicited to develop new building types for a new society (factories, workers housing etc.), as well as proposing its own programs of social reforms, all the while navigating between two opposite tendencies that permeated its activity: an architecture of resistance [Ruskin, Morris, etc...] versus a collaboration with the new economical order [The Avant Garde: Sant Elia, Le Corbusier, The Bauhaus, etc...].

Today, what is the position of architecture towards this global capital expansion? I argue that recent developments have shown the total eclipse of resistance after the complete co-option of architecture in the service of capital during the late phases of modernism, through post-modernism and into the contemporary developments. In fact, this collaboration transcends any particular style as it continues to be subject to the same process of production. In other words, even the most daring proposals of the last decades appear to be simply formal manoeuvres, without any attending social or political role.

MANFREDO TAFURI AND THE ROLE OF ARCHITECTURAL CRITICISM

Manfredo Tafuri appeared on the architectural scene during the momentous period of the 1960's in a post-war European context still searching for its lost political and cultural role in the world. He emerged within a movement around Quaroni and Rogers, which attempted to establish a new role for architecture and architectural criticism at a time of crisis. Tafuri's work in the 60's reflected his wide scope of interests and his comprehensive vision of architecture across history, from the study of the Renaissance, to Mannerist architecture, and culminating with what is considered his first major theoretical work: *Teorie e storia dell' architettura*.⁵

Ideas, informed by the complex layers of philosophy, politics, aesthetics, and social sciences, are central to the Tafurian edifice, although they are always in a precarious condition of temporary constructions, a virtual scaffold within which architecture is scrutinized and mercilessly examined, at times probing deep into the

"thing-in-itself" to uncover its myths and delusions or to celebrate its rare moments of epiphany measured on the scale of historical relevance, at other times to examine the scaffolding itself and its relation to the thing it carries, dismantling it and re-erecting alternative scaffolds.

In 1973 Tafuri followed with his second theoretical work, *Progetto e utopia*, which proposed to examine more concretely architecture in relation to capitalist development.⁶ With this book, and its follower in the series *La Sfera e il labirinto*, the trilogy confirmed Tafuri as the most important critic of architecture, despite his own rejection later of the notion of criticism.⁷ In *Progetto e utopia*, Tafuri proposed to examine architecture in relation to capitalist development, tracing this development back to the century of the Enlightenment and the "crisis of reason" perceived in Laugier's natural city as well as Piranesi's *Carceri*. The traditional city was the locus where the crisis played itself out, and had to contend with the developing chaos as it attempted to redefine its new order.⁸ The ultimate confrontation with this condition of modernity would develop in the Twentieth century with the various Avant Garde movements in their two opposite trends: one which affirmed the validity of intellectual work within the reality of industrialism, the other negating this role and claiming an autonomy of "pure ideology".⁹ Tafuri pointed to the inevitable assimilation of the former under the capitalist system whereas the latter took the aspect of a false consciousness, reflecting back on the same reality it tried to escape.¹⁰

The paradoxical position of architecture was exemplified in the city, and specifically in Hilberseimer's experiments on social organization. Here architecture as the manipulation of aesthetic forms, a basis Le Corbusier could not even escape, was critically challenged by the machine-production of the collective housing projects, *the Siedlungen*, and the transformation of the role of the architect as a mere organizer, at best, of the cycle of production. Tafuri seemed to deplore already then, in a way reminiscent of the positions of another major cultural critic before him, Theodor Adorno, this reduction of architecture to the habitation cell and its dissolution into simple measure, as exemplified in Hilberseimer's rejection of architecture as a means of creative research.¹¹ In his critique, Tafuri alluded to the contemporary Avant Garde, which he paradoxically criticized for its vain experimentation in the articulation of an architectural language. This attempted experiment with language in the post-war period was a consequence of the emerging semiotic discourse in other fields, which eventually filtered into architecture proper.¹² The critique of this "neo-Avant Garde" was

illustrated by Aymonino's Gallarate quarter, ASNO-VA's model for the Palace of the Soviets, and Yamana's World Trade Center.¹³ The choice of these different examples seemed to imply a fatalistic resignation which no longer depended on the nature of the form, no matter how resolved or aesthetically relevant.

In *The Sphere and the Labyrinth*, Tafuri further sharpened his criticism, singling out the main actors of this "architecture dans le boudoir".¹⁴ He criticized the architecture of "dissonance" of James Stirling, Peter Eisenman and many others; lumping them together with the technological utopia of Archigram and the confused signs of Venturi.¹⁵ These "pathological attempts of a bourgeoisie in anguish", in his words, pointed resolutely to itself in self-interrogation:

The "disenchanted avant garde" completely absorbed in exploring from the comfort of its charming boudoirs the profundities of the philosophy of the unexpected writes down, over and over again, its own reactions under the influence of drugs prudently administered... With a smile we have to catalog them in the imaginary museum of the bad conscience of our "small age", to be used as rearview mirrors by whoever recognizes himself to be caught in the midst of a crisis that obliges him to remain stuck in the minefield of the "evil present".¹⁶

As mentioned previously, these radical positions which seem to imply no way out, are ideologically related to the *Frankfurt School*, and especially that of one of its important members: Theodor Adorno.¹⁷ Adorno, represented a radical position within this group of Marxist thinkers, rejecting the reification of *Kultur* to a product for mass consumption, while insisting on its role within a framework that escapes any totalization.¹⁸ Adorno's "negative dialectic" maintained that artistic activity should always be held accountable to its epistemological role as a means of social criticism while simultaneously being obliged to resist reification in the capitalist world of consumer culture.¹⁹

In one of his rare discussions of architecture, Adorno criticized the reduction of architecture to "functionalism" which in his opinion resulted in an architecture of "deficient monotony". Adorno presented Adolf Loos's rejection of the ornamental function in architecture as an example of a Bourgeois reaction against eroticism and the pleasure principle, arguing instead for an architecture that would constantly negotiate a fine line between an uncritical espousal of ornament and a radical functional position that would eliminate it.²⁰

Faced with this dialectical opposition between the functional and the ornamental, or in other terms between the economic imperative and the aesthetic supplement, architecture was condemned to negotiate its role through "constant aesthetic reflection". In another thesis written with Max Horkheimer, Adorno had articulated a position against the architecture of false technological pretensions. In this essay which painted the culture industry as one of "mass-deception," he criticized the condition of contemporary urbanism:

...the older houses just outside the concrete city centers look like slums, and the new bungalows on the outskirts are at one with the flimsy structures of world fairs in their praise of technical progress and their built-in demand to be discarded after a short while like empty food cans. Yet the city housing designed to perpetuate the individual as a supposedly independent unit in a small hygienic dwelling make him all the more subservient to his adversary—the absolute power of capitalism.²¹

It is important to notice in this case Adorno's refusal to accept the ideological premises of Modernism, which pretended to solve the social urban problems by proposing precisely these socialist housing projects where dwelling is reduced to a functional arrangement of units. Frederic Jameson saw in Tafuri's intransigent critique a manifestation of a "dialectical history" where enclaves of resistance are impossible, and compared Tafuri's position to Adorno's criticism of music which shifted the attention from the subject to the object, as well as Barthes's realization of the impossibility of an ideology-free writing which led him to postulate a *degree-zero* writing.

Jameson interpreted Tafuri's critique as a degree-zero architecture, resigned in the end to the celebration of the emblematic Miesian silence, the "stoic renunciation of action against the neo-Gramscian maneuvers destined to prepare for an eventual seizure of power".²² For Tafuri it seems, as for Adorno in general, architecture should remain an instrument of knowledge, a means of creative research, it must neither relinquish its cultural role nor become a mere product of disputation that would subsequently dissolve into the capitalist system of production.

Here lies the problematic situation of Tafuri, which is emblematic of the problematic of architecture itself, condemned between a position that, short of the re-examination of architecture in relation to the means of production and the whole economic system on which it depends, would fail to overcome the challenges posed

by modernity; and an opposite position that threatens to strip it of its aesthetic function in a system ruled by the necessities of production.

THE URBAN CONDITION AS A FRAMEWORK: FROM LE CORBUSIER TO REM KOOLHAAS

Where does this leave us today, in the face of a global network of architectural production that spreads from East Asia to the Americas, where architecture is marketed principally for its image value and its “levelling” capacities? And couldn’t we see this process already at work in the dissemination of what Philip Johnson labeled as the “International Style” in the 1930’s, across vast areas of the industrial and developing world, and which would subsequently be at the center of Tafuri’s analysis?

In his critique of *‘Design and Capitalist Development’*²³, Tafuri initiated the deconstruction of the Modernist project. In it, he reserved a chapter to Le Corbusier’s project in Algiers, which was given the emblematic title of *The Crisis of Utopia*.²⁴ What are the reasons for singling out this particular urban proposal? And what are the lessons it may offer for our reading of contemporary urban projects?

For Tafuri, the urban manipulations of Algiers testified to a higher resolution of previous urban proposals by Le Corbusier, unparalleled in the history of modern urbanism for its unity and complexity. The proposal for Algiers showed in his view a maturity in dealing with the question of urbanism beyond the confines of the traditional city synthesizing both the ideological and formal attributes of the problem. Yet its eventual failure to materialize could be related to many factors, most importantly to the international crisis of modern architecture, a crisis that Tafuri located at the beginnings of the international modernist project, in the early 1930’s:

The crisis of modern architecture begins in the very moment in which its natural consignee—large industrial capital—goes beyond the fundamental ideology, putting aside the superstructures. From that moment on, architectural ideology no longer has any purpose. The obstinate insistence on seeing its own hypotheses realized becomes either a surpassing of outdated realities or an importunate disturbance.²⁵

In Algiers, in fact, Le Corbusier’s rational grid of the *Ville Radieuse* was fundamentally transformed to suit the particular cultural and physical landscape, even

admitting an eclecticism of styles under the canopy of the levelling superstructure, with units of Moorish style, Louis XVI alongside the Pavillon de L’esprit Nouveau juxtaposed in a display reminiscent of the palaces of the Eighteenth century. In Algiers the dichotomy between modernity and tradition is apparently resolved in the attempt to preserve the Casbah while simultaneously proposing to “urbanize” the city with a domineering technological feat.²⁶ Yet as Tafuri noted, these vain attempts to affirm architecture’s role within the new political and economic order were doomed.

The Algiers experiment would compare rather modestly to the contemporary visions of Rem Koolhaas for the “metropolis.” Koolhaas has emerged as the indisputable visionary of a new direction in urbanism after Post-Modernism, disseminated across Europe and America, and even beyond, around the world. To what can we attribute this Koolhaas phenomenon? The question is not simply that of a tactful response to contemporary urban challenges at a global scale, but may be seen as a re-evaluation of the modernist project to operate within the system of late-capitalism. Thus, on the one hand, a re-interpretation of the architectural object in relation to contemporary paradigms [iconic role of the cinematographic image] coupled with its inscription within a larger urban framework in tune with the dynamics of a new economic reality. Koolhaas’s first theoretical investigations in fact centered on New York city, read as a response to economic factors, and not as a reduced history of architectural moments.²⁷ What already interested Koolhaas at that time, was the unhindered and almost natural development of architecture in response to factors outside of normative histories.

Koolhaas was able to see that such patterns of development, propelled by economic factors, would become the reigning paradigm of urban developments around the world, as opposed to the conservative ideology of urbanism in the tradition-oriented cities of Europe. Later on, controversial cases would be brought to light, such as Atlanta, as model urban centers of the future. What fascinated Koolhaas was again this ability of capital to produce, unhindered, a new dynamic and constantly shifting order, made possible by the erasure of history, as in the case of Atlanta, and the emergence of new forms of practice, as exemplified in the person of the architect-developer, John Portman.²⁸ Few years later, Koolhaas presented five examples of projects in which his firm was involved, and that would usher this new phase of practice at the extra-large scale: La Defense, Melun-Senart and Lille in France; and Yokohama and Minato Mirai in Japan. In these projects, Koolhaas was able to identify a new emerging typology

"[...] which we probably will have to recognize soon as the dominant typology, together with lite-urbanism, of the near future: a completely inarticulate container building with no architectural pretensions, which is just there to accommodate certain processes or offices and which simply represents a massive quantity of square footage imposed on an urban site without any more positive contribution."²⁹

It is important here to recall Adorno's critique of the periphery and its discardable architecture, or Tafuri's critique of Hilberseimer's neutral condensers designed as simple solutions to a technical and economic imperative.

Koolhaas's latest publication takes this point even further. A compilation of "research" material and articles by various experts, arranged under the title *Mutations*, it argues that the role of the architect is no longer central to the process of contemporary development, which is mainly subject to economic factors. This constitutes Koolhaas's most explicit espousal of globalization as an order in which architects, consciously or subconsciously, are doomed to operate albeit with a reduced value. This gives the architect another opportunity for a flight forward, in a sense, which is not devoid of its psychedelic thrills. Thus, for the first time after Robert Venturi's modest espousal of the banality of popular culture on Main Street, another manifesto with far more reaching resonance celebrates what has been heretofore taboo in architectural culture: the anonymous and banal towers that mushroom in urban and suburban landscapes in China, Nigeria and other parts of a fast-developing world, amidst the poverty generated by these very acts, within a cocktail of iconic images of a pop culture invading traditional ghettos.

The exhilaration is palpable, and the conclusion, though not explicit can be sensed: the architect or urbanist of the Twenty First century is again called upon to participate in this adventure without limits. As Jean Attali, one of the authors, expressed it:

The city has definitely ceased to be the object and the end. [...] This situation allows for more transformations, indeed metamorphoses, than the models inherited from the history of cities could suggest or predict: a city spreading like an aerosol through the countryside, a city rising like a bamboo forest after a tropical storm, a city niched between cities, filling the interstices of former agglomerations, a city that does not speak its name.³⁰

And Koolhaas to confirm:

Cities like Singapore probably represent the truly generic condition of the contemporary city: history has been almost completely blotted out, the entire territory has become completely artificial, the urban issue does not endure in any kind of stability beyond a relatively short period of time.³¹

This optimism may be compared to the "naiveté" of the earlier German Avant-Garde, which Tafuri had pointed to, and its attempt to overcome the anguish of the modern intellectual by associating itself with the work ethic of an emerging proletariat.³² In this instance, however, it is to the opposite "ethic" that the contemporary intellectual is called upon to espouse: the ethic of the anonymous operator reacting to unpredictable economic forces, in their glorified capacity to level landscapes in the physical, economic and cultural terms, while the "city of peace" is replaced by the *city of exacerbated difference*, driven by economic desires.³³ In more recent works, especially the two volumes of *The Project on the City*, Koolhaas expands his theory to additional themes, celebrating the triumphant new forms of shopping and other activities of a consumer-oriented world.³⁴

CONCLUSION

In the face of the difficulties of this position in which contemporary architecture finds itself with respect to praxis, either succumbing to the dynamics of a global economy, or in an even more desperate condition of nostalgic return to an idealized past, the answer to this dilemma may be found by maintaining a vigilant form of criticism, as exemplified in the work of Manfredo Tafuri. While Tafuri's particular *penchants* towards certain forms, as in his celebrated resignation to the laconic silence in Mies's work, should not become foundation stones that rigidly confine this type of criticism, his method and his vision of history, and the role of architecture in it, should still serve as guidelines for our objectives, whereas the surrender to the economic imperatives would definitely remove the last foundation of an architecture that aims towards higher social and political ideals, and may in a sense, sound the death of architecture.

In Koolhaas's work we may still discover the other side of a theoretical practice that nevertheless, and despite its zealous thrust towards a projected hyperreality, seeks to recover from the modernist project some useful building blocks, in a sense also resisting the reification of "architecture" into a simple technical practice. Architecture appears to be, in both cases, still called upon to continue its engagement with the world, and through

this provide a richer discourse on the social, the political, the aesthetic and the economic.

This position suggests a revision of the avant garde's historical effort in proposing new models of urban and extra-urban development, within the capitalist system of production, while remaining critical to the eventual implications of such proposals. This position may not answer Tafuri's critique; yet it does answer to others, from Althusser to Lefebvre and Jameson, who maintain the possibility of a critical practice that does not await the arrival of the future, especially when the future appears to be eternally postponed. Architecture is then challenged to overcome these difficult conditions, while negotiating within its own disciplinary conventions and remaining engaged with its historical projects. The other option, i.e the total submission to the economic and political imperatives would be an indication of the final acquiescence to a culture of banality and generic forms, and the irrevocable dissolution of architecture into a landscape of disenchantment.

NOTES

- ¹ Manfredo Tafuri. *The Sphere and the Labyrinth*. MIT, 1990 [21]
- ² [...] But have ideas, formed in art and various other fields such as science, philosophy, engineering, linguistics, sociology and psychology advanced the art of building? If so, in what ways have features, acquired from investigations in other fields, resolved questions or clarified situations essential to the specific nature of architecture and its intrinsic tasks? Or, in contrast, have appropriated ideas and the desire for novelty marginalized fundamental aspects of the discipline of architecture?" Scott Poole and Pia Sarpaneva. ACSA International Conference announcement, 2003.
- ³ "The greatest confusion in the "criticism" of architecture is in fact due to the magazines attached to the profession: architects should do architecture and historians should do history." Manfredo Tafuri, interview with Richard Ingersoll, published in *Design Book Review*, Spring 1986, reprinted in *Casabella*, 619-620, Jan-Feb. 1995 [99].
- ⁴ Saskia Sassen. "Analytic Borderlands: Economy and Culture in the Global City" in *Columbia Documents of Architecture & Theory*, Volume Three, New York, 1993.
- ⁵ published in Italian in 1968, translated into Spanish in 1973, then French 1976, and English 1979.
- ⁶ Bari: Laterza & Figli, 1973. translated into English as *Architecture and Utopia: Design and Capitalist Development*, Cambridge: MIT Press, 1976. For an overview of Tafuri's beginnings see Tomas Llorens, "Manfredo Tafuri: Neo Avant Garde and History" in *Architectural Design*, 6/7. London:1981.
- ⁷ "There is no criticism, only history" in interview with Richard Ingersoll, reprinted in *Casabella* 619-620, Jan-Feb. 1995 [97-99].
- ⁸ Tafuri contends that these theories on the city as a natural phenomenon tend to negate the dichotomy between city and countryside, a classic marxist polarity. Tafuri, 1976 [Chapter 1].
- ⁹ Tafuri, 1976 (65-66).
- ¹⁰ Tafuri, 1976 (94-96).
- ¹¹ Tafuri, 1976 (106-108).
- ¹² Tafuri, 1976 [Chapter 7].
- ¹³ A critique of the skyscraper appears later in the *Sphere and the Labyrinth*. Cambridge: MIT, 1990 In the chapter "The New Babylon" Tafuri sees the gaiety of the Chrysler building being replaced by the "Dinosaur City", a "triumphal march of urban industrial America toward imperialist expansion" supported by the urban ideologies of the early pioneers of the skyscraper. (188-189).
- ¹⁴ Tafuri, 1990 [Chapter 8].
- ¹⁵ He saw in Venturi's work an "... architecture [that] is dissolved into a deconstructed system of ephemeral signs. In place of communication, there is a flux of information, in place of architecture as language, there is an attempt to reduce it to a mass medium, without any ideological residues, in place of an anxious effort to restructure the urban system, there is a disenchanting acceptance of reality, bordering on extreme cynicism." (285-286).
- ¹⁶ Tafuri, 1990 (289-290).
- ¹⁷ The *Institut Fur Sozialforschung*, which developed in the late 1920's as an independent entity around the *University of Frankfurt*, included among its members Theodor Adorno, Walter Benjamin, Max Horkheimer and Herbert Marcuse. The *Frankfurt School* critics addressed all aspects of modern culture from literature to film, music, and politics. For more on the Frankfurt School see Martin Jay's *The Dialectical Imagination: A History of the Frankfurt School and the Institute of Social Research, 1923-1950*. Univ. of California Press, 1973; and Rolf Wiggershaus's *The Frankfurt School: Its History, Theories and Political Significance*. MIT Press, 1994.
- ¹⁸ Martin Jay. *Marxism and Totality: The Adventures of a Concept from Lukacs to Habermas*. Univ. of California Press, 1984 (242-243).
- ¹⁹ Martin Jay as well as Phil Slater and Robin Ridless, agree on this point. In addition to Jay (op cit.) see Robin Ridless *Ideology and Art*. New York: P. Lang, 1984. and Phil Slater. "The Aesthetic Theory of the Frankfurt School" in *Working Papers in Cultural Studies*, 6. Birmingham: Univ. Center for Contemporary Cultural Studies. 1977.
- ²⁰ Theodor Adorno. "Functionalism Today". Lecture at the meeting of the *Werkbund* in Berlin (1965), reprinted In *Oppositions* #17. Cambridge: MIT Press, 1979.
- ²¹ "The Culture Industry: Enlightenment as Mass Deception." in Adorno & Horkheimer. *Dialectic of the Enlightenment*. New York: Herder & Herder, 1972.
- ²² in Ockman, J. ed. *Architecture, Criticism and Ideology*. Princeton: Princeton Press, 1982.
- ²³ The subtitle to *Architecture and Utopia*, 1976.
- ²⁴ Tafuri, 1976. [Chapter 6].
- ²⁵ Tafuri, 1976 [135-6].
- ²⁶ see Robert Fishman. "From the Radiant City to Vichy: Le Corbusier's Plans and Politics 1928-42" in *The Open Hand*. Russell Walden, Ed. Cambridge, Mass: MIT Press, 1982.
- ²⁷ Rem Koolhaas. *Delirious New York: A Retroactive Manifesto for Manhattan*. NY: Monacelli, 1994.
- ²⁸ Rem Koolhaas. "Atlanta" in *Quaderns d'Arquitectura i Urbanisme*, 184, Barcelona, 1990.
- ²⁹ Rem Koolhaas. "Urban Operations" in *Columbia Documents of Architecture & Theory*, Vol.3, NY, 1993.
- ³⁰ *Mutations*, Bordeaux: ACTAR, 2000 (269).
- ³¹ *Mutations*, 2000 (309-310).
- ³² Tafuri, 1990 [Chapter 4].
- ³³ See Koolhaas, *Mutations*, 2000 (334).
- ³⁴ For a critique of this last work, see Frederic Jameson's "Future Cities", in *New Left Review*, issue 21, May/June 2003 [65-79].