3.
Cultural Space

On January 20, 1975, Peter Eisenman was interviewed by Alvin Boyarsky, Director of the Architectural Association in London, about the Institute for Architecture and Urban Studies, which recently had distinguished itself through various research and design projects, educational programs, and cultural productions. This conversation, conducted and recorded in the television studio of the AA, which was at the time an internationally renowned school, testified to its friendly recognition of its American counterpart and a mutual interest on the part of both institutions.[374] Boyarsky began by introducing Eisenman as a "compere emcee," i.e., master of ceremonies or an announcer, and praised him for stimulating a debate through the formation of groups, as "someone who puts together many packages, involving many people in many places."[375] Eisenman spoke candidly and at length about the Institute's early years, its composition and funding, and paid tribute to the British architecture culture he had encountered in his student days at Cambridge, which to him was largely about cultured debate, rather than just the design of buildings. He returned Boyarsky's kindness by pointing to the AA as "some sort of a hybrid," even a role model for the Institute, given the Institute's recent work as an educational institution since the fall semester of 1974, with its offerings for liberal arts college students and its novel adult education program, specifically noting its collaboration with

374 "Peter Eisenman–in conversation with Alvin Boyarsky," AA School of Architecture, January 20, 1975, www.youtube.com/watch?v=rhQLaM0Q11g (last accessed: May 31, 2023); the conversation was recorded and later published as an almost verbatim transcript; see Eisenman, 2007, 83–87.

375 Ibid, 83.

Archigram for a workshop held shortly thereafter in New York.[376] The interview was significant not only in terms of its talking points, as both interviewees pointed out that the Institute was now active on an international level thanks to the ambitious journal *Oppositions*, which began publication in late 1973, and other productions that earned it its reputation as a center of debate and drew the attention of the architecture community, extending far beyond the East Coast of the United States, but also in terms of media, as the interview was broadcast on AATV, the school's own television channel. It is this combination of form and content, the emphasis on the importance of public debate, and the highlighting of the power of curating people, that foreshadowed the advancing medialization of architecture, the culturalization of the social, and the economization of the cultural: a development in which the Institute and the AA were both instrumental.

For parallel to its reinvention as an architecture school after the turning point in 1973, which brought about a massive redesign and restructuring and ultimately radically changed the market for architecture education in the United States, the Institute after 1974–75, under Eisenman's leadership, also increasingly made its mark as a new kind of cultural space, both an event space and an exhibition space.[377] From then on, cultural production and cultural products at the Institute, constantly oscillating between bourgeois and countercultural forces, took on different functions, both discursive and institutional. Strikingly, after funding for urban renewal and public housing projects had ceased, New York was no longer of concern and urban studies now had to be reinterpreted. Against the backdrop of societal transformation in the United States, the Institute set out to act as an educational and cultural service provider to the architecture community, academia, and the world of arts and culture, and to finance operations not only through revenue from student and internship fees, but also from grants from the National Endowment for the Arts (NEA) and the National Endowment for the Humanities (NEH), private foundations and—increasingly—private donations for public events, series of lectures, and exhibitions. This complex business model would shape the Institute's politics and economics for years, until its demise in 1985. This reorientation also entailed new ways of working for Fellows and Visiting Fellows, new organizational

376 Ibid, 85.

377 Kim Förster, "Institutionalizing Postmodernism: Reconceiving the Journal and the Exhibition at the Institute for Architecture and Urban Studies in 1976," in *Mediated Messages: Periodicals, Exhibitions, and the Shaping Postmodern Architecture*, eds. Véronique Patteeuw and Léa-Catherine Szacka (London: Bloomsbury, 2018), 213–229. In this essay on institutions of postmodernization, I argue that the Institute can be seen as a paradigmatic example of the "well-defined cultural spaces," that Manfredo Tafuri wrote about in his critique of the New York architectural scene as being "entrusted with the task of pleasurably entertaining a highly selected public;" see Tafuri, 1976, 53–72, here 53; Tafuri, 1987; here, Tafuri merely alluded to the Institute, and instead discussed individual architects, the usual suspects, and their individual positions.

structures, and new kinds of programming in the context of broader trends in architecture. It was thus inevitable that, in the wake of the reorganization that accompanied the economization of the "Undergraduate Program" and the "Internship Program," the Institute opened up even more to an increasingly broad target audience. This turn towards the cultural sphere, which must be seen in the context of the transformation of American culture and which aimed to open up historical and theoretical approaches in architecture to both a professional and general public with new trends in liberal arts education, adult education, alternative art spaces, and architecture publications, took place against the backdrop of the democratization of higher education, as well as the promotion of the arts and the humanities under a welfare-state policy that, while having been in place since the mid-1960s, took on new proportions under President Jimmy Carter in the wake of the United States Bicentennial in 1976.

Education and Culture

By holding a series of public lectures and setting up exhibitions after the move to its new premises in 1971, the Institute had already established two new formats and acquired a wealth of expertise, which it continued to develop and expand from the fall of 1974. In doing so, the Institute, as both a socio-cultural and epistemic actor, accompanied—or even pioneered—a postmodern turn in American architecture culture. For the public events served a dual purpose: the presentation of projects and discussion of positions on the one hand, and on the other, the acquisition of public grants from the arts and culture sector and of private funds by drawing on the American tradition of philanthropy and cultural sponsorship. With the 1974–75 academic year, the previous IAUS Spring Lectures series, which had served as a platform for Research Associates, Fellows, and friends in the past four years, was transformed into a curated year-round program: under the simple title "Architecture," evening lectures were now organized in the fall and spring semesters. The "Evening Program," originally conceived and advertised as adult education, similar to what had once been postulated for American architecture education in the *Princeton Report* of 1967, served to simultaneously academize and popularize the debate. It was aimed at a diverse audience, even if it ultimately consisted mainly of architects and designers speaking to their peers. At the same time, the Institute's foray into holding its own exhibitions was revived with a premiere in 1971 and transformed into an independent "Exhibition Program." At first, these shows were quickly-made, rather eclectic group and solo exhibitions of drawings and models, later supplemented by retrospectives of forgotten protagonists, sometimes heroes, of architectural modernism from Europe and America, who now served as references for a new theory production and modernist historiography.

It was no coincidence that with the architectural *dispositif* of autonomy and creativity—comparable to developments in art and culture—the Institute invested in a culturalization of architecture at precisely the same time when

New York, as an international financial center, was particularly affected by the economic downturn as a result of progressive deindustrialization and the onset of globalization, with the collapse of the Bretton Woods system and the transition from Fordism to post-Fordism as the defining economic form.[378] Urban studies have highlighted that in 1974–75 the metropolis was on the verge of insolvency, having been simultaneously plunged into a financial and fiscal crisis by the actions of banks and the absence of tax revenues resulting from the suburbanization of large segments of the population. Lacking the opportunity, the Institute was no longer concerned with making a contribution to society by, for example, regenerating inner cities as places to live, spend leisure time, or work, or even by organizing or regulating housing, albeit in a technocratic approach, as with the townhouse design commissioned by the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development as part of the "Streets Project" (1970–72) or the prototype for low-rise alternatives (from 1972) commissioned by the New York State Urban Development Corporation—for both urban and suburban sites—with its shift toward public-private partnership or even ownership. From a sociology of culture perspective, the introduction of new mechanisms for communicating architecture and tools for marketing, public relations, and acquisition, meant that, in the course of a semiotization, historicization, and aestheticization of not just the urban but the architectural, there was an increasing focus on architecture as a work of art and thus the architect as an artist.[379] With education and culture, two key features of capitalist ideology and thus of social life in the post-industrial knowledge, information, and service society now became the focus of the Institute's work. This combination created new financially lucrative forms of labor, employment, and work in architecture, with its gendered division and morality of competition, individualism, and meritocracy, that became attractive, alongside training a new generation of architects. The architectural project of the Institute thus changed abruptly from a contribution to architectural production to its management, i.e., the administration, dissemination, and reproduction of architectural knowledge, through the processing and control of information.[380] In line with the rules of an immaterial, symbolic economy that exists alongside the goods of a classical, material economy, activities at the Institute such as lecturing, debating, and exhibiting foregrounded circular processes of re-evaluation and self-legitimation of architecture as a

378 On the transformations of New York in the wake of the globalization of telematics and economic transactions, see Saskia Sassen, *The Global City. New York, London, Tokyo* (New York: Princeton University Press, 1992); on the transformation of New York from an industrial metropolis to a global city, see Moody, 2007.

379 Reckwitz, 2012. Cultural sociologist Andreas Reckwitz discussed the culturalization of cities, with New York in the 1970s and 80s as an example, in his study on the invention of creativity.

380 McHale, 1976.

discipline.[381] The intellectual and artistic practices of the Fellows who exhibited there went hand in hand with the professionalization and economization of cultural production in architecture—a development at the Institute that certainly paralleled the emerging transformation of universities into "factories of knowledge" and of cities into the sites of a cultural and creative economy.[382] Globally speaking, New York was a pioneer and model in this respect, as can be seen, for example, in the emergence of alternative art spaces, the launch of new journals, the proliferation of conferences, and the prominence of research centers, and at the same time the transformation of the museum, increasingly driven by blockbuster exhibitions, as well as a burgeoning gallery sector and art market.[383]

In the mid-1970s, as a neoliberal trend and economic revitalization took hold in the United States, characterized by government de-investment, privatization, deregulation, and a belief in market self-regulation, the Institute with its educational offerings and public events, from the perspective of institutional critique, quickly became a forum or meeting place beyond the inner circle of Fellows, staff, students, interns, and extended circle of friends, colleagues, and architects on a national and international level. In an earlier essay about Eisenman's house designs, entitled "L'Architecture dans le Boudoir" and published in *Oppositions* in 1974, the architecture historian and critic Manfredo Tafuri compared the culture of the Institute and its journal, at least indirectly, to the activities in the boudoirs of eighteenth-century France, i.e., small and secluded interior spaces in country houses and city mansions where literature and art were consumed by the aristocracy or bourgeoisie.[384] The Institute had similarly transitioned into the coquetry space of architecture, where a new scene emerged, one that initiated an epistemological shift toward postmodernism, as evidenced by various historical sources of self-representation and external perception. From the perspective of the architecture humanities, it pioneered innovation, variation, differentiation, diversification, and ultimately commodification—not only of education but also culture—providing a blueprint for an institution of architecture in a globalized, postmodern society that always incorporated entrepreneurial and governmental dimensions as well. Moreover, education and culture at the Institute were subject to what was later termed an "economy of attention." This involved interlocking, self-amplifying networks and played out at different scales of groups, organizations, and institutions and in the process transformed cultural,

381 Bourdieu, [1971] 1983, Bourdieu, 1983.

382 Raunig, 2012; see also Gerald Raunig, *Industrien der Kreativität: Streifen und Glätten 2* (Zurich: diaphanes, 2012).

383 Ault, 2002.

384 Tafuri, 1974.

social, and symbolic capital into economic capital.[385] While the Institute provided a stage for architects, designers, scholars, and artists to position and make a name for themselves, the work of Fellows and Visiting Fellows, now acting as cultural producers and consumers, can best be seen as a hybrid form of material and immaterial labor based on flexible, precarious relations.[386]

The Institute made history, for parallel to its efforts beginning in the mid-1970s to distinguish itself as a serious educational institution with a broad range of offerings, it cultivated a name for itself as a cultural institution, eventually evolving into a "fashionable," if not postmodern, salon in New York.[387] With their Evening Program and Exhibition Program, the Fellows henceforth worked to ensure that architecture and art, education and entertainment, culture and consumption were closely intertwined. At the Institute, cultural production was approached by way of pluralism, which became the condition of postmodern discourse in its social and aesthetic, creative and intellectual assumptions. The project of foregrounding both the design and the tools of design, drawings and models, and inviting other architects, artists, critics, scholars, and writers to reflect on these cultural techniques, architectural knowledge, and modes of representation and perception, which were discussed and displayed as autonomous and creative acts in lectures and exhibitions, was not without interest, and the Institute managed to captivate other audiences. With the Institute's growth, funding from the major state and national foundations, and the expansion of its reach to the American, if not global stage, the Fellows not only sought to professionalize and eventually bureaucratize management and curation, but also the design of programs and products—even if they succeeded only for a few years. The turn to the architecture establishment in New York, which combined philanthropy and cultural sponsorship, was historically significant. After all, the Institute, as a new, self-created and self-sustaining group, organization, or institution in architecture, was producing a new generation of architects and academics. While education paid the bills, the convergence of lectures, exhibitions, and finally publications produced stars—fostering, if not creating a celebrity culture. Finally, the Institute promoted the practicing architects among the Fellows and Visiting Fellows who succumbed to the lure of the art and architecture, if not the real estate market, and pioneered the fusion of architecture and sculpture that was advanced in the 1980s under the label of deconstructivism.

385 Franck, 1998; Franck, 2000; see also Lapassade, [1967] 1972; Pierre Bourdieu, "The Forms of Capital," in *Handbook of Theory and Research for the Sociology of Education*, ed. John G. Richardson (New York: Greenwood Press, 1986), 241–258.

386 Lazzarato, 1996.

387 Ockman, 1988, here 198–199. The Institute's evolution toward what Ockman once aptly described as a nexus of "its bureaucratization, its cultivation as a fashionable salon and power base in New York, and its solicitation of mainstream patronage" began as early as the mid-1970s; see Tafuri, 1976; Tafuri, 1987.

3.1 Providing Adult Education

In the fall semester of 1974–75, the Institute set about fundamentally redefining the relationship between new cultural producers and consumers in architecture on the one hand, and the ambiguity of production and reception of architectural knowledge on the other by reinventing and honing its education and culture profile—first as an alternative to universities and museums as the classic venues of legitimation and dissemination of knowledge, and later in competition with them. The pedagogy that the Institute now developed as an architecture school, swiftly launching alternative educational offerings targeting diverse cohorts (see chapter two), not only guaranteed its ability to operate after years of impending bankruptcy—now staved off with the income from tuition and internship fees—but also made its emergence as one of the "well-defined cultural spaces," to adopt and expand on Tafuri's words, possible in the first place.[388] With the start of the fall semester, a new, comprehensive lecture series with the catchy and apt title "Architecture" replaced the IAUS Spring Lectures series that had been running since 1971. The series had been modeled on the New School for Social Research, with a variety of course offerings in the evenings to appeal to the widest possible audience of professionals and laypersons. For the Evening Program, which focused almost exclusively on architecture and to a lesser degree on urban issues, to be financially self-sustaining, the Institute applied for funding from the New York Council on the Arts (NYSCA), a state foundation of very great importance for art and culture projects. In the ambitious application text, jointly written by Kenneth Frampton, the originator of the idea, and Eisenman in his capacity as Institute director, "Architecture" was advertised in November 1973 as a "continuing education" program that was to be larger, above all more professional, and better marketed than the previous series of lectures.[389] The rationale was that there was an existing demand for a public debate on architectural topics. The event format, which contributed to the Institute's survival with additional income from course fees, was ultimately an instrument of both self-marketing and identification with the Institute.

With "Architecture," the Institute was following the example of the larger museums in New York, where comparable offerings already existed, especially since an awareness of lifelong learning had been gradually gaining traction since the American higher education reform of 1968. Qualifications cited included both the Institute's past activities and the Fellows' individual work, as well as the institutional network of funding bodies, cultural institutions, and American

388 Tafuri, 1976, 53; Tafuri, 1987, 293.

389 IAUS, "Request for Assistance for the Institute for Architecture and Urban Studies. A Program for Continuing Education in Architecture and the Urban Environment." Source: Yale University, Robert A.M. Stern Archives.

universities.[390] In the proposal text, the authors presented an extensive program spanning several years and including one or even multiple lectures every weekday evening during the semesters from October to December and from March to May—an incredibly high number. They also sketched out concepts for possible lecture courses on the history and theory of architecture to prove that they had sufficient expertise and the networks to be able to implement an event series of this magnitude. Thus, in addition to Frampton, a number of architecture historians from the most prestigious American universities, notably Colin Rowe as host and Vincent Scully as lecturer, were to present their current research to a broader, and in particular urban audience. There were also courses on the history of architecture theory and the semiology of architecture, with Mario Gandelsonas as a scheduled speaker. "Architecture," with a capital "A," was henceforth the Institute's unique selling point vis-à-vis other institutions, and the Evening Program found an audience not only among architects—young professionals and architecture students from master's programs were targeted—but also in the Manhattan community. The educational focus was also evident from the fact that the offering was explicitly presented as a supplement to the established curricula, not just of schools of architecture: students of all disciplines were to receive credit for participation from their home universities. The threefold objective articulated in this program testified to the Institute's high aspirations: "1.) to stimulate and strengthen the overall approach of the profession to environmental design and to establish a more profound common cultural base from which to practice design; 2.) to ultimately raise the general level of design performance within the New York region; 3.) to demonstrate the model of an independent extra-mural educational institution which may eventually come to be inaugurated in other urban centers in the United States."[391] Accordingly, the Institute proposed nothing less than to provide guidance and direction to the profession, to influence architectural events through theoretical and historiographical considerations, and to extend its own sphere of influence on a national level. These three goals were repeatedly modified and reformulated in the years that followed, with various cultural productions using slightly different wording.

With "Architecture," the Institute had designed an event format that was unprecedented on this scale. Even as he prepared the application to NYSCA, Eisenman had already pulled strings, activated his networks, and written to a number of architects and heads of architecture schools asking for comments and criticism on the planned program, and above all for letters of recommendation.

390 Qualifications cited included affiliation with MoMA, support from the Graham Foundation, collaboration with Cornell University, Cooper Union, Rice University, Rutgers University, institutionalization of the internship through that of the Great Lakes College Association, sponsorship by NYSCA and the NEA, and collaboration with the UDC.

391 IAUS, "Request for Assistance for the Institute for Architecture and Urban Studies," n.p. Source: Yale University, Robert A.M. Stern Archive.

These letters, contributed by Ulrich Franzen, James Polshek (dean of the Graduate School of Architecture and Planning at Columbia University), John Hejduk (dean of the School of Architecture at Cooper Union), Robert Stern (president of the Architectural League), and Tim Prentice (president of the New York chapter of the American Institute of Architects), were enclosed with the grant application. This not only served to establish an institutionally grounded support network but also ensured that the project was announced in advance in architecture circles, thus already laying the foundation. In this context, Eisenman had also written to Robert Stern in November 1973. Stern, in addition to his architectural practice, was also teaching at Yale University and especially at Columbia College; as president of the Architectural League in New York, where he had started out as Program Director, he was a leading figure in East Coast architecture despite his youth.[392] Since then, Eisenman and Stern cultivated a friendly rivalry for a while, especially since the two stood for different camps in the architecture scene—the much-discussed "Whites vs. Grays" debate was already buzzing with myth—although they were not so different socially, in terms of habits, skills, dispositions, etc. despite their different aesthetic preferences.[393] On the contrary, by positioning himself as an opponent in the battle for attention—a framing that introduced the neoliberal paradigm according to which the market is the most efficient coordinating mechanism for society and thus for culture, into the architecture debate—Eisenman made common cause with Stern. In a letter to Constance Eiseman, the director of NYSCA, Stern explicitly expressed his support for the Institute's plan to organize "Architecture." The unlikely alliance between Eisenman and Stern was crucial to the success of the grant application and, by extension, to the "Architecture" series coming to fruition. For with this distinguished series of lectures, the Institute was actually competing with the League and its public programs. Now, however, synergies were being exploited instead: Stern was even originally slated to direct the Evening Program and was also appointed Visiting Fellow in 1974, having already organized the IAUS Spring Lectures series that spring. But although he ultimately declined, and the collaboration with the League thus failed to materialize, Stern nevertheless invested considerable time and energy in the Institute in the years that followed, acting as a presenter and lecturer, crowd puller and campaigner in the service of a particular variant of architectural postmodernism, and ultimately, in the early 1980s, playing a not insignificant role as a source of ideas and advice regarding public events.

392 Stern, et al., 1995.

393 Stern was first invited to participate in the Institute in 1972 before supporting *Oppositions* in 1973 and was previously asked for advice on grant acquisitions and public relations strategy. In 1973, he ignited the debate by curating a series of articles "Five on Five" in the May issue of *Architectural Forum* with contributions by himself, Jaquelin Robertson, Charles Moore, Alan Greenberg, and Romaldo Giurgola; see Robert Stern, "Stompin at the Savoye," *Architectural Forum* (May 1973): "Five on Five," 46–48.

Adult Education

In June 1974, the Institute received US$19,000 in start-up funding for "Architecture" from NYSCA, the very foundation that otherwise supported alternative art spaces and art projects across all boroughs of New York, and yet also recognized adult education in Midtown Manhattan as being worthy of support. However, the Institute had bigger plans: "Architecture" finally made it possible for the Institute to establish itself as a new force for intellectual, often polemical debate in the New York architecture scene. Eisenman found a suitable replacement for Stern in young Andrew MacNair, whom he appointed to coordinate the Evening Program. Having just finished his studies in architecture, first at Princeton and then at Columbia, where he had already gained experience in organizing small exhibitions and self-publishing his own newspaper, McNair was approached on the street one day by Eisenman in a seemingly preordained encounter.[394] With the active support of Eisenman, Frampton, and Stern, MacNair was tasked with quickly putting together an extensive program of events. This was to take place in the Institute's penthouse on 8 West 40th Street, which required a new structure and organization. The spacious two-storied main hall provided nearly ideal conditions for holding public events, especially a series of lectures since it was large enough to accommodate about one hundred people. Nevertheless, the Institute had to be remodeled, primarily to incorporate the daily operations of "Architecture" as a public and at the same time commercial event. Partition walls were installed to allow the audience members who took one of the elevators up to the twentieth floor to be easily redirected so that admission could be charged centrally in one corner of the space. However, there was no infrastructure on site yet to host an event of this scale: furniture (seating and lectern) and technology (carousel projectors) had yet to be purchased or rented. The first step was to renovate the event space: new carpets and shades for the windows were installed, so that the first lectures could begin before dark. MacNair may not have been as intellectually interested as the long-time Fellows and always remained a junior partner, but he was thoroughly creative, filling the role of mover and shaker perfectly, and, despite his punk attitude, became a central figure who soon took on all of the Institute's public events and public relations, significantly shaping its public image, while simultaneously demonstrating street credibility.[395] For "Architecture," he was aided by William Eitner, who served as his technical assistant. In addition, he worked

394 MacNair, who studied under Vidler and Frampton, among others, was initially assigned Stern as his thesis advisor at Columbia, but he turned him down and instead chose Raimund Abraham as his supervisor and Robert Smithson as his reviewer; he completed his thesis on the redesign of the Central Park Zoo under Frampton. After graduation, MacNair first worked for Haus-Rucker-Co. on a project on rooftops in New York.

395 By his own admission, MacNair was all over the New York art and music scene in downtown and midtown Manhattan: there he frequented the hip clubs, attended live performances by the bands of the hour, listened to punk, new wave, and disco, and befriended young architects and artists, who were invested in land art, post-minimalism, and performance art.

closely with a series of secretaries, who reported to him. In the first two years, these were Regina Wickham, who was also charged with coordinating architecture education in the Undergraduate Program, followed by Ruth Plawner in 1976, as his own assistant, and finally Mimi Shanley in 1977.

"Architecture" figuratively and literally provided a stage for Fellows and friends, both the inner and outer circle, emerging and already acclaimed architects and academics, who made appearances there as presenters and speakers, to reach an audience beyond the universities and museums, as well as publications. The first events in the Evening Program began in September 1974 and were scheduled to run for ten weeks. The program featured academic lectures on current approaches to the history and theory of architecture, as well as to urban planning and policy, alongside presentations of the positions of up-and-coming architects and designers. Massimo Vignelli, who had previously contributed the graphic design for *Oppositions*, specially designed a square poster announcing a total of six lecture courses on various days of the week, Mondays through Thursdays, sometimes two lectures in a row: "Public Places in New York" (presented by Michael Kirkland), "Introduction to the History of Modern Architecture, 1900–1920" (Kenneth Frampton), "The Background Work, and Influence of Louis I. Kahn" (Robert Stern), "An Introduction to Urban Design" (Jonathan Barnett), "The Architecture of the Italians: 16th Century" (Colin Rowe), and "Human Versus Natural Environment" (Andrew MacNair). "Architecture" thus encompassed different types of knowledge production and consumer tastes, both introductory and advanced, and appealed to a diverse audience with a programmatic novelty and complexity that was the secret to its success. The choice of presenters and lecturers deliberately broke down distinctions between highbrow and popular culture, and the themes depicted on the poster appealed to both the middle classes and an alternative clientele. This testified to the Institute's freshness and openness to the architecture profession, as well as towards the general public, but also to the new postmodern sensibility that had come to characterize the art and culture scene in 1970s New York.

In a short space of time, the Institute was able to establish itself as a unique, sophisticated venue: a community space for young architects, designers, intellectuals, and creatives—predominantly from New York, the East Coast of the USA, and the rest of North America, but increasingly from other parts of the world as well—and an event space for an educated yet consumerist public that could afford the admission fees. This receptiveness once again strengthened the internal cohesion of the group, as the Fellows were now more strongly integrated into complex discursive and institutional networks. "Architecture" provided a forum of national standing for staging controversial debates among peers, for engaging in a practice of communication and interaction that was typical of the architecture discipline, and for demonstrating individuality and distinctiveness in public. In this way, conversations about architecture increasingly found their way into academic and metropolitan culture at the Institute, which in some ways took on a pioneering role.

Institutional Identity

At the Institute, Vignelli's graphic design assumed a central function in culture production, in processes of group formation and identification, and in the attention economy.[396] Vignelli, having first worked with Unimark International to design the corporate identity of large American companies and thus of corporate culture in general in the second half of the 1960s, and then going on to independently develop the graphic identity for New York and several national institutions (for example, the information system for the Botanical Garden in Brooklyn and the brochures and information boards of the National Park Service of the USA) in the 1970s, in addition to redesigning the signaling system and subway map of the New York Metropolitan Transportation Authority, now brought his experience and practice to the Institute.[397] After designing the cover and layout for *Oppositions*, Vignelli developed an entirely new graphic language—modernist in style but certainly contemporary—for the Institute, which he applied to its overall institutional identity. In addition to all the Institute's publications, Vignelli went on to design almost all of its printed materials, including stationery, envelopes, invitation cards, posters, leaflets, flyers, and brochures, etc. With this contribution to the Institute, its meaning and purpose, he shaped a sense of belonging, if not community, i.e., a living environment and experiential space. The design for "Architecture" was modeled on the layout and logotype for *Oppositions*, with its attention-grabbing elements, sans-serif font, capital-letter title, and constructivist color scheme. In addition, with the black bar at the top and the red lettering, the poster introduced two graphic elements that would become identifying features and trademarks of the Institute as a cultural space, replacing the old logo, the Vitruvian Man. The "Architecture" series was also, with reference to the sociologist Pierre Bourdieu and applying his theory of capital and the economy of cultural production to the field of architecture, coded according to the mechanisms of culturation and dissemination in the art, literature, and culture sector.[398] And while the fourth issue of *Oppositions*, scheduled for the fall of 1974, had to wait for funding, "Architecture" became an important flagship for the Institute—in no small part because of this poster and the new institutional identity. Building on

396 Vignelli's archive, which contains many of the graphic designs for the Institute, is housed at the Vignelli Center for Design Studies at Rochester Institute of Technology; CCA's IAUS fonds also has a large selection of Vignelli's designs.

397 With Unimark International, Vignelli played a decisive role in the dissemination of Helvetica in the United States; see *Helvetia* (2007, director: Gary Hustwit), https://www.hustwit.com/helvetica (last accessed: May 31, 2023); see also Jan Conradi, *Unimark International: The Design of Business and the Business of Design* (Baden: Lars Müller, 2009); see Emilio Ambasz, *Design Vignelli* (New York: Rizzoli International, 1981); Eric Larrabee and Massimo Vignelli, *Knoll Design* (New York: Harry N. Abrams, Inc., 1981); Massimo Vignelli, "On Rational Design," (interview with Steven Heller and Elinor Pettit) in *Design Dialogues*, eds. Steven Heller and Elinor Pettit (New York: Allworth Press, 1998), 3–7.

398 Pierre Bourdieu, "Social Space and Symbolic Power," *Sociological Theory* 7, no. 1 (Spring 1989), 14–25.

Oppositions, Vignelli used the poster to position and showcase the Institute as a genuine institution and a strong brand with a high level of recognition. Printed in a run of several thousand copies and mailed to architectural firms and schools of architecture across the country, the poster provided information about the conception of the series of lectures, as well as the standing of its presenters and speakers. It also provided quick and easy access and insight into the Institute's discursive and institutional networks: merely listing the names and large number of illustrious guests secured and disseminated the Institute's reputation as a center of debate. Each semester, a large print of the new poster was displayed on the bulletin boards of universities and colleges or in the kitchenettes of offices, while smaller versions were used in apartments, adorning refrigerators and bedroom doors. Part artwork and part advertising, the poster for "Architecture" immediately gave the Institute greater visibility than *Oppositions*; a staggering US$6,000, one-third of the NYSCA grant, was spent on printing and mailing.

In the mid-1970s, when there were hardly any building contracts for architects in New York due to the economic downturn, the Institute was able to transform itself into a new working context. By offering a select group of people the opportunity to lecture, exhibit, and publish there, i.e., to work as cultural producers, to operate and realize their potential as entrepreneurs in their own right, the Institute motivated the assembled individuals to profitably mobilize their cultural and social capital and transform it into economic capital in the medium term. Eisenman, like other longstanding Fellows and Visiting Fellows who attended for a year, financed his work by holding teaching positions at the Institute and at one of the local schools of architecture, and by receiving additional funding for cultural production. Crucially, the interplay of individual activities and one of the Institute's programs produced a variety of internal synergies and external networking effects. The Institute, now a constitutive part of New York architecture culture, positioned itself as a self-regulating system that adopted and continued certain traditions in order to shape the future of the profession and discipline. "Architecture" initially provided a framework for architects to present their historiographical or theoretical research, or their design projects, and to position themselves as public intellectuals. The Fellows who took advantage of this in the first two years were Frampton ("Introduction to the History of Modern Architecture," "Architecture 1," "History of Modern Architecture 1920–1940," "Architecture 2;" Le Corbusier in Context, "Architecture 4")[399] and Gandelsonas ("Symbolic Dimensions of Architecture," "Architecture 4") as *Oppositions* editors, alongside Visiting Fellow Anthony Vidler

399 Throughout the 1970s Frampton drew on lecture courses for his work on his monograph *Modern Architecture. A Critical History* (1980); in the eight-part lecture course "Le Corbusier in Context" he elaborated and presented the first results of his research project "Le Corbusier and the Evolution of the Purist Sensibility, 1898–1928," for which he received a grant from the John Simon Guggenheim Memorial Foundation in 1974–75. Frampton published his studies on Le Corbusier in *Oppositions* 15/16 and *Oppositions* 19/20 in the early 1980s.

("Architecture in Mass Society: Depression War and Reconstruction, 1929–1959," "Architecture 3"), and Peter Wolf ("The Future of New York: Controversies and Consequences," and, with Patricia C. Jones, "Architecture 4") as chairman of the Fellows,[400] each of whom presented a series of lectures. As Program Director, MacNair also regularly assembled a lecture course with peer-to-peer presentations from contemporary architects, artists, and designers, some of them highly renowned. At its best, with "Architecture" the Institute demonstrated its ability to serve as a cultural space in terms of the joint project of reevaluating and redisciplining architecture, as well as a collective teaching and learning process with boundaries between faculty and students, lecturers and audience, exhibitors and visitors, authors and readers becoming increasingly fluid. With lectures being held every night, work and leisure at the Institute were inextricably linked, which went hand in hand with the emergence of immaterial labor among architects and academics. While the individual Fellows' contributions were largely based on self-exploitation, the Institute distinguished itself by establishing new centralized and distributed networks for the production, dissemination, and reception of architectural knowledge, within and beyond the profession and the discipline. The Fellowship itself was based on the liberal principle of merit and gratitude and, above all, as its further development shows, nevertheless shaped and reflected by the then prevailing power (and gender) hierarchies in society, other labor remained flexibly organized and precarious.

Within this neoliberal institution of an emerging postmodern architecture culture, Rem Koolhaas was to play a special role in the Evening Program and the Exhibition Program, initially as a presenter and lecturer in the lecture course "Who is New York? The Future of the Metropolis," which MacNair organized with him as part of "Architecture 2" in the spring semester of 1975.[401] Koolhaas, who was officially a Visiting Fellow at the Institute in 1974–75, began work there on *Delirious New York* by giving lectures on "Manhattanism," the specific architecture and culture of New York. He researched this topic during his time at the Institute, which provided him with students and interns for this purpose, and published articles about it in *Oppositions*, and later in *Architectural Design*, before the study was

400 Wolf had just published the monograph *The Future of the City* (1974), with funding from the Ford Foundation.

401 Koolhaas was listed on the posters for the "Architecture" series several times, with lectures on "Coney Island," November 1974, "Delirious New York: Manhattan as Laboratory," March 1975, "Recent Projects and New Zoning 1976," May 1975, "Delirious New York: The Secret Life of Buildings," November 1975, and "Dali, Le Corbusier, and New York," March 1977. These topics were all included in *Delirious New York*. In 1976, after two years at the Institute, Koolhaas went back to the AA in London, where he held lectures and completed his monograph, but he was to return to New York and the Institute repeatedly, contributing to exhibitions and publications, and later presenting his retroactive manifesto there in the fall of 1978.

published in book form.[402] The Institute provided him not only with a workspace but also an income, for in 1974–75 he taught as a tutor in the Undergraduate Program, in parallel with a course he taught at Columbia University, which allowed him to co-found OMA. Yet Koolhaas was never made a Fellow: he once described his role at the Institute and his contributions to "Architecture" as that of the proverbial "fly on the wall," seeing and hearing events as they occurred.[403] Early in his international career, Koolhaas benefitted greatly from the Institute, which saw him reach maturity as an architect. Not only was he able to publish certain findings from the archive early on in *Oppositions*, thus making his book project officially known, but his appearances in the "Architecture" program, for which larger premises were rented specially and which attracted local architecture critics, allowed him to set the agenda and establish his own voice vis-à-vis the New York architecture scene. Koolhaas and MacNair, with whom he was friends and with whom he also cooperated, were the "young savages" compared to the more serious Eisenman, Frampton, Gandelsonas, and Agrest, or Vidler. And yet the Institute benefitted greatly as well, as it could enlist the support of the traveling wayfarer on his peregrinations between the old world and the new.

Architects, Intellectuals and Critics

Within a short period of time, the Institute produced a new type of architect: not just an artist, but an intellectual, a public figure who performed in front of an audience, similar to developments in philosophy and the humanities, and the public events, "Architecture" and the "Forum" release event for *Oppositions*, from 1974 onwards, were instrumental in this.[404] Several Fellows were able to make a name for themselves as historians or theorists by presenting lecture courses or contributing content. Meanwhile, Eisenman assumed the role of the host in "Architecture," not infrequently emerging from his office, where he had used the time to work, shortly before the start of the event to greet the audience and, as Institute director, to announce the evening's speakers—in other words, he was the "master of ceremonies," as Boyarsky rightly noted,

402 Rem Koolhaas, "'Life in the Metropolis' or 'The Culture of Congestion'," *Architectural Design* 47, no. 5 (1977): "OMA," 319–325; see also Kenneth Frampton, "Two or Three Things I Know About Them: A Note on Manhattanism," *Architectural Design* 47, no. 5 (1977): "OMA," 315–318, George Baird, "Les Extremes. Qui se Touchant," *Architectural Design* 47, no. 5 (1977): "OMA," 326–327, and Demetrios Porphyrios, "Pandora's Box. An Essay on Metropolitan Portraits," *Architectural Design* 47, no. 5 (1977): "OMA," 357–362.; see Rem Koolhaas, "Why I wrote Delirious New York and Other Textual Strategies," *Any*, no. 0 (May/June 1993), 42–43.

403 In other writings, I have used the figure of the harlequin to characterize Koolhaas, as his ironic attitude led him to perform veritable jumps, somersaults, and cartwheels in design, aesthetics, writing, and rhetorics; see Kim Förster, "From Remment to Rem. A Quite Literary Story of Someone Who Made It in New York," *Clog* (June 2014), 32–33.

404 Michel Foucault and Gilles Deleuze, "Intellectuals and Power," in *Language, Counter-Memory, Practice. Selected Essays and Interviews*, ed. Donald F. Bouchard (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1977), 205–217.

always in the spotlight.[405] Eisenman himself gave lectures too. For example, he expounded on the historical references for his formalist stance ("Giuseppe Terragni and Italian Rationalism," May 1975), presented his rationalist designs ("Transformation, De-Composition and Critique," April 1976), and discussed his theoretical approaches ("Post-Functionalism. A Continuing Modernism," November 1976), thus legitimizing himself and publicly promoting his work as both an architect and a theorist. Despite a relatively small output of buildings, texts, and other contributions, the Institute at that time was Eisenman's project, and he was masterful in building his public persona as an architecture intellectual, in part by skillfully enlisting Fellows and friends, architects and critics, to his cause and imposing his own thinking style on his colleagues.[406] One characteristic aspect of the Institute's artistic and intellectual work in "Architecture," however, was that each lecture course was aimed at very different audiences endowed with intellectual or financial capital: local and national architects, but also a broader, culturally minded public. Eisenman and the other Fellows spoke to their colleagues, mostly converts, with whom they competed for attention, if not commissions, but they also preached to lay audiences, so that they had to adapt their content to the interests of the general public and popularize, or, to use Pierre Bourdieu's terms, trivialize, even vulgarize it.

The intellectualization and popularization of architectural knowledge, history, and theory in the context of adult education, the Institute's public relations efforts, and the marketing of its educational offerings in the arts and humanities as a commodity were accomplished through a number of promotional strategies, improved advertising, and the involvement of critics. MacNair placed more ads in the local press, in the liberal daily *The New York Times*, the popular weekly *New York Magazine*, and the left-wing neighborhood newspaper *The Village Voice*. Despite declining to take on the role of program director, Stern played a crucial role in shaping the program of "Architecture" by presenting his own lecture course every semester, thus supporting the Institute in its public outreach mission, for example by holding overview lectures on popular and yet sophisticated topics ("The American House. From Jefferson to Wright," "Architecture 2," "The American House: From Frank Lloyd Wright to Robert Venturi," "Architecture 3," "The New York Apartment House," and "Architecture 4"). Stern, more than any other presenter, succeeded in appealing to an Upper East Side clientele that was used to comparable formats at the Metropolitan Museum or the Museum of Modern Art, and thanks to his efforts "Architecture" became a huge success with

405 Eisenman, 2007, 83.

406 Ghirardo, 1994, 71. Architecture historian Diane Ghirardo characterized Eisenman's "masterful public relations work" in terms of his constant gamesmanship and criticized his talent as a self-promoter: "With a canny talent for showmanship more akin to P.T. Barnum than to Walt Disney, Eisenman in the early 1970s managed to parlay a miniscule design portfolio and a wide range of acquaintances into the New York-based Institute for Architecture and Urban Studies." In other words, Eisenman was successful not so much for his curiosities, but for his public relations.

the audience. Stern also appeared regularly on discussion panels and, as spokesman for the "Grays" in the perceived stronghold of the "Whites," took on the role of the eloquent *advocatus diaboli*, challenging Eisenman time and again, so that the paying audience was party to a spectacular debate. Stern was soon joined by other presenters who enjoyed a high standing and were recognized outside the world of architecture. Paul Goldberger, for example, contributed to "Architecture 2" in the spring of 1975, along with Ada Louise Huxtable, the second, younger architecture critic at the *New York Times*, who was responsible for more popular topics and contemporary, primarily conservative postmodern architects. The lecture course presented by Goldberger, "The American Architectural Establishment. A Critical Reassessment," in which a representative of the younger generation of architects addressed a project by a successful architectural firm, was extremely popular. Stern featured Johnson/Burgee Architects, for example, who were successful despite the economic downturn and had just completed Pennzoil Place in Houston, Texas. This comprised two skyscrapers that introduced a postmodernist formal language with their trapezoidal plan as a variation on the modernist glass box and had been much lauded and made famous by Huxtable, who dubbed them the "building of the decade," although the firm itself was not well regarded in New York architecture circles due to the commercial nature of its corporate architecture. Eisenman, who also contributed to this lecture series, chose Paul Rudolph, the architect of the Brutalist art and architecture building at Yale University in New Haven, Connecticut, where he also served as dean, and whose work was thus historicized and elevated at the Institute at a time when the Brutalist style was gradually slipping out of fashion, despite the advocacy of Reyner Banham, and Rudolph was increasingly pursuing projects in other countries.[407]

In its internal report for the 1974–75 fiscal year, Institute director Eisenman noted that the Evening Program, as a newly introduced format of educational, cultural, social, and symbolic value, had in its first semester already recorded a total of more than four hundred paying participants who attended one of the lecture courses for a tuition fee of sixty dollars. Compared to the adult education offerings at other cultural institutions in New York, the program was relatively inexpensive. The Institute had gone into debt to set up "Architecture;" this was due to the high demands of the program but also to the inexperience of everyone involved in event management and accounting. In the second semester, the Evening Program experimented with tiered ticket prices and used cultural sponsorship as an additional source of revenue, as it had done when *Oppositions* was first launched. Occasionally, private individuals were enlisted as donors, who in return received free admission to all events and whose names were listed on the

407 Other architectural firms whose projects were presented and discussed included: Skidmore, Owings & Merrill, John Portman, Davis Brody & Associates, Bertrand Goldberg and Harry Weese, I.M. Pei & Partners, Gunnar Birkerts, Kevin Roche, and John Dinkeloo as students of Eero Saarinen, Cesar Pelli, and Edward L. Barnes.

poster. In the mid-year report to NYSCA, MacNair cited quantitative attendance figures as a measure of the attention paid to the Institute as a cultural institution. In addition, an evaluation was conducted at the end of each semester to gather qualitative information about participants. This allowed a new programming and curation focus to be selected each semester according to audience demand and interest. Although initial revenues of US$33,000 were offset by expenses of US$45,000, after some teething problems, the Evening Program as a commercial offering in its second year contributed a not insignificant 30% to the funding of the Institute's operations. Then, in fiscal year 1975–76, US$82,000 of revenue was collected for the Evening Program, slightly more than half of the Undergraduate Program, which brought in US$150,000. The fact that, despite the Institute's increasing annual budget, the fees of individual presenters and lecturers repeatedly went unpaid, with Fellows and friends of the Institute even foregoing the remuneration to which they were entitled, was indicative of the continued tenuous financial situation and the precarious nature of cultural production. Although jobs were created at the Institute, the working conditions remained questionable due to poor payment practices and haphazard financial management.

Exhibition Activity

After years of no further initiatives, an effort was made to organize exhibitions at the Institute again and for it to start exhibition operations on its own. The internal historiography of the Institute mentions an exhibition in 1974, entitled "Drawing as Architecture"—an equation that would have elevated representational technologies to the rank of architecture—with contributions by Raimund Abraham, Diana Agrest, Peter Eisenman, Mario Gandelsonas, John Hejduk, and Robert Stern.[408] The initiative to hold exhibitions on a regular basis originated with MacNair who, alongside his time-consuming and labor-intensive task of coordinating "Architecture," started out by organizing a number of smaller, informal exhibitions.[409] A newspaper advertisement announced six exhibitions for 1975, beginning with a historical exhibition titled "Mart Stam: Dutch Architect 1920–1965" (January 14 to January 31, 1975), which MacNair quickly assembled

408 Suzanne Frank in her memoirs of the Institute refers to "Drawing as Architecture" that is said to have taken place; see Frank, 2010, 167; see also Taylor, 2010, 317; Architecture historian Jordan Kauffman casts doubt on this; see Jordan Kauffman, *Drawing on Architecture: The Object of Lines, 1970–1990* (Cambridge: MIT Press, 2018), 94f. However, there are no references to be found in internal documents (lists, memos, notes, reports) in CCA's IAUS fonds. The 1978 IAUS brochure, on the other hand, already lists this exhibition, without naming the participants, which could be interpreted as an early claim to authorship of an idea, as was so often the case, and even an early case of valorizing architectural drawings. Kaufman alludes to the rift that had opened up on an institutional level between MoMA and the Institute by then, and on a personal level between Drexler and Eisenman, not to mention Ambasz, which is a longer story.

409 Taylor, 1990, 315–322. Taylor, who worked as director of development at the Institute before founding her own gallery, had written this essay about the Institute's Exhibition Program for a seminar course taught by Mary McLeod at Columbia University.

from exhibits from the Institute's 1971 exhibition "Art & Architecture USSR 1917–32," since these were still stored in crates at the Institute and had to be constantly moved back and forth to free up space for the Evening Program to run smoothly.[410] The first half of 1975 saw further exhibitions by members of the inner circle and friends of the Institute: the postcard collections of Rem Koolhaas and Madelon Vriesendorp, designs by Lella and Massimo Vignelli, photographs by Dorothy Alexander, who documented the Institute's 1973 "Low-Rise Alternatives" exhibition at MoMA, designs for Central Park by MacNair himself, the kinetic sculptures of Tim Prentice, a friend of Eisenman's, formerly an architect and now a practicing artist, and the environmental and land art of Alan Sonfist, whose pioneering role was amply illustrated by "Time Landscape," an urban forest in New York. These exhibitions were always scheduled for a brief run (a week or two, sometimes a month) and made quickly; the works were simply hung on the wall as the central main hall was needed for the nightly events. At first, most of the exhibitions were devoted to art; there were hardly any architecture exhibitions. MacNair's curation did not seem to follow any approach other than the available opportunities and offerings and his own interests and tastes; the exhibition design was rather self-made and amateurish, which had a charm of its own. In addition, MacNair's programming and curation of "Architecture" was notable for its introduction of new formats designed to tap into new markets and reach new audiences. For one thing, the Institute supplemented its adult education program in the spring of 1975 by adding an extraordinary workshop series by the British group Archigram, quite in keeping with the times, on the subject of "Toward the Urban Suburbia." This included six workshops, for which, along with Peter Cook, Ron Herron, and Mike Webb, the protagonists of London's former pop avant-garde were brought to the Institute in their first-ever visit to New York. In addition, the Institute offered educational trips to Florence and London in the summer of 1975, billed as a "Summer Program," although in the end they were not carried out. But there was huge potential and eventually further steps were taken to expand and develop it into a viable and competitive cultural institution. Despite the diversification of its offerings and commercialization of its activities, however, the Institute never really participated in the development that Max Horkheimer and Theodor W. Adorno criticized in their analysis of the "culture industry" in *Dialectic of the Enlightenment*, notwithstanding the Marxist concept of culture which is diametrically opposed to that of Bourdieu. Compared to the developments in film, radio, and print in the first half of twentieth-century America, and television in the second half, the Institute's cultural production—the evening lectures, exhibitions, and other products, especially print products—were still largely publicly

410 IAUS, "Portfolio for an Application to the 1976 AIA medal," n.d. Source: AIA Archives. As so often, chronologies should be contested, for the exhibition dates given in the adverts are not only themselves erroneous, but also differ from those listed later in promotional materials and historiography; see Taylor, 1990, 321.

funded and not just business, education, and culture in the broader sense, and on top of that, they were far too uncertain and volatile.[411]

In fiscal year 1975–76, after a successful start, the Institute's leadership focused on growth with all cultural activities. Not only was the NYSCA funding renewed, but the Institute also received grants from the Gottesman Foundation (of Adam and Celeste Bartos) and the Duke Foundation. These funds allowed Eisenman and MacNair to expand the thematic focus of the Evening Program from architecture to contemporary trends in the arts, which was particularly consistent with Eisenman's understanding of the architectural object as the result of a formal transformation. In addition, the Institute now established exhibition activities that would, within a year, make it a player in the field of architecture exhibitions. One reinforcing moment in this development was the exhibition "Architectural Studies and Projects" (March 13 to May 15, 1975) at MoMA, curated by Emilio Ambasz in the museum's penthouse on the sixth floor, which housed the lounge and cafeteria, on the initiative of Barbara Jakobson: It displayed drawings by twenty-two architects.[412] In MoMA's press release, Ambasz first defined architectural drawings, which were perceived as critical, if not visionary, as an art form in their own right: "Paper Projects have in many instances influenced architecture's history as forcefully as those committed to stone. Whether their intent is aesthetic, evocative, ironic, polemical, methodological, ideological, or conjectural, their strength has always resided in their poetic content." In keeping with the times, with the complications of the macroeconomic environment that accompanied the 1973 oil crisis, the individual exhibits were for the most part fictitious architectural drawings that did not necessarily correspond to a concrete building project; some of them were even unbuildable.[413] "Architectural Studies and Projects," which was critically received with two reviews in the *New York Times*, was also trendsetting and quite strategic in other respects, as it paved the way for New York's architecture

411 Adorno and Horkheimer, [1944] 1972.

412 MoMA, "Architectural Studies and Projects," Press Release no. 14, March 13, 1975, https://www.moma.org/documents/moma_press-release_332895.pdf (last accessed: May 31, 2023). Among the architects exhibited were: Raimund Abraham, Peter Cook, Peter Eisenman, John Hejduk, Rem Koolhaas, Richard Meier, Gaetano Pesce, Cedric Price, Ettore Sottsass, Friedrich St. Florian, and Superstudio; see Barbara Jakobson (interview with Sharon Zane), (New York: MoMA, October 29, 1997), 22; https://www.moma.org/momaorg/shared/pdfs/docs/learn/archives/transcript_jakobson.pdf (last accessed: May 31, 2023). See also Kauffman, 2018, 78ff. Kauffman points out that the authorship of the idea was disputed.

413 Through MoMA, architectural drawings have entered the history of art and architecture as visionary projects, due in part to an early group exhibition titled "Visionary Architecture" (1960), a number of solo exhibitions in the early 1970s, and the establishment of the Howard Gilman Collection curated by Pierre Apraxine, who was head of the Art Lending Service from 1970 to1973. This collection was later celebrated and historicized in another group exhibition titled "The Changing of the Avant-Garde: Visionary Architectural Drawings" (October 24, 2002, to January 6, 2003); see Terence Riley, ed., *The Changing of the Avant-Garde: Visionary Architectural Drawings from the Howard Gilman Collection* (New York: MoMA, 2002).

culture to become more commercial.[414] It was held as an art, promotional, and sales event of the Art Lending Service, a subdivision of the Junior Council under Jakobson's direction that lent works of modern art donated by galleries to individuals and corporations to display in their homes and offices, and thus supported MoMA. "Architectural Studies and Projects" contributed to the development of a market for architectural representations by putting a price tag on young architects' drawings and selling them straight off the wall, virtually as a capital investment, making them both fashionable and profitable. The highest selling prices were fetched by variants of drawings that were later published in *Delirious New York*, Koolhaas' "Manhattan Projects," and especially drawings by Elia and Zoe Zenghelis.[415] From among the Fellows, Eisenman was featured, whose series of drawings "Transformation No. 14" for his recently completed design for *House VI* commissioned by the Franks and produced by interns at the Institute, found no buyers. However, this development resonated at the Institute, although it represented an intellectual counterpart (not least because of its non-profit status), and yet it was implicated through a symbolic economy.

While public interest in architectural drawings was fostered with exhibitions such as those at MoMA, the Institute began organizing regular architecture exhibitions as part of its exhibition activities under MacNair's banner in the fall of 1975. As aggregations of individual architects from the Institute's circles, these were initially group exhibitions of works by Fellows and friends, forming groups of like-minded individuals and providing frameworks for interpretation, to be later supplemented by exhibitions of works by contemporary postmodern American and European architects. The first group show was "Goodbye Five. Work by Young Architects" (September 16 to October 1, 1975), an exhibition of projects by eighteen young architects assembled by MacNair. Even though the publication *Five Architects*, towards which the title referred, was only a few years old, this represented a provocative proclamation of a generational change in the New York architecture scene, as a continuation of the existing polemic about Eisenman and the New York Five.[416] The exhibition showed a cross-section of a younger American architecture scene that was not really doctrinaire or ideological, nor necessarily

414 Paul Goldberger, "Architectural Drawings at the Modern," *The New York Times* (March 14, 1975), 24; Ada Louise Huxtable, "Poetic Visions of Design for the Future," *The New York Times* (April 27, 1975), 142.

415 Of the sixty-six drawings on display, fifty-three were for sale. According to a list of works, the highest purchase prices were achieved by two drawings by OMA, "The Square of the Captive Globe" [sic!] with US$ 770, which Rem Koolhaus [sic!] had made with Zoe Zenghelis, and "The Egg of Columbus Center" with US$ 780, drawn by Elia and Zoe Zenghelis. None of Madelon Vriesendorp's drawings were sold.

416 The exhibition "Good-bye Five: Work by Young Architects" included works by Alan Chimacoff & Steven Peterson, Architects in Cahoots (John Casbarian, Danny Samuels, Robert Timme), Stuart Cohen, Richard Hammer, Rem Koolhaas, Leon Krier, Andrew MacNair, Mark Mack, Richard Plunz, Stephen Potters, Tod William, Jon Michael Schwarting, Massimo Scolari, Studio Works (Craig Hodgetts, Robert Mangurian), Susana Torre, Lauretta Vinciarelli, Stuart Wrede, and Timony Wood.

committed to a single stance but thrived equally on formal playfulness and figurative allusions, as in the works of Architects in Cahoots from Houston or Studio Works from Los Angeles, and with Susana Torre and Lauretta Vinciarelli also included two female architects.[417] In addition to MacNair as Fellow and Koolhaas as Visiting Fellow, other Institute staff members were also featured (Stephen Potters, Michael Schwarting, and Stuart Wrede). Two European architects, Leon Krier and Massimo Scolari, who stood for postmodernism and were later featured in solo shows, made their first appearance at the Institute in this context. MacNair had buttons that read "Goodbye Five" produced for the opening and distributed them among the audience to deliberately popularize the first group show at the Institute which, like its historically legitimized and now famous predecessor, served primarily as provocation and self-promotion. Simply by wearing this emblematic button, as was common in punk or alternative culture at the time, that evening's exhibition visitors were making a statement, consciously or unconsciously, against the elitist habitus and discursive supremacy of the New York Five. The exhibition was the first at the Institute to attract attention in the New York dailies and architecture press, with critical reviews appearing in the *New York Times* and *Progressive Architecture*.[418] Reviewers complained that the installations were disorganized and unprofessional and lacked labels. Most importantly, they again drew attention to the retreat of architects into artistic practice, which they believed, as had been evident at the Institute in the mid-1970s, to be primarily due to the country's poor economic situation. The Institute's exhibitions, the critics pointed out, and its public events in general were evidence of this: the sociopolitical approaches, participatory design, and environmental issues that had been all the rage in the field at the beginning of the decade, after 1968, were now apparently no longer in vogue among this new generation of architects.

3.2 Hosting Evening Entertainment

With the fall semester of 1975, the Evening Program became much more extensive and attractive, at times including up to ten, sometimes even eleven lecture courses per semester, with two lectures per day, at 6 p.m. and 8 p.m. "Architecture 3" already covered a fairly broad range of topics. In addition to the

417 In 1973, Susana Torre co-founded the Archive of Women in Architecture at the Architectural League of New York, on which basis she curated the 1977 exhibition "Women in American Architecture: A Historic and Contemporary Perspective;" see Susana Torre, *Women in American Architecture: A Historic and Contemporary Perspective* (New York: Whitney Library of Design, 1977), see also https://archleague.org/women-in-american-architecture-1977-and-today/ (last accessed: May 31, 2023).

418 Paul Goldberger, "Young Architects Display Recent Visionary Designs," *The New York Times* (September 19, 1975), 25; Peter Papademetriou, "Good-bye Five: Work by Young Architects," *Progressive Architecture* (November 1975), 20–21.

Fellows' interests and areas of expertise, the lecture courses now included courses facilitated by outside presenters on topics such as historic preservation and the conversion of buildings, humanism in architecture, the history of ideas in nineteenth-century architecture, an introduction to issues in architecture, positions in interior design, the architecture of Chicago, and topics in contemporary art, painting, sculpture, and film. In its dual role as a bridge between education and culture, the Institute cooperated with various local universities and targeted individual lecture courses towards so-called "non-traditional students," emphasizing the focus on architecture as a unique selling point in the course catalogues. For two semesters in a row, art critic and theorist Rosalind Krauss, who had come to the Institute in 1975 at the invitation of Eisenman along with her colleague Annette Michelson after both had quit as editors at *Art Forum*, offered lecture courses on "Content in 1960s Painting and Sculpture" and "Critical Issues of Art in the 1970s." The following spring, Krauss and Michelson founded the art criticism and theory journal *October*, with the Institute as its initial publisher.[419] In a different radical twist, Arthur Drexler presented a lecture course on "L'École des Beaux Arts" in the fall semester of 1975 as a special format designed to coincide with the exhibition he curated at MoMA, "The Architecture of the École des Beaux Arts" (October 1975 to January 1976), even though he had fallen out with Eisenman and had in the meantime resigned as chairman of the Board of Trustees of the Institute. The Beaux-Arts exhibition, which foregrounded the Beaux-Art system that was still prevalent when the Bauhaus made its mark in the 1920s, made a case for postmodernism—as a departure from modernism and as a stylistic movement rather than a social development, which was now being revisited at the Institute, and ultimately both institutions benefited from the debate and the attention.[420] Drexler was viewed rather critically among the Fellows for this MoMA exhibition, which showed original Beaux-Arts drawings and photographs of Beaux-Arts buildings in the USA, and which came across as visually powerful and thus crowd-pleasing. Subsequently, MoMA's recent reorientation was hotly debated at the Institute in the context of a "Forum" for *Oppositions* 4 in January 1976, under the title "The Architecture of the École of Beaux Art-Exhibition," announcing a paradigm shift in architecture culture that had finally arrived in New York.[421]

419 Not only Krauss, but also Michelson contributed to the Institute's public events in return for being hosted there with *October*; Michelson for example offered a lecture course on "Soviet Film 1925–1935. A Study in Revolutionary Cinema" as part of the "Architecture" series, conceived as a film seminar in the Rizzoli Publishing House Screening Room, and sponsored by the Rizzoli Bookstore nearby, on 5th Avenue between 55th and 56th Street. Later, *Oppositions* featured writing on Sergei Mikhailovich Eisenstein; see Manfredo Tafuri, "The Dialectics of the Avant-Garde: Piranesi and Eisenstein," trans. Marlène Barsoum and Liviu Dimitriu, *Oppositions* 11 (Winter 1977), 72–80.

420 MoMA, "The Architecture of the Ecole des Beaux Arts," Press Release no. 59, August 8, 1975, https://www.moma.org/momaorg/shared/pdfs/docs/press_archives/5289/releases/MOMA_1975_0074_59.pdf (last accessed: May 31, 2023); see Kauffman, 2018, 14ff.

421 William Ellis, "Beaux," *Oppositions* 5 (Summer 1976), 131–134.

The curation of "Architecture" as an ongoing series of lectures involving a variety of architects, designers, and artists, academics, and critics in New York and turning them into content providers and cultural producers at the Institute was aimed at amplifying the intricacy, if not the complexity of the debate, and helping the discipline flourish outside of the university lecture hall, the museum/gallery, and beyond of the pages of books and journals. In economic terms, beyond the cultural transformation, the expansion and differentiation of the Institute's teaching and cultural products went hand in hand with the increasing focus of "Architecture" on the philanthropic model in 1975–76, when three types of cultural sponsors were introduced: individuals (US$175), professional sponsors (US$220), and corporate sponsors (US$275). In the spring of 1976, the Institute also received institutional sponsoring for the Evening Program for the first time. At the same time, this establishment of cultural production at the Institute, of social processes involved in the generation and circulation of cultural forms, practices, and values, which was supported by state arts funding, an outwardly open but ultimately closed system of opinion that revealed shared understandings (and misunderstandings) within the New York architecture community, demonstrated to the public that the Fellows were no longer bound by a common research and design project. Nonetheless, in epistemological terms, the Evening Program and Exhibition Program showed that the Fellows, Visiting Fellows, lecturers, and audience formed a collective of thought that was part of a larger community of thought, sharing a common interest in an architectural project: namely, to introduce a new postmodern thinking style and, in this way, to re-culturalize architecture, i.e., to re-semantize, re-historicize, and re-aestheticize it. In an article about the Evening Program in the *New York Times* in October 1975, Goldberger gave the Institute additional support, a good argument against its somewhat elitist image: "But probably the farthest from the ivory tower is the Institute's Evening Program, a New School-like potpourri of courses designed to bring the gospel of architecture to the average man on the street."[422] While Western society at the time, explicitly American society, was from an urban sociological perspective deemed to have lost the capacity for impersonal cooperation and thus for political action, Goldberger, as an architecture critic who was himself involved in and benefited from the reorientation and repositioning of the Institute, with its opening to the public, became an accomplice to this culturalization of architecture.[423]

The immense significance attached at the Institute to the Evening Program, not only as an institutional and discursive format, but above all as a socio-cultural event, was also underscored by the fact that Eisenman himself now presented

422 Goldberger, 1975, 41 & 77.

423 Richard Sennett, *The Fall of Public Man. On the Social Psychology of Capitalism* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1976).

a lecture course entitled "Modernism 1975" for the first and only time in the fall semester of 1975 as part of "Architecture 3," inviting prestigious guests, architects, historians, and critics to debate current trends in architecture and the status quo of contemporary architecture in general, which he provocatively defined as a problem of style. The "Critical Dialogues," as they were captioned, were not a classical lecture course, but rather public events featuring conversations in a talk show format. His guests were John Hejduk, Cesar Pelli, Peter Smithson, Peter Blake, O.M. Ungers, Vincent Scully, Denise Scott Brown, Martin Pawley, and once again Robert Stern, an illustrious circle of intimates and colleagues from various backgrounds who stood for a variety of ideological, conceptual, and architectural approaches. The topics of conversation were the various prevailing styles of the time: realism, pragmatism, modernism, neo-rationalism, populism, idealism, and post-modernism. The talk show format was explicitly modeled on the successful PBS television program "Firing Line" (since 1966) with William F. Buckley Jr. in order to, in Eisenman's words "engender a spirit of participation," i.e., to make the program more viewer-friendly, and perhaps also television-friendly.[424] A stage had even been set up in the Institute's main hall for the first time at Eisenman's particular request. In addition, Eisenman, along with MacNair, had briefly considered recording the events and broadcasting them on New York City Cable TV, then a fledgling medium based on the idea of public access. Although the plan for such a media offensive was not pursued further, Eisenman once again took center stage with the "Critical Dialogues" by conceiving and hosting these events.

A critical historiography of the "Critical Dialogues" based on psychoanalysis and deconstruction might focus on Eisenman's constant pursuit of controversy at the Institute; not only the editorship of *Oppositions* but also the organization of "Architecture" was a means for him to emphasize the Institute's central role and its extraordinary position of power in the American architecture world. The title "Modernism 1975" was self-explanatory, and so the events needed no further explanation beyond their aim, which was to propagate the continuing relevance of a modernist rather than postmodernist architectural language at the dawn of a postmodern pluralism, a culture of ambiguity and indifference. Nor did it require a didactic or communicative concept beyond a simple juxtaposition of eminent architects, historians, theorists, and critics. With forty-nine paying spectators in the audience, the "Critical Dialogues" were comparatively successful, although Eisenman did not come close to the popular appeal of his counterpart Stern. Above all, however, it became clear that the Institute was now attempting to fulfill its educational mandate as broadly as possible with

424 New School, "Course Catalog," 1975–76, 65. The New School course catalogue for the fall semester of 1975, directly below Eisenman's, announced as another lecture course of the "Architecture" series that urban planning scholar and Civil Rights activist Paul Davidoff was to present at the Institute on "Community Participation in the Environmental Design of Neighborhoods: Programs for Improvement." But the education offering on the history, politics, and strategies of planning from below was, for unknown reasons, not offered at all.

"Architecture," and that the Evening Program admirably served the needs of the New York cultural audience as evening entertainment, comparable to television. While the education and culture programs pushed for professionalization and economization, the Institute itself in 1975–76 became more of a stage than a classroom, with controversial positions being discussed and counter-positions taken. This practice echoed that of the "Whites" vs. "Grays" debate, in that it suggested a choice, but ultimately represented no real alternative.[425]

The emergence of postmodernism, conceived as both a discursive formation and an institutional network, ultimately as a cultural phenomenon in architecture, became evident at the Institute in "Architecture 3," where intellectual debate took a back seat to quality of performance. What is notable about Eisenman's greatest contribution to adult education is that he called these public conversations "critical." His choice of guests suggests that he meant this as more of a formal or rhetorical attribution than a philosophical or socio-political one. For not only the debate conducted with *Oppositions*, but also the public events, series of lectures, and exhibitions were ultimately additive and collective, characterized by competition, solidarity, enmity, and friendship. The definition of the position adopted with "Modernism 1975" already testified to the fact that—even before Charles Jencks finally made the pluralism of varieties of post-modernism socially acceptable, presentable, and intelligible with *The Language of Post-Modern Architecture* (1977)—the narratives of modernism had been exhausted and emptied of all meaning.[426] Attention was now focused on the staging of a plurality, which was always also socially specific, gendered, and generationally contingent, which represented a distraction from architecture, housing, and urban planning as a formerly social task. Despite all the claims of "criticality," aside from its popular format, "Modernism 1975" was in institutional terms an elitist event, characterized by the fact that it no longer made any difference whether the issues under discussion were "real" or "bogus."[427]

With regard to the Institute's architectural project—disciplinary and professional—which was directly related to the self-realization and self-marketing both of the Fellows as individuals and the Institute as a group, Eisenman found a congenial partner in Stern, who had initially claimed "post-modernism" for himself, his thinking, and his activities in New York architecture circles, and not

425 Watson, 2005; Martin, 2010, 29.

426 See especially the "Architecture" chapter in Martin, 2010, 174–179.

427 In epistemological terms, the distinction between "real problems" and "bogus problems" is central, not only to modern science, but to any exclusive community; see Fleck, [1935] 1979, 104; in architecture history, the accusation of the falseness of postmodernism, explicitly formulated against Eisenman's networks, has been repeatedly made and fiercely debated; see Ghirardo, 1994. The Institute's original claim to stand for the real, i.e., for "real facts" and for "real problems," has since faded.

only for the "Critical Dialogues."[428] Eisenman and Stern joined forces by staging a controversial debate that was performed in public, thus apparently producing architectural truths. Their shared interest in the power of controversy and an economy of attention was first manifested in their joint publication of a special issue of the Japanese journal *Architecture + Urbanism* on "White and Gray: Eleven Modern Architects" in April 1975.[429] With their appearances in each other's lecture courses as part of "Architecture," Eisenman and Stern continued the "Whites" vs. "Grays" debate that had previously been generated and conducted in journals, i.e., *Architectural Forum* and *Oppositions*, at the Institute, literally "in-house," showcasing themselves and their projects in an open confrontation.[430] In 1976, just when the Institute was escaping the narrow national focus of the debate and was able to position itself internationally, for example by signing a contract with MIT Press for *Oppositions* (see chapter four) and by being commissioned to curate the American contribution to the 1976 Venice

428 Architecture historian Kazys Varnelis points out that Eisenman and Stern were friends and documents the extent to which both were aware of their roles and expressed that they needed each other as opponents: "As Stern described it, his friendship with Peter Eisenman was based on 'the very oppositeness of his nature from mine ... [he] is my perfect alter-ego: If I didn't invent Peter Eisenman who would have?'" Eisenman, for his part, once claimed, "If Stern had not existed, I would have had to invent him, and vice versa." See Kazys Varnelis, "Philip Johnson's Empire: Network Power and the AT&T Building," in *Philip Johnson: The Constancy of Change*, ed. Emmanuel Petit (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2009), 123.

429 *Architecture + Urbanism*, no. 52 (April 1975): "White and Gray: Eleven Modern Architects". This issue featured projects by twelve East Coast architects (all men) who roughly fell into the two camps of the "Whites" and the "Grays": Peter Eisenman, Robert Stern (with John Hagmann), Charles Moore, Richard Meier, Michael Graves, Jaquelin Robertson, Werner Seligmann, Charles Gwathmey (with Robert Siegel), Richard Weinstein, Tim Prentice with Lo-Yi Chan and Rolf Ohlhausen, Giovanni Pasanella, and John Hejduk. The projects were framed by two introductory texts by Vincent Scully ("The Shingle Style Today or the Historians Revenge") and Colin Rowe ("Collage City"). The occasion for this renewed grouping, which resumed the polemics of the early 1970s, was a discussion meeting at the University of California in May 1974, hosted by Cesar Pelli, Anthony Lumsden, Tim Vreeland, Craig Hodgetts, and Paul Kennon, who called themselves the "Silvers." In the second half of the 1970s, the juxtaposition was then superseded by the emergence of debates on architectural postmodernism vs. the neo-avant-garde.

430 In *Utopia's Ghosts*, Martin points out that the dichotomous "Gray/White" camp formation overlapped with the launch of *Oppositions* and other activities at the Institute in 1973, when Stern edited the special feature "Five on Five" for *Architectural Forum*: "Thus, also in 1973, elements of this apparatus interacted with those of another apparatus speaking its own dialect in the Gray/White debate, an in-house power struggle of five against five, for which architecture-as-language was a foregone conclusion. It made no difference that one side spoke of semantics while the other spoke of syntactics, because these two levels ultimately converged—again, quite pragmatically—in architecture's new home within an ecology and an economy of signs." See Martin, 2010, 66. Elsewhere, Martin compares the staging of the debate to a televised boxing match, as a media event in which the point is to take sides with one of the two opponents; see Martin, 2010, 29. When he writes that the debate was held "in-house," he seemed to be referring to the fact that it was hermetic. It should be noted, however, that the debate was not only mediatized in journals, but also took place live at the Institute, and that the competition, due to the concerted efforts and prearranged agenda, resembled a wrestling match rather than a boxing match; less of a sporting contest than one that was always about high ratings and good entertainment; see Förster, 2018, 215, 226, footnote 5.

Biennale, the programming and curation of "Architecture 4" provided concrete proof that the two supposedly opposing but ultimately quite similar schools of thought represented by Eisenman and Stern may have differed in terms of their preferred architectural language, but not in their media or forms of communication, despite their individual habituses and cultural differences.[431]

International Stage

After audience figures for the Evening Program stagnated, albeit at a high level, in 1975–76, the Institute was able to obtain additional funding from the NEA by including art theory in the spring of 1976. The broader scope of "Architecture" alone enabled the Institute to demonstrate openness and inclusiveness, lay claim to specific topics, and involve a wide range of people. It was no less original to legitimize architectural theory by including art theory, analogous to the steps taken by Eisenman with his house designs earlier in the decade, and thus to assert the autonomy of a postmodern, creative, and intellectual architectural practice on a broad basis. Notwithstanding, with "Architecture 5" in the fall semester of 1976, when the economic downturn was still definitely noticeable after the height of the crisis, the Institute offered more established architects and designers than ever a major platform on the international stage to present and discuss their current projects: practicing architects from the Institute's broader network and friends from Eisenman's circles (John Hejduk, Charles Gwathmey, Ulrich Franzen, Philip Johnson), international guests (Arata Isozaki, Rafael Moneo, James Stirling, O.M. Ungers) and New York and other American architects (Samuel Brody & Lewis Davis, William Conklin, Charles Moore, Paul Rudolph). MacNair also managed to engage renowned graphic and fashion designers (George Nelson, Candy Pratts, Ward Bennett, Mary Joan Glynn, Milton Glaser, Massimo Vignelli, Ivan Chermayeff) for the Evening Program. The highlight of "Architecture 5," however, was Manfredo Tafuri, who was enlisted as an internationally renowned scholar to make an appearance at the Institute with a lecture on "Modern Architecture: The Dialectics of Order and Disorder." Tafuri was Eisenman's and the Institute's harshest and most vehement critic and had previously torn apart the self-proclaimed avant-garde, or postmodern "neo-avant-garde," on the basis of a historically grounded reading, a combination of structuralist linguistics and political economic analysis.

431 By the time Tafuri unmasked the demarcation between the different camps in American architecture circles as arbitrary in his [1976] 1987 essay "The Ashes of Jefferson," the PR strategies of the "Whites" and the "Grays" had already been transformed into a debate about the legitimacy of an architectural postmodernism. The Five Architects were finally, with *Oppositions* 5 (Summer 1976), declared dead. A collage of portraits of the five protagonists, as part of Vignelli's graphic design, which preceded Tafuri's contribution "American Graffiti. Five x Five = Twenty-five" provided another self-image, through which this short-lived group was simultaneously historicized and heroized. Eisenman, with his polemical text "Post-Functionalism," which was finally published as an editorial to *Oppositions* 6 (Fall 1976), claimed to have outlined a basis for a general theory of architecture.

In view of this comprehensive and impressive program, which was once again communicated via the poster and fully justified the funding from the NEA, it hardly mattered that individual speakers who had been initially announced did not appear in the end and in some cases, entire lecture courses had to be canceled due to lack of audience interest. What became apparent, however, was that the two art courses planned by Krauss (Lawrence Alloway, Max Kozloff, Jeremy Gilbert-Rolfe, Steven Koch, Robert Pincus-Witten, and Yvonne Rainer were scheduled as external guests), for example, were ultimately not held due to lack of interest.

In the mid-1970s it became evident that the Institute, with all its public events, "Architecture" as a series of lectures, and the exhibitions, increasingly functioned as what in social research is called a tastemaker, as well as a gatekeeper, since it not only mediated access to the globalizing architecture world of New York, but also represented a reference system in that it did not act and network as a functional elite in the service of a power elite, but instead shaped at least the American, if not international architecture debates and education with new patterns of interpretation, structures of meaning, and identities. In the spring of 1976, new trends from Europe were introduced at the Institute when a new series of lectures called "New Wave of European Architecture," aimed at professionals and students, brought a number of young European architects to New York for the first time as part of "Architecture 5." Among the invitees were O.M. Ungers (representing Berlin), Rem Koolhaas (Amsterdam), Elia Zenghelis (London), Massimo Scolari (Milan), Carlo Aymonino (Venice), Robert Krier (Vienna), Leon Krier (London), Jürgen Sawade (Berlin), Aldo Rossi (Milan) and, at the end, O.M. Ungers again (this time representing Cologne). For ten weeks, they met on Monday afternoons to discuss their current projects in the context of the respective local architecture scenes. While the title of the series was a reference to the French Nouvelle Vague—the auteur films of young cineastes produced in the 1950s and 60s that opposed established commercial cinema, its imagery, and narrative flow—the international new generation of architects was, at the suggestion of MacNair, announced as the new architectural avant-garde in the subcultural *Village Voice*.[432] And while a central role was assigned to Ungers, Koolhaas was singled out as the secret star. The distinctive hallmark of the "European New Wave" as another public event was that a group of young European auteur architects, who represented unconventional, even dissenting approaches while simultaneously espousing a shared postmodern aesthetic, were brought together under one label and marketed by the Institute. Unlike the avant-garde movements historicized in *Oppositions*

432 The tone of the advert in the *Village Voice* was rather suggestive: "Facades: From the urban centers of Europe—London, Berlin, Vienna, Milan, etc.—come nine of the architectural avant-garde to tell us their theories about the endless quest 'to make a new architecture.'" See "Options" *Village Voice* (January 19, 1976).

and communicated by "Architecture," it was not so much about the marriage of artistic expression and social progress or even radicalism in the face of changing socio-economic and political conditions. The "European New Wave" was primarily significant in conceptual and methodological terms; in New York, it marked the beginning of a globalized, postmodern architecture culture based on a glamorized culture of celebrity. For the Italian architect Aldo Rossi, who in 1976 began commuting regularly between Milan and the United States, where he taught as Mellon Professor at Cornell University and Visiting Professor at Cooper Union, it was the first, but not the last, appearance at the Institute; he was absorbed and appropriated by Eisenman for his own purposes. The Krier brothers were also largely unknown in the United States at the time. Ultimately, all of the Institute's programs and products aimed at both peers and a general public had a cultural, social, and symbolic added value in addition to their educational value. With the "New Wave" format, which was not well received by the New York architecture public at first, but was later continued and expanded, the Institute campaigned for a young generation of up-and-coming architects from Europe at an early stage, quasi a postmodern variant of what MoMA had previously done with its International Program. It identified who was popular internationally and subsequently, in combination with its publications, shaped the taste of a generation of architects in the United States.

In addition, monographic exhibitions of architectural designs began to be regularly shown at the Institute. Characteristically for the architectural innovation of this period, it was mainly drawings and models, i.e., the classic instruments of design, that were on display—preferably of visionary or theoretical projects, and less of realized or even projected projects. In the spring of 1976, for example, Scolari and Rossi each exhibited their fictional "Drawings and Projects" in solo exhibitions at the Institute after their "New Wave" lectures. Again, exhibitions and even openings at the Institute were sparsely attended, although MacNair, now supported by Silvia Kolbowski, produced specially designed advertisements and posters based on Vignelli's graphic identity concept. Because the main hall was always available except for in the evenings and the times when design studio crits were held for the educational programs, MacNair was able to produce exhibitions in a very short time and on a low budget. In addition, in his typical DIY style, he produced fanzine-like booklets to accompany the exhibitions. These contained photocopied materials and were quickly stapled together. In curating the Exhibition Program, he then primarily implemented the ideas of Eisenman and other Fellows and worked closely with the exhibiting architects. The short lines of communication and comparatively unbureaucratic structures at the Institute made it possible to make quick decisions and thus respond to needs as they arose. The exhibits, still presented in a makeshift manner, were often simply hung on the walls, and most of the time no special exhibition design was developed at all. Even if a certain plurality was celebrated within "Architecture" as the highest virtue at the Institute, what the various cultural productions, the

positions represented in the series of lectures, and the aesthetics conveyed by the exhibitions had in common was that they testified to the verbally and visually powerful assertion of artistic and intellectual autonomy. In this sense, the Institute acted more as a non-commercial art space of architecture, at least formally, while the works did not have a local angle (which gained in complexity as art and commerce became increasingly intermingled).

If the 1970s saw the permeation of capitalism into all areas of social and cultural life, then the Institute, with its repositioning and restructuring, stands as an example of how, against the backdrop of the triumphant advance of the culture, media, and advertising industries in the United States, the fine dividing lines between education and entertainment, culture and commerce became increasingly diffuse—including in the field of architecture.[433] By the mid-1970s, the Institute was able to establish itself as a new architecture institution with an extremely ambitious product and program policy, in terms of form and content, in very differently regulated knowledge markets. In addition to architecture education with the "Undergraduate Program," the "Internship Program," and the "Design and Study Options," and cultural production with "Architecture," the Exhibitions Program, and new formats such as the "New Wave" series, a more comprehensive publication practice emerged as a new, third field of activity for Fellows and editorial staff (see chapter four). With its complex reprogramming and curation, the Institute enriched the educational and cultural landscape of the New York metropolitan region while asserting its role as a leading architecture center on the East Coast of the United States, if not the international stage, thanks to its broader cultural aspirations. By engaging with very different forms of capital, the Institute now established itself as a powerful instance of consecration and legitimation on the lines of Bourdieu's analysis in "Sociology of the Market of Symbolic Goods," thus exerting influence on the reconstitution of the architecture field and the reinterpretation of an architectural habitus.[434] After its repositioning, the Institute's leadership did everything within its power to ensure that it acted as an institution itself and was legitimized by other cultural and professional institutions. Having already been honored by the Municipal Art Society in 1975, the Institute was awarded the Gold Medal of the American Institute of Architects (AIA) in early May 1976. The Institute's operations, its

433 On the mechanisms of culture, media, and advertising industries, see Adorno and Horkheimer, [1969] 2009. The Institute's contribution to the transformation of architecture culture lay less in new technologies of information transmission or telecommunication that were gradually gaining acceptance in metropolitan society, as well as architecture firms; personal computers did not play a role yet, and cable television was not used. At the Institute, the copy machine was the most important device. It was used by the Institute's leadership, editors, and faculty to copy documents, texts, and teaching materials; writing and editing was done using the "cut and paste" technique. Eisenman also made copies of many internal documents, which he apparently took home with him and later gave to the CCA as the Institute's (un-)official archive, so that they form the source basis of this publication.

434 Bourdieu, [1971] 1983.

policies, and economics were now clearly aimed at becoming an authority on education and culture and a serious competitor to other New York institutions.

Inner Circle and Extended Circle

The crux and major challenge facing the institutionalization of new cultural forms, practices, and values at the Institute, as well as its further expansion as a network, were once again Eisenman's charismatic, entrepreneurial, and ambitious behavior, bearing, and presence, which determined the Institute's Fellowship and personnel policies. Recent organizational, structural, and functional changes in 1975–76 were reflected in the expansion of the Fellowship and new structures of actors and relationships, underscoring the growth and maturity of architecture education, the diversification of cultural production, and the introduction of public relations activities. The Institute now included ten Fellows; in addition to Eisenman, as the established, unchallenged Institute director and Wolf as chairman of the Fellows, they were, in alphabetical order: Diana Agrest, Stanford Anderson, Julia Bloomfield, William Ellis, Kenneth Frampton, Mario Gandelsonas, Andrew MacNair, and Leland Taliaferro.[435] The Fellowship, despite its members' obligation to pay dues to the Institute while retaining their status, was a flexible structure that accommodated the particular conditions and needs of the Institute's cultural work. This was illustrated by the modification of the Fellowship Article, undertaken in 1975–76 for the first time to reflect the Institute's newly defined orientation as an educational and cultural entity. Not only was the status of Visiting Fellows redefined and regulated, but it was also established that the Institute, even if it continued to grow, would have a maximum of only twenty Fellows, ensuring the exclusivity of their status. After Koolhaas and Wrede had been Visiting Fellows for the first half of the year, both of them contributing to individual lecture courses and deriving an income from teaching, Eisenman succeeded in bringing two more architects from Europe: Bernard Tschumi and Grahame Shane. They both came to the Institute from the Architectural Association in the spring of 1976, after Koolhaas had left to return to London, and were on the Institute's faculty in the second half of the year.[436] One of Eisenman's successes, a milestone for the Institute,

435 The Fellows, however, were not all equally involved in cultural and educational activities, let alone stationed at the Institute at all: Anderson was editor in charge of the Institute's *On Streets* publication, to be published by MIT Press, but was hardly ever present in New York, Frampton taught at the RCA in London from 1975 to 1977, occasionally visiting New York to hold lectures at the Institute and working primarily as editor of *Oppositions*, and Taliaferro worked as executive architect on the MGPV housing project in Brownsville, Brooklyn until 1976, and then as Eisenman's executive partner on *House X* outside of the Institute.

436 In contrast to Shane, who left the Institute after only one semester, Tschumi stayed a little longer, showing "A Space: A Thousand Words," the exhibition which he curated, and first exhibited at the RCA in London in April 1975, for a second time, while also working on his postcard series "Advertisements for Architecture" and writing his manifesto-like text "Architecture and Transgression;" see Sandra Kaji-O'Grady, "The London Conceptualists: Architecture and

its future activities, and its reputation was a contract signed with MIT Press in April 1976 for the continued publication of *Oppositions*. This transformed what was supposed to be a "little magazine" into a scholarly journal, strengthening the format, and the content was now provided by the Institute's international circles. In the spring of 1976, the Institute added a second publication: the art theory and criticism journal *October*, edited by Krauss and Michelson, and initially self-published. This meant that, in addition to the Evening Program and the Exhibition Program, two formats whose reach was primarily local and regional, the Institute now had two ambitious publications with an international reach. Thus, at least temporarily, the Fellows secured a near-monopoly position in the architecture and art debate and participated in the international debate about postmodern theory, historiography, and aesthetics which, in the case of *October* (more than *Oppositions*), reflected the rise of poststructuralism, and was particularly influenced by French philosophers.[437] Eisenman succeeded in bringing more people, who were responsible for individual productions, to the Institute as Visiting Fellows for 1976–77, including Vidler as the new editor of *Oppositions* and Krauss as editor of *October*. Finally, the Institute evolved into a lively and popular hub for architects from the United States and abroad during this period, cultivating a variety of relationships as more and more architects from Europe, Japan, and Argentina stopped by the Institute on their journey to the East Coast of the USA via New York (in no small part due to its convenient location between Grand Central Terminal and Penn Station/the Port Authority Bus Station). It thus became an incubator for architectural ideas, the commercialization of drawings and models, and new projects. For example, in addition to regular visits from Rossi, Rafael Moneo, among others, spent time at the Institute at Eisenman's invitation beginning in 1976, and Arata Isozaki was also a frequent guest. Curating content and building complex relationships with individuals who participated as lecturers, exhibitors, authors, teachers, etc., the Institute was not only a platform and showcase for its distinguished Fellows but also a gateway for high-profile and soon-to-be prominent international guests to the American architecture and art world.

Another step toward professionalizing the Institute's cultural work was the creation of the post of director of development in the spring of 1976 at the initiative of Armand Bartos, a long-time chairman of the Institute's Board of Trustees, which was to become the central point of contact for the development and implementation of fundraising, cultural sponsorships, and third-party

Performance in the 1970s," *Journal of Architectural Education* 61, no. 4 (2008), 43–51. Ultimately, Tschumi also turned his back on the Institute, not least because he felt less connected to the New York architecture scene than to the local art scene. His subsequent exhibitions, "Architectural Manifestos" and "Manhattan Transcripts" were both shown at other New York art venues, at Artists' Space and at P.S.1.

437 The journal *Semiotext(e)* had organized the conference "Schizo-Culture" at Columbia University in late 1975 to introduce post-1968 French radical philosophy to New York.

financing. From a pool of thirty applicants, Wolf ultimately selected Frederieke Taylor, who had previous experience in public relations in England and had also served on MoMA's Junior Council.[438] Upon her appointment as director of development, Taylor, who was initially given Visiting Fellow status in 1976–77 before being elected Fellow in 1977, filled one of the few full-time positions at the Institute paid for by the Bartos' Gottesman Foundation. Building on the American tradition of philanthropy and existing grant programs, her primary responsibilities were to improve outreach, solicit private donations, and submit applications to the major arts and cultural foundations at the state and federal levels. In addition, she was responsible for the Institute's relations with its trustees and its broader network. As a marketing tool, the Institute commissioned a new prospectus which was mailed out in the spring of 1976 and for the first time listed all seven of the Institute's educational offerings and its past research and design projects, various publications, exhibitions, and awards.[439] Obviously, the establishment of the new post restructured the Institute's entire operations, which had a positive effect on the financial planning of its leadership and made its business practices both more professional and more transparent. Once in office, one of Taylor's first official acts was to organize a fundraiser for all of the past donors of the "Architecture" series; in June 1976, she invited representatives of the business and finance communities to a reception at the Union League Club, where they heard a talk about the importance of adult education in architecture, which was then one of the Institute's flagships. As early as the second half of the 1970s, her duties also included establishing a circle of friends of the Institute as a philanthropic network, the newly launched Architects' Circle, cultivating relationships so that the organization and program of all the public events would be supported by a network of patrons in the future. As "friends," Taylor initially courted successful architectural firms that had already presented lectures as part of "Architecture," and thus were beholden to the Institute. Philip Johnson, who had officially sponsored *Oppositions* since 1974 but had otherwise remained in the background, was one of the first donors of the Evening Program. Thanks to Johnson's recommendations, Taylor was subsequently able to successively expand the Institute's Architects' Circle, organizing exclusive events for members in return for an annual contribution

438 Taylor's father, Pieter Sanders, a Dutch art collector who specialized in Piet Mondrian, became interested in architectural models and drawings at the time and bought a model of Eisenman's *House X*.

439 The Institute's 1976 prospectus advertised not only the names of both trustees and Fellows, but also Visiting Fellows at the time. It listed all the public and private grants awarded to the Institute since 1974–75 as a form of recognition and to solicit funding: NEA, NYSCA, C.B.S. Foundation Inc, The Duke Endowment, Graham Foundation, D.S. and R.H. Gottesman Foundation, J.M. Kaplan Fund, Inc, Edward John Noble Foundation, Alfred P. Sloan Foundation, and Van Ameringen Foundation, Inc.

of US$1500.[440] In addition, the Institute listed all its cultural sponsors in promotional materials, and they also received a subscription to *Oppositions*. The professionalization of cultural production in architecture, following in the footsteps of established institutions, was ultimately made possible by the fact that the Institute's operations were now sustained by a complex economic model which, while still being based on tuition fees and reliant on grants from various foundations, took an increasingly professionalized approach to cultural sponsorship as a third source of revenue, i.e., a reciprocal venture. This was quite common in the United States for 501 (c) not-for-profit organizations. Crucially, however, larger sums were available as a result of the federal funding policy during this period. It was explicitly the NEA and NEH under President Jimmy Carter in the wake of the bicentennial celebration in 1976 that enabled the Institute to exist and evolve as an agenda-setting cultural space, a social space for work, life, and experience, and a style-setting architectural firm. In its as-yet new dual role as an institution of education and culture, the Institute flourished by intensifying and differentiating its publishing activities. It shaped material and non-material architecture culture in the United States and beyond, informing postmodern thinking styles, transforming aesthetic norms and attitudes, and introducing new cultural ideas, values, and beliefs—a truly epistemic space that produced bodies of knowledge, power structures, and creative and intellectual routines through exchanges with other disciplines, the arts, and the humanities.

Transatlantic Dialogue

The Institute's focus on culture, i.e., the assertion and establishment of a complex web of meaning, and especially its focus on curation, i.e., in Eisenman's case specifically the compilation of lists and assemblage of groups, was again evident in the summer of 1976, when it was officially invited by the U.S. Committee on International Exhibitions of the American Federation of Arts to curate the American contribution to the XXXVVIII Biennale di Venezia. For the first time, the famed art biennial, traditionally framed as a competition between nations, included an architecture section called "Europe/America: architettura urbana, alternative suburbane" in the Magazzini del Sale under the curatorial direction of Vittorio Gregotti in addition to the national pavilions.[441] The architecture focus at the 1976 Venice Biennale was thus the dichotomous confrontation and exchange between European and American positions on the relation of architecture to the city, which was played out as a conflict of interests and generations between representatives

440 The Institute's Architects' Circle in fiscal year 1977–78 involved: Edward L. Barnes; Davis, Brody & Associates; Conklin and Rossant; Ulrich Franzen; Philip Johnson & John Burgee; Richard Meier; Mitchell/Giurgola; I.M. Pei; Paul Rudolph; Skidmore, Owings & Merrill; and Robert Stern.

441 "Europe–America. Historical Centre–Suburbia," in *Environment*, *Participation*, *Cultural Structures: General Catalogue*. Second Volume, ed. La Biennale di Venezia (Venice: Alfieri Edizioni d'arte, 1976), 235–264.

of modernism (members of Team X such as Aldo van Eyck, Giancarlo De Carlo, Alison and Peter Smithson) and postmodernism (Manfredo Tafuri, Aldo Rossi, and several American architects invited by the Institute).[442] For the curation of the American projects, the Institute received funding in advance from the NEA and the Graham Foundation; in addition, various other American universities (Cooper Union, Columbia University, UCLA, Pratt Institute) participated in the exhibition—both financially and through student labor.[443] As Institute director, Eisenman made the curation of the American contribution his own project and invited Stern to serve as co-curator. Under the title "Suburban Alternatives. Eleven American Projects," the two assembled several architects and firms whose designs for suburban homes were meant to represent a genuinely American architecture, to the exclusion of others.[444] At the Institute, the selection of participants, whose contributions and exhibits were coordinated by Taylor, i.e., a kind of public relations exercise, became a veritable power play, sometimes involving violent reactions, angry phone calls, and bruised egos. In his opening speech to the panel discussion that he held as curator in Venice on August 1, 1976, Eisenman declared that for him the fundamental problem was one "of building urbanity, of suburbia, or society," only to assert immediately afterward that it was the Americans who were now bringing in new ideas because of their experience with suburbanization.[445] By, above all, resisting the resumption of the debate on modernity, he was deliberately preparing the way for postmodernism. Adopting the role of architecture historian, he acknowledged "the change of the modern movement," before summarily

442 Léa-Catherine Szacka, "Debates on Display at the 1976 Venice Biennale," in *Place and Displacement: Exhibiting Architecture*, eds. Thordis Arrhenius, Mari Lending, Wallis Miller, Jérémie Michael McGowan (Zurich: Lars Müller, 2014), 97–112. It would, however, be short-sighted to limit the debate to the generational conflict alone. While architecture was given its own subsection at the 1976 Venice Biennale with the emergence of postmodernism, an independent architecture biennale was staged for the first time in 1980 under the curatorial direction of Paolo Portoghesi; see Léa-Catherine Szacka, *Exhibiting the Postmodern. The 1980s Venice Biennale* (Venice: Marsilio, 2016).

443 During the bicentennial celebration of the independence of the United States, the funding volume of the federal foundations in the art and the humanities was significantly increased, explicitly with regard to art education (and thus also architecture education) programs; see Donna Binkiewicz, *Federalizing the Muse: United States Policy and the National Endowment for the Arts, 1965–1980* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina, 2004), 184ff.

444 At the 1976 Venice Biennale, "Suburban Alternatives: Eleven American Projects" featured: Raimund Abraham, Emilio Ambasz, Peter Eisenman, John Hejduk, Craig Hodgetts, Richard Meier, Charles Moore, Cesar Pelli, Robert Stern, Stanley Tigerman, Denise Scott Brown with Robert Venturi (of the New York Five, Michael Graves, Charles Gwathmey & Robert Siegel were not involved; of the Fellows, Diana Agrest and Mario Gandelsonas). In 1977, the projects of four architects who had exhibited in Venice were presented in New York in the exhibition "Abraham / Eisenman / Hejduk / Rossi" at Cooper Union.

445 IAUS, "Transcript of a Conference at Venice Biennale," August 1, 1976. Source: CCA Montréal, IAUS fonds: ARCH153618. The participants were: Carlo Aymonino, Peter Eisenman, James Stirling, Raimund Abraham, Aldo Rossi, John Hejduk, Denise Scott Brown, Hans Hollein, Robert Stern, Peter Smithson, Emilio Ambasz, Giancarlo De Carlo, Oriol Bohigas, Aldo Van Eyck, Manfredo Tafuri, and Alvaro Siza.

dismissing functionalism in a multitude of respects: political, economic, sociological, and aesthetic. Eisenman concluded his speech by quoting Michel Foucault and referring to a new episteme of "post-functionalist sensibility," which he nevertheless pointedly set apart from a "positivist sensibility." The two American curators, a real dream team, brought practical ideas to the exhibition rather than theoretical ones, and used the biennial to their own ends: Eisenman showcased designs of *House X*, and Stern presented his project for a subway suburb.[446] In sum, the American contribution to this twentieth-century debate on urbanism/suburbanism as a way of life thus once again drew attention to the ways in which author architecture and the real estate industry were intertwined. With its plea for urban development largely based on automobility, home ownership, and mortgages, the exhibition curated at the Institute dovetailed effortlessly with the agenda of architectural postmodernism, which in Venice was pitted against the representatives of a now-defunct European structuralist approach to modernist urbanization.[447] If participation in the exhibition meant media attention on the very big international stage for the American architects who took part, especially for Eisenman, the Institute was also able to make a name for itself and gain recognition as a new cultural actor and network on an international level.[448]

446 Peter Eisenman, "Five Easy Pieces: Dialectical Fragments Toward the Decomposition and Reintegration of Suburbia," in *Environment, Participation, Cultural Structures: General Catalogue*. Second Volume, ed. La Biennale di Venezia (Venice: Alfieri Edizioni d'arte, 1976), 256; see also Fredric Jameson, "Modernity versus Postmodernity in Peter Eisenman," in *Cities of Artificial Excavation. The Work of Peter Eisenman, 1978–1988*, ed. Jean François Bédard (New York, Rizzoli International, 1994), 27–37. Stern's design indirectly criticized the Institute's only realized building project by contrasting the low-rise housing complex in Brownsville, Brooklyn, commissioned by the Urban Development Corporation, financed in public-private partnership, and completed in the summer of 1976 after three years of construction, with a counter model based on small-scale, private ownership and located in the immediate neighborhood.

447 At the 1976 Venice Biennale, the now transatlantic dispute over the interpretation of architecture—polarizing between generations, styles, continents, and politics—erupted on August 1, 1976, during a panel between Aldo van Eyck and Manfredo Tafuri. Eisenman, commenting on Oriol Bohigas' *Oppositions* essay on "Aldo van Eyck and the New Amsterdam School," described the situation with the following words: "However, unlike the usual transition between generations, this was not just the passing of an age or the changing of a style. Instead, it revealed the existence of a profound schism between the architects of the fifties and sixties and those of the seventies. This split is marked by a galaxy of complex liaisons and alliances, as well as by the conflicts represented by the architects of the Biennale—United States vs. Europe, Team Ten vs. Tendenza, near Left vs. far Left, populism vs. elitism, realism vs. formalism—all of which are too fraught with subtle nuances to be easily condensed in this context." See Peter Eisenman, "Commentary," *Oppositions* 9 (Summer 1977), 19–20.

448 It emerged from the assembly of participants that by 1976 the demarcation between the two camps of the "Whites" and the "Grays" had become obsolete. In his essay "Les cendres de Jefferson," written in the summer of 1976, Tafuri pointed out that the two camps were ultimately not that different; see Tafuri, 1976. Reinhold Martin took up Tafuri's criticism of the indistinguishability of the architectural positions in his history of postmodernism: "By 1976, the date of Tafuri's 'Ashes of Jefferson' text, the debate had played itself out with both sides fully identified with postmodernism." See Martin, 2010, 30.

On the other side of the Atlantic, the Institute benefitted from the contacts it had made, emerging in the second half of the 1970s as an important hub and nexus for a transatlantic dialogue, contributing its share to the globalizing postmodern European and North American cultural sphere. This was largely due to Eisenman's esteem for both intellectual and creative positions from Europe and his efforts not only to invite criticism but to make the critics great. After the 1976 Venice Biennale, Eisenman continued to expand his contacts in Italy, especially with the architects, historians, and theorists teaching at the Istituto Universitario di Architettura di Venezia (IUAV). It was, as so often with Eisenman, a personal, social network superimposed over the institutional one that was cultivated, presented, and exhibited here. After Rossi's and Scolari's first appearances at the Institute in the wake of the "European New Wave" earlier that year, Eisenman planned to engage them as faculty in the newly created "Design and Study Options" (which ultimately never came to fruition), as he did with Tafuri, who headed the IUAV in 1976, positioning it at the intersection of criticism and historiography and thus charting a course for action, both for himself and for the discipline.[449] Even if this plan to integrate some of the most prominent European professors of architecture and architecture history and persuade them to commit to the Institute's larger cultural project failed, a "New York—Venice" axis was invoked, at least from the Institute's vantage point, which was reflected in the cultural production manifested on the pages of *Oppositions*. This axis was later translated into further exhibitions by Rossi and Scolari and was then reflected in publications (both planned and realized) by Rossi, Tafuri, and others. This was somewhat surprising since the Venice School was committed to highlighting the conditionality and thus fragility of historical certainties, rather than simply reproducing architectural ideologies, as was often the case at the Institute.

In terms of both architecture and media history, it is noteworthy that as the Institute's relations with Europe intensified in the summer of 1976, the European architecture press also became more critical of the transformations in American architecture culture. This was most evident in the French *L'Architecture d'Aujourd'hui*, edited by Bernard Huet, whose August/September 1976 issue, a special issue on New York's building culture called "New York in White and Gray" was devised as a commentary on the unfolding urban crisis of the American metropolis and resulting developments in the profession and discipline of architecture.[450] With contributions from Huet as editor-in-chief and Brian Brace Taylor as correspondent editor, who was intimately

449 For Tafuri, writing mainly as a historian, historiographical research represented a form of resistance after the project of modernity had become fully enmeshed in the capitalist system; see Leach, 2014.

450 *L'Architecture d'Aujourd'hui*, no. 186 (August/September 1976): "New York in White and Gray."

familiar with the American architecture world and was responsible for this issue, "New York in White and Gray" addressed two parallel, reinforcing developments, later exemplified by the image of the demolition of the Pruitt-Igoe housing complex: the emergence of an architectural postmodernism versus the end of public housing. The issue exclusively presented individual positions from the Institute's inner circle: Agrest (with Alessandra Latour) and Frampton each contributed an article, documenting a housing competition announced by the Urban Development Corporation for Roosevelt Island in 1975 while also discussing the subsequent demise of the housing authority and its consequences for the Institute's only building project, published here as a sort of post-mortem. In addition, *L'Architecture d'Aujourd'hui* published an article by Stern (but not by Eisenman) which was presented as the first theory of postmodern architecture. The thematic issue also included articles by Taylor and Tafuri, both of whom provided detailed descriptions and reflections based on participant observations, offering key texts that, from a historiographical, theoretical, and—ultimately—narrative perspective, provided initial insights into what an institutional critique of architecture might look like, i.e., how the work of architecture institutions in general and the Institute, in particular, might be addressed, and while not necessarily representing a disruption, nevertheless addressed questions of injustice, or even oppression.

Taylor's article "Self Service Skyline" stood out as the first text to explicitly address the Institute as such, and offered an outside perspective, emphasizing that from its inception the Fellowship had been much more culture-focused by design, as compared to two other, quintessentially socio-politically defined New York institutions in architecture and planning, which were founded around the same time and operated at municipal and state level, and with whom the Institute had successfully collaborated on research and design projects in its early days: the Urban Design Group (UDG) and the Urban Development Corporation (UDC), i.e., the subdivision of the City Planning Commission on the one hand, and the state housing authority on the other.[451] While the title unmistakably alluded to the self-centeredness of New York's architectural production, Taylor criticized the debate between the "Whites" and the "Grays" for its aesthetics, which he saw as being detached from reality, saying that its lack of congruence was once elevated to the new design paradigm, resulting in architecture as a system becoming self-constituting, self-referential, and self-reproducing. Taylor's verdict was devastating, for he attested that at this point since the UDG and the UDC had ceased to exist, at least in their original form, all three players would have held only a marginal position in relation to the American architecture and construction world. The Institute, whose funding, collaborations, programming, and curation he discussed in detail, did not, in his view,

451 Brian Brace Taylor, "Self Service Skyline," *L'Architecture d'Aujourd'hui*, no. 186 (August/September 1976), 42–46.

represent any position more radical than those of the established schools of architecture, although he did recognize a number of critical approaches. For him, the Institute was distinguished from the established institutions by its function and role within an international network: "In point of fact, the IAUS's principal attribute has been its capacity to bring together for limited periods the representatives of a non-American intelligentsia and to offer them an open forum for ideological debate. This is something that neither MoMA nor a university faculty was able to provide." Taylor acknowledged that the economic crisis in the United States meant that priorities had to be set differently and, as a result, architecture education and cultural production at the Institute were paramount. In the Marxist tradition, he concluded that the practices of architects operating within this closed system of close relationships had done little to change modes of production or forms of labor; however, he did not analyze the immaterialization and precarization of the Fellow's activities as a new reality in greater detail. Written for a French readership, the article noted that no new cultural values had emerged, nor had the role of architects been redefined in relation to mass culture. For Taylor, those involved accepted that the gap between rich and poor would continue to grow, or even that architecture helped to drive this socio-economic process.

The special issue also included Tafuri's article "Les cendres de Jefferson," in which the Italian historian and critic expressed himself (initially in French) similarly to Taylor on New York's architecture circles.[452] Writing about contemporary culture in the Marxist tradition, Tafuri, having visited and gained first-hand knowledge of the Institute that same year, for the first time focused on the new "organizational structures of intellectual work" as a historically significant event. While his text mostly focused on the different positions of selected American architects, Tafuri opened by criticizing the snobbery and self-referentiality of the architecture scene there.[453] At the outset, he briefly remarked on the scarcity of jobs for architects on the US East Coast in general, after the UDC, one of the largest employers, had been dissolved the year before. Regarding the culturalization of architecture, he expressed outrage that "once high levels of comprehensive integration have been achieved, it [has become] possible to maintain well-defined cultural spaces, entrusted with the task of pleasurably entertaining a highly selected public," and that "in such a way, new circuits of production and use do come to

452 Tafuri, 1976; Tafuri, 1987. It should be noted that the collection of essays was initially scheduled to appear in the Oppositions Books series.

453 Again, Tafuri came up with the New York Five: Eisenman, Graves, Gwathmey, Hejduk, and Meier, as distinct from Paul Rudolph and I.M. Pei, Philip Johnson, Robert Venturi, John Portman, and Kevin Roche; but he also cited the representatives of the other camp: Robert Stern and John Hagmann, Diana Agrest, Mario Gandelsonas, Rodolfo Machado and Jorge Silvetti, and Emilio Ambasz. Apart from Agrest, these architects were again all male.

be created."[454] In keeping with the theories of the time, Tafuri argued from the perspective of psychoanalysis and literature, architecture and sociology, that the code of behavior in New York was dominated by "vanity" and "comedy," and that "formalism" and "a systems of solitudes" were among the basic requirements for sheer survival. Although he did not explicitly mention the Institute in this context, and elsewhere in the article merely referred to it as Eisenman's current group, after the demise of other groups founded by Eisenman, the Five Architects, and the Conference of Architects for the Study of the Environment (CASE). His main critique of the Institute as a cultural space, being an "instrument of self-promotion and identification," however, was more profound and addressed the Institute's recent cultural efforts, particularly its public events: the Evening Program, the Exhibition Program, and especially the "New Wave" series. He drew on French cinema, noting that "architecture [came] to be exhibited in its own *cinémas d'essai*," i.e., art-house cinemas that were run independently of the industry and existed only because they received financial support from the government. Tafuri thus repeated the criticism of architecture's assertion of autonomy that he had voiced earlier in his 1974 *Oppositions* essay "L'Architecture dans le Boudoir," in which he had denounced the "formalism" of the New York Five and compared it to Marquis de Sade's method of depicting sexual transgression and sexual gratification, in that "maximum freedom springs forth from maximum terror;" a criticism he revisited and amplified two years later in "Les cendres de Jefferson" with the phrase "the formal terrorism of Eisenman."[455] He was indirectly referring to the fact that contemporary architects like Eisenman discussed their supposedly avant-garde projects, which became entangled in endless language games, behind closed doors, preferring to fete themselves rather than accept their social responsibility. This time, however, Tafuri's attack was no longer directed only at building, but now also referred to cultural production in general, i.e., talking, exhibiting, and writing about architectural practice.

Shortly thereafter, in her article "Fiddling While New York Burns" in the October 1976 issue of the British *Architectural Design*, architect Camilla Ween echoed the serious claims made in *L'Architecture d'Aujourd'hui* and elaborated on the criticism for the publication's English-speaking readership.[456] In particular, Ween found fault with what she saw as the complacent actions of the New York architecture scene, which she attempted to capture with the metaphor "the architectural avant-garde fiddles with increased intensity," and in the same vein, the work of "cultural institutions" like the Institute—she was actually the first to use the term, which she used to include professional groups like the UDG and

454 Tafuri, 1987, 293.

455 Tafuri, 1987, 300; see Ockman, 1995, 71, footnote 71.

456 Camilla Ween, "Fiddling While New York Burns," *Architectural Design* 46, no. 10 (October 1976), 630.

educational institutions like the Cooper Union as well—for creating an incestuous environment. With the title of her article, Ween was referring not only to the designs of a new generation of "cult architects," thus anticipating a critique of stardom or star architecture, but also and primarily to the architecture, education, and culture produced by institutions in light of the grave socio-economic situation in New York, which in 1975–76 was verging on bankruptcy, while in some neighborhoods, explicitly in the Bronx, abandoned houses burned down. Ween's perspective from across the Atlantic was therefore instructive, in conceptual and methodological terms, in that it classified and situated cultural change in architecture at the transition to neoliberalism, deregulation, and privatization, without having to name these abstract processes. For by adopting the ancient idiom "fiddling while Rome burns," she was referring to the burning of Rome in 64 B.C., and thus to Emperor Nero, who was not only accused of arson but was also alleged to have sought even greater self-aggrandizement by rebuilding the city. This was a more than harsh criticism of the elitist habitus and self-important actions of Eisenman, Stern & co. Koolhaas' postmodern, humorous take on architecture and the city, "once imaginary, continually hysterical and finally delirious," was the only approach she regarded favorably, wishing he had infected the Institute with it. Like Taylor and Tafuri in *L'Architecture d'Aujourd'hui*, Ween explained historical developments in architecture culture not only from their context, which was not self-evident but on the basis of their political and economic conditions and constraints, while also attributing a certain share of responsibility for the situation in neglected neighborhoods to the architects. For her, the comparison to Nero was a simple yet striking illustration of how the architecture world could be blamed for having closed itself off from reality, and how its disengagement had only widened the "gulf between the ruling classes and the newly urbanized poor;" an accusation that was repeatedly leveled toward the Institute.

Clearly, a large part of the architecture community on the East Coast of the USA, not just at the Institute, had turned to showcasing knowledge, defending beauty, and feting itself in a hedonistic vein, rather than continue to examine sociopolitical phenomena and serve as a corrective. The informed, even eloquent criticism in *L'Architecture d'Aujourd'hui* and *Architectural Design*, two leading European architecture journals, highlighted the extent to which voices in the European architecture community were dissociating themselves from developments in New York, explicitly from the paradigm shift toward a postmodern rhetoric and aesthetics, mediated through cultural production, which at the Institute was increasingly characterized by an internationally oriented entrepreneurial attitude and philosophy.[457] For the Fellows, on the other hand, it became

457 In the German-speaking world, the paradigm shift in architecture from a social project to a cultural project was neglected and hardly ever (if at all) addressed in the more theoretical journals: in Switzerland, *Archithese* reported favorably on the specific metropolis of architecture in 1976 with three themed issues on New York, see *Archithese*, no. 17, 18, 20; in Germany, *Arch+* took a

clear that, with their creative and intellectual work, the architects and academics assembled there, through the interplay of a wide variety of production contexts, were never truly autonomous in the face of an increasingly globalizing architecture culture, but also made themselves dependent on social power hubs and economic, political, and cultural decision-makers, i.e., the power elite. One key development in New York and especially at the Institute since the mid-1970s was that architects and academics, while consciously arguing against and thus, at least rhetorically and aesthetically, attempting to detach themselves from the structural conditions of architectural production, were nevertheless creating new dependencies on the building industry and the real estate market. However, the budgeting of education and culture as the predominant forms of architecture mediation, i.e., the reproduction of architecture in neoliberal times—of which the Institute is a paradigmatic example—made it clear, via the economization of architecture education on the one hand and increasingly privately funded cultural production on the other, that the lecture series, exhibitions, and publications were more than just a mechanism in the market of the symbolic economy, but rather their primary aim was to open up new markets.

Attention Economy

The extent to which the Institute's cultural events which, despite being a commercial offering, were partly a public forum and partly an elite salon held behind closed doors, not only provided a cultural and social frame of reference but also had economic value, was evident from the fact that the intellectual and above all symbolic capital of the assembled elite was put to profitable use. The evening lectures, like the exhibition openings, were a veritable who's who of seeing and being seen. Under the title "Forum," the publication of the latest issue of *Oppositions* was now increasingly celebrated at the Institute with special release events that might include thematic lectures or panel discussions and usually culminated in well-attended cocktail parties. In late October 1976, the publication of *Oppositions* 5, dubbed the "Italian Issue" at the Institute, which featured a review of Aldo Rossi's San Cataldo Cemetery in Modena by Rafael Moneo and a concluding critique of the New York Five by Tafuri, the first issue published by MIT Press, was duly celebrated at the Institute with a debate on Rossi's architectural drawings. Yet ultimately, the Latin name "Forum" with its allusion to an outdoor public space in Rome, or any other city (Latin: civitas), used as a

look across the Atlantic with a special issue on "Der Tod der Architektur" in 1978, but only published a translation of Tafuri's avant-garde critique of the New York Five (not of the cultural spaces of the architecture scene) and a Marxist critique of urban developments in New York lamenting the death of architecture; see Manfredo Tafuri, "Die Kritik der Architektursprache und die Sprache der Architekturkritik," trans. Michael Haase, Marc Fester, Nicolaus Kuhnert, *Arch+*, no. 37 (April 1978): "Der Tod der Architektur," 4–16 (translation: Michael Haase, Marc Fester, Nicolaus Kuhnert); on the Americanization of cities and the turn in domestic and social policy underlying the financial crisis, see also Francis F. Privens and Richard A. Cloward, "Die Krise der Stadt am Beispiel New Yorks," *Arch+*, no. 38 (May 1978): "'Amerikanisierung' der Städte?" 24–27.

marketplace for the sale of goods, was at least ambiguous, if not misleading. For while the "Forum" served an economy, it was in fact an exclusive social occasion reserved for Fellows and Visiting Fellows, and beyond that for the journal's donors and other invited guests from the world of building and construction, as a way of expressing gratitude for their financial and philanthropic support. Here, the new civility at the Institute overrode the supposed radicalism of its architects and academics. The events were photographed by Dorothy Alexander, who had previously exhibited at the Institute and rose to become the Institute's in-house photographer in the years that followed.[458] While in the beginning the panels of the release events, and thus the curation and intellectual capital, were shown, later often two or three people from the inner and outer circles of the Institute are photographed—deep in conversation, sometimes even with a cocktail glass in hand. These photos, which depicted a largely male-dominated social class in which women were merely allowed to do the legwork in subordinate roles, were also published, captioned by name(s), in each upcoming issue of *Oppositions*. The Institute thus absolutely reveled in its own celebrations, giving *Oppositions* the character of a popular illustrated society magazine and the Institute a prestigious reputation and, arguably, a bit of glamour. The diagnosis formulated by sociologist Richard Sennett at about the same time in his 1976 publication *The Fall of Public Man*, with the subheading *On the Social Psychology of Capitalism*, with regard to developments in American society and economy at large, can thus be applied to the New York architecture community as a specific, yet representative segment of metropolitan society: an "erosion of public life in the cities" and the reduction of all actions in public to a form of "playacting," i.e., a performance or spectacle that is primarily concerned with acclaim and prestige.[459] This shift in emphasis at the Institute, which was certainly contingent on socio-political and economic constraints, but nonetheless readily carried out, from welfare-oriented urban renewal and housing projects and a humanistic educational ideal to an increasingly publicity-oriented cultural institution, competing on the market of adult education, art, and exhibitions, highlighted the extent to which attention had now become a commodity and currency in architecture culture as well, as had the organization of new job assignments, scopes of work, and divisions of labor.[460] With the cultural production, indeed profit orientation of all formats,

458 Dorothy Alexander's photographs (negatives) can be found in the Beinecke Library of Yale University.

459 Sennett, 1976.

460 From as early as the mid-1970s, the Institute's stance and operations can be understood as a paradigmatic example of an attention economy, as described by philosopher and architecture theorist Georg Franck in close reference to Marx's theory of capital (the structure of both publications shows extreme similarities) and Bourdieu's concept of capital, which he developed with regard to the deconstructivist architecture of the 1980s; see Franck, 1998 and Franck, 2000; see also Karl Marx, *Das Kapital. Kritik der politischen* Ökonomie (London: Faber & Faber, [1867] 2007); and Bourdieu, 1986.

i.e., the Evening Program and the Exhibition Program, and now the "Forum," architecture culture, advertising, outreach, and public relations at the Institute had become indistinguishable with regard to the interplay of all forms of capital; what was featured was who or what was currently in fashion.

In 1976–77, in the context of "Architecture," the Institute focused on further popularizing and semanticizing, historicizing, and aestheticizing architecture in New York. For "Architecture 5," it secured funding from the NEA, the J.M. Kaplan Fund, and the Mary Duke Biddle Foundation. Two respected journalists who wrote about society, art, and culture and who were known to their New York audiences from the local cultural press were secured as presenters: Brendan Gill (editor at *The New Yorker*) for the lecture course "The Preoccupations of Critics and Architects 1976," and Grace Glueck (*The Village Voice*) for "Design without Architects." The lecturers in these two courses were almost exclusively big names from the American architecture and design communities, to whom this kind of publicity brought further attention. Gill's course featured Philip Johnson, William Conklin, Roy Allen of SOM, Samuel Brody and Lewis Davis, Ulrich Franzen, Charles Gwathmey, and Paul Rudolph, almost all members of the Architects' Circle, plus Arthur Drexler and Charles Moore; Glueck's course featured George Nelson, Ward Bennett, Mario Salvadori, Milton Glaser, Massimo Vignelli, Ivan Chermayeff, and two women, Candy Pratts and Mary Joan Glynn. Stern, on the other hand, who was working on a book series as a Visiting Fellow in 1976–77, made it his mission to introduce postmodern architecture to the New York public as a hitherto barely theorized or historicized style with his lecture course on "New Modernism/Postmodernism." He promoted a new historicism, classicism, and eclecticism with various representatives and apologists of architectural postmodernism as lecturers, e.g., Alan Greenberg, Hugh Hardy, and Rodolfo Machado. Eisenman's renewed appearance on Stern's course testified once again to their shared interests and strategies on behalf of a truly postmodern culturalization of architecture. In his lecture, "Post-Functionalism," Eisenman presented his most recent outlines of a general theory of architecture, which he then published as an editorial to *Oppositions* 6, where he used a post-humanist approach to lay the foundation for his deconstructivist sculptural practice.[461]

Along with the blossoming of postmodernism as a stylistic form and practice, a postmodernization of architecture culture became apparent in all fields of the Institute's work, in addition to a pluralization of ideas and knowledge, encompassing an attention economy, i.e., affective, attention-seeking performances, and speech acts that commodified the cultural, the social, and the symbolic: in the overall pedagogy and concrete didactics of its teaching, the product range of its

461 Peter Eisenman, "Post-Functionalism," *Oppositions* 6 (Fall 1976), n.p. In modernism, as it breaks with the past, Eisenman recognized a "non-humanist attitude toward the relationship of an individual to his physical environment."

cultural production, the content of its publications, first and foremost *Oppositions* and *October*, as well as in every other format conceived, produced, or published there from 1977 onward. This includes the tabloid architecture newspaper *Skyline* (from 1978), the IAUS Exhibition Catalogues (1978), and the Oppositions Books series (1981), (see chapter four). An operationalization of history and theory, their division in postmodern terms, that served to underscore the assertion of the autonomy of architecture, if not its criticality, was evident in the editorials of *Oppositions* 4 through 7. These were written individually by the editors between 1976 and 1977 and published as personal manifestos, a development that was critically reflected in Tafuri's contributions. Since *Oppositions* had been elevated to the status of an academic publication by MIT Press, according to Eisenman's "Director's Report" of the summer of 1976, another key priority during fiscal year 1976–77 was to develop the exhibitions into a regular and vital part of the program in their own right.[462] Discursively and institutionally, this paradigm shift meant that heroes of modernism who had fallen into obscurity were shown alongside representatives of postmodern sensibility who were now surging to the fore. With a larger budget, a more professional organization, and a promise to appeal to the public, the Institute's exhibitions sought to attract funding from the major art and humanities foundations and participate in the global art establishment and business. After the American art scenes had been generating numerous alternative art practices (performance art, conceptual art, minimal art, etc.) and with them new cultural subjects since the 1960s, the Institute's exhibiting and curating operations were to benefit from the vibrant art community and booming art market in New York. The fact that the art world, which had emerged and survived not least thanks to federal funding, was also subject to drastic changes in the mid-1970s in terms of institutional structures became evident, among other things, in the increasing marketization of the creative *dispositif* and the progressive replacement of the "art community" by a "financial community."[463] While the format of the spectacular blockbuster exhibition was consolidated in the summer of 1976 with the "Treasures of Tutankhamen" exhibition and its lavish display at the Met, the triumph of institutional critique was simultaneously reflected in the establishment of the P.S.1 Contemporary Art Center in a vacant school building in Long Island City, Queens, which had been purchased by Alanna Heiss, the founder of the Institute for Art and Urban Resources.[464] In the context of the culturalization of New York,

462 Peter Eisenman, "Director's Report," June 10, 1976. Source: CCA Montréal, IAUS fonds: A.1-2.

463 Reckwitz, 2012.

464 For "Rooms" (June 9 to June 26, 1976), the inaugural exhibition at P.S.1 curated by the Institute for Art and Urban Resources, a large group of artists, among them Gordon Matta-Clark, was invited to work on the building in an act of institutional critique; see Hal Foster, "1976," in *Art Since 1900. Modernism, Antimodernism, Postmodernism*, eds. Hal Foster, Rosalind Krauss, Yve-Alain Bois, Benjamin H. D. Buchloh, David Joselit (London: Thames & Hudson, 2006), 620–623; see also *Art Forum* (October 1976).

the institutionalization of the local alternative art scene was further aided by the fact that until the mid-1970s, the budgets for art spaces were largely funded by the NEA, primarily from the "Visual Art Program" funds under the direction of Brian O'Doherty. Following "Architecture," the Institute's Exhibition Program benefited from this development. More crucially, however, the Institute was implicated when architectural projects, drawings, and models were exhibited there, and soon after shown, sold, and promoted in commercial galleries for the first time, first at the Leo Castelli Gallery (beginning in 1977), which at the time was beginning to specialize in architecture, and soon after at the Max Protetch Gallery (1978).[465] The Institute, both directly and indirectly, became involved in the business of art, which had a significant impact on architecture production and culture.

Ideas as Models

This newly launched Exhibition Program began with "Idea as Model" (December 16, 1976, to January 14, 1977), a much larger group exhibition than "Good-bye Five" and other earlier DIY exhibitions that MacNair had organized and curated almost single-handedly.[466] At Eisenman's suggestion, MacNair had written to selected architects, many of whom were already associated with the Institute in one way or another, in the summer of 1976, specifically asking them to contribute scale models this time rather than drawings in order to showcase their communicative qualities and conceptual diversity. Initially titled "Ideas as Models" (plural), the aim of this exhibition was "to present ideas and problems of architecture as investigated in model form."[467] Eisenman wanted the generic scale model to be understood not merely as an instrument of design, but as a medium of knowledge at the intersection of architecture and conceptual art. While he had already engaged with this idea in his theoretical texts and house designs, the exhibition now officially bore the subheading "Investigation about Architecture." In this way, the Institute presented itself to the professional world as an innovative exhibition space while at the same time distancing itself again from the most recent developments at MoMA, where the major exhibition of architectural drawings from the Ecole des Beaux Arts, curated by Drexler, had been on view the year before. When "Idea As Model" (singular), finally opened at the end of the year, after a three-month delay, the Institute displayed a total of twenty-four models of very different make and quality, architecture

465 Kauffman, 2018, "The Changing Nature of Architectural Drawings," 134–221 & "Normalized Practice: Architecture in the Galleries," 222–272.

466 Martin Hartung, "Idea as Model," in *Exhibit A: Exhibitions That Transformed Architecture 1948–2000*, ed. in Eeva-Liisa Pelkonen (London: Phaidon, 2018), 196–201; preparations for the exhibition "Idea as Model" began as early as July 1976, and it was originally scheduled to open on September 9, 1976; see also Stefaan Vervoort, "Scale Models and Postmodernism: Revisiting Idea as Model (1976–81)," *Architectural Theory Review* 24, no. 3 (2020), 224–240.

467 Andrew MacNair, letter to Robert Stern, July 28, 1976. Source: Yale University: Robert A.M. Stern Archive; see Richard Pommer, "The Idea of 'Idea as Model'," in *Idea as Model: 22 Architects 1976/1980*, Catalogue 3, ed. IAUS (New York: Rizzoli International, 1981), 3–9, here 3.

and art, mostly by New York architects (featuring representatives of both camps, the "Whites" as well as the "Grays," with Michael Graves, Charles Gwathmey, John Hejduk, Charles Moore, Jaquelin Robertson, and Robert Stern) and once again by architects from Europe (O.M. Ungers, Massimo Scolari, and Leon Krier, as well as Rafael Moneo and Stuart Wrede, who were Visiting Fellows), and by all practicing Fellows (in addition to Eisenman, these were Diana Agrest and Mario Gandelsonas, as well as William Ellis). In keeping with the economy and aesthetics of the time, the exhibition poster, hand-crafted from a design by Graves, now appeared in a strikingly postmodern design: a three-dimensional collage of materials (wood, cardboard, and paper) that Graves' students at Princeton had produced at great expense, applied to the very template designed by Vignelli (silkscreen, chalk).[468] In an act of both creativity and commercialization, the handmade posters, produced in a small series of 100 copies and hand-signed by Graves, were sold during the opening and in the exhibition afterward, in part to cross-fund the exhibition and cover the costs of labor and organization.

The most distinctive aspect of the group exhibition was that it showed scale models as both an independent intellectual achievement and an artistic work. Conversely, it bore witness to the derealization of postmodernism, blurring the boundaries between reality and fiction. For the exhibits presented very different approaches, comparable to model making in the daily routine of architecture firms or in architecture studies, where very different techniques are used for concept and design models, models for testing materials or construction, and presentation and exhibition models. Thus, in the context of "Idea as Model," some models referred to a single idea, while others told more of a story. Ultimately, however, many of the models on display did not meet the criteria established beforehand, because they did not generate new ideas that led to design decisions.[469] Even the Eisenman model of *House II* exhibited here, which had been made especially for the exhibition by David Buege, one of his interns, did not meet the requirements, since the design idea underlying *House II* had already been formulated in working drawings and realized in the *Falk House* (1970). Contrary to what was postulated, the model made of colored Plexiglass plates intersecting at right angles was not strictly speaking a "study of a hypothesis, a problem, or an idea of architecture," since the formal transformations of the architectural structure were merely illustrated retrospectively for the purpose of the exhibition, and not fundamentally explored.[470] In other words, it was ultimately a presenta-

468 The poster for "Idea as Model" is neither to be found in CCA's IAUS fond, nor at the Vignelli Center for Design Studies. However, a copy is archived at the Museum für Gestaltung at ZHdK in Zurich (inventory no: 3DK-0003).

469 Hartung, 2018, 198f.

470 Buege subsequently reproduced the plexiglass model of *House II* in an edition of three identical copies; in 1980, Eisenman sold one of the models to the Deutsches Architekturmuseum (DAM) in Frankfurt for DM 3,000 (inventory no: DAM: 066-001-052).

tion model, not a working model. Nevertheless, as curator of the exhibition and principal author of the catalogue that followed years later, the model of *House II* portrayed Eisenman as the most intellectually and architecturally consistent of the architects on display, demonstrating the conceptual finesse and artistic willpower of his house designs by emphasizing the steps taken rather than the results achieved by the formal transformations.[471] Although the official catalogue originally planned for the exhibition could not be realized on schedule, "Idea as Model" was revisited by Paul Goldberger in the *New York Times*, where he reviewed the Institute's second group exhibition under the heading "How Architects Develop Ideas."[472] Here, Goldberger criticized the curation in particular, saying that the models on display had nothing to do with each other and that the selection did not follow any particular concept. Internally, however, "Idea as Model" was considered a success due to the enormous number of visitors, up to 150 people per day by their own account: a powerful argument, and one that was communicated in a letter of thanks from MacNair to the participating architects after the exhibition.

In the context of the Institute's history, and even more so from the perspective of sociology and architecture culture, the postmodern obsession with power exhibited in the scale model of "Idea as Model" made it a significant historical event, one that was symptomatic of the assertion of autonomy communicated by Eisenman in his 1976 editorial for *Oppositions* "Post-Functionalism." This represented a departure from earlier social and political commitments.[473] At the same time, it marked the conclusion of an early phase in terms of the market for contemporary architectural objects, to which the 1975 MoMA exhibition "Architectural Studies and Projects," especially the works of Barbara Jakobson and Emilio Ambasz, contributed.[474] The Institute's exhibitions, starting with "Idea as Model," were both symptom and cause for a new phenomenon in the globalizing architecture culture of postmodernism: on the one hand, the assertion that architecture, the architectural drawing and model were proposed as an autonomous art form, and their changing nature, as a once purpose-bound instrument of design, with their incorporation into the already globalized art market on the other. As a result, the Institute, with its Exhibition Program and in synergy with its other cultural productions, was instrumental in making the architectural object a form of capital investment on par with built architecture, thus rendering it a fetish in the Marxist sense.[475] By that time, it was already

471 Peter Eisenman, "House II Transformations," In IAUS, 1981, 34–35.

472 Paul Goldberger, "How Architects Develop Ideas," *The New York Times* (December 27, 1976), 58.

473 Vervoort, 2020, 235.

474 Kauffman, 2018, 78ff.

475 Franziska Stein, "Peter Eisenman: House II (Falk House)," in *Das Architekturmodell. Werkzeug, Fetisch, kleine Utopie*, eds. Oliver Elser, and Peter Cachola Schmal (Zurich: Scheidegger und Spiess, 2012), 250–254.

evident that the Institute was anything but naive and that architects had already lost their innocence.[476]

This development, later criticized for its hypocrisy, had already manifested itself at the Institute in the run-up to "Idea as Model." A conflict emerged following an incident on the eve of the opening, involving a performance by New York artist Gordon Matta-Clark.[477] Himself a trained architect, having studied architecture at Cornell University in the late 1960s and then taking part in the SoHo art scene since the early 1970s instead of going into practice, Matta-Clark had been invited by MacNair to contribute because of his conceptual rigor. It was not only Matta-Clark's early work under the moniker "Anarchitecture" that became one of the great founding myths of radical art and architecture of the decade.[478] In fact, he made his name with his architectural dissections (or literal deconstructions), including "Splitting" (1974), a suburban single-family house that could no longer be sold on the market, "Day's End" (1975), a pier that had fallen victim to deindustrialization, and also internationally, "Conical Intersect" (1975), a Parisian apartment building that had to make way for the urban renewal during the construction of Centre Pompidou.[479] MacNair had invited Matta-Clark to execute one of his "cuttings" in a seminar room as a site-specific artwork that would have revealed the financial workings underlying the Institute as an architecture institution itself.[480] But things turned out differently, and a crucial aspect of this chapter of the institution's history—as well as this form of institutional critique—is that Matta-Clark's contribution to "Idea as Model" exists mostly in the memories of those who attended it and, in the absence of evidence, can hardly be substantiated. Legend has it that Matta-Clark, whose relationship with the New York architecture scene was ambivalent, showed up at the Institute late at night during the final preparations for the exhibition, apparently under the influence of alcohol and accompanied by his partner, Jane Crawford. According to eyewitness accounts, he hung a series of photographs of destroyed windows of houses in Harlem and the Bronx, which he had brought with him, between the windows in the main hall, which were

476 Richard Pommer, "Post-script to a Post-mortem," in IAUS, 1981, 10–15. The "Idea as Model" exhibition was then contextualized in the catalog, which was not published until 1981, as an independent publication.

477 The explosive power of the exhibition was not apparent to its immediate surroundings and was only acquired retrospectively through its reception.

478 Mark Wigley, *Cutting Matta-Clark. The Anarchitecture Investigation* (Zurich: Lars Müller, 2018).

479 Stephen Walker, *Gordon Matta-Clark: Art, Architecture and the Attack on Modernism* (London: I.B. Tauris, 2009).

480 Rosalyn Deutsche, "The Threshold of Democracy," in *Urban Mythologies. The Bronx Represented since the 1960s*, ed. John Alan Farmer (New York: Bronx Museum of the Arts, 1999), 94–101, here 95.

twice as high, and then shot the panes with a BB, that gun he had borrowed from Denis Oppenheim, a friend and colleague; a performance witnessed by only a few people that nevertheless went down in architecture and art history as "Window Blow-Out."[481] Oral history further relates that when Eisenman entered the Institute the next morning and noticed the broken windowpanes, he felt compelled to act immediately, thus completing the performance in a sense: he had Matta-Clark's photographs removed and the broken panes unceremoniously replaced by a glazier before the guests appeared for the opening that night. The photographs were wrapped up and left for the artist to pick up. Whether consciously or unconsciously, it was Eisenman's reaction and action, later likened to an act of censorship, that completed the artwork and gave it that mythical, indeed legendary aura.[482] Whether he was acting as Institute director, i.e., because of the insurance or the lease, or for other minor, even personal reasons, and thus intervening in curatorial practice, was not recorded. The real fascination of "Window Blow-Out," however, lies in the fact that, unlike Matta-Clark's other performances, this work of art lived on only as a narrative, since he apparently did not document it in photographs or film, as was his usual practice.[483]

481 Besides Matta-Clark and Crawford, the only people present that evening were MacNair himself and a few of the Institute's interns and students who helped set up the exhibition; see Jane Crawford, transcript of an interview with Jürgen Harten, March 27, 1979, Source: CCA Montréal, Gordon Matta-Clark collection: PHCON2002: 0016:006:124. Although Crawford confused the Institute with the Architectural League, gave the wrong date and address of the exhibition, and omitted the title, this is an early reception, only two years after the event.

482 Andrew MacNair, in Mary Jane Jacob, *Gordon Matta-Clark: A Retrospective* (Chicago: Museum of Contemporary Art 1985), 96. It has however been frequently pointed out that Eisenman may have overreacted in this situation. Crawford mentioned that the press at the time did not cover the censorship of "Window-Blow Out" at all. MacNair, however, in an early interview stressed that Eisenman felt reminded of the Kristallnacht. Art historian Thomas Crow reiterated this statement, without discussing the comparison that seems exaggerated and inappropriate; see Thomas Crow, "Site-Specific Art: The Strong and the Weak," in *Modern Art in Common Culture* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1996), 134. It remains unresolved whether Eisenman voiced this comparison. For to compare an artistic performance, however aggressive it may have appeared, with the centrally organized and state directed violence against the Jewish population across the Third Reich on the night of November 9, 1938, would ultimately testify to a misjudgment of the extent and brutality of the anti-Semitism of the Nazi regime; a provocation at any cost.

483 Philip Ursprung, "Blinde Flecken der 1970er Jahre: Gordon Matta-Clarks 'Window Blow-out'," in *Reibungspunkte*, *Ordnung und Umbruch in Architektur und Kunst*, Festschrift für Hubertus Günther, eds. Hanns Hubach, Barbara von Orelli-Messerli, Tadej Tassini (Petersberg: Michael Imhof Verlag, 2008), 293–300. In his essay on "Window Blow-Out," art historian Philip Ursprung argued that no records exist, neither in CCA's Gordon Matta-Clark collection nor in its IAUS fonds. To my knowledge, neither an invoice from the glazier nor a complaint to the police are archived there. In an oral history interview, I was given to understand that one of the Institute's interns apparently photographed the performance, but further research for documentation yielded no tangible results.

In the years that followed, the story of Matta-Clark's performance at the Institute was regularly reiterated and reinterpreted.[484] While it has hardly played a role in architecture history, "Window Blow-Out" has always been relevant to art history. Echoing sentiments expressed about the Institute in the architecture press in 1976, the site-specific performance was seen on the one hand as a rebellious act against the profit drive of the architecture establishment, and on the other as a symbolic confrontation with the unacceptable housing conditions of an impoverished strata of society—both being criticisms that had been raised at the time.[485] The first review, an essay by Richard Pommer, which was supposed to be published in the Institute's catalogue but did not appear until 1981, already highlighted the different social responsibilities assumed by art and architecture and the generational conflict that was revealed here: "The late Gordon Matta-Clark wanted to show photographs of vandalized New York windows against panes broken for the occasion at the Institute, but at last minute, with the cold air coming in, his exhibit was pulled. A pity, whatever the reasons: it would have called attention to the rival conceptions of younger artists, who often seem less afraid of social statements than these architects do."[486] The roles were clearly assigned: while according to this interpretation, Matta-Clark stood for a socially engaged art practice that opposed the revitalization and beautification of urban space, the avant-garde architecture practice at the Institute reproduced the hierarchical organization of the segregated city. In the end, both parties benefited from this confrontation, which was elevated to a battle. Through the rebellious performative act at the heart of architecture culture, which was not spontaneous but planned, and the outraged action that followed, an ultimately political reaction to this powerful allegory, Matta-Clark and Eisenman defended and even grew their standing and reputation in their respective scenes. Only the Institute, which had previously always portrayed

484 To address the reception of Matta-Clark in recent art history, a veritable fascination with his person and work that informs historiography, Ursprung reflected on the conditions, possibilities, and limits of oral history. To this end, he has given individual protagonists and witnesses of "Window Blow-Out" the opportunity to have their say, while highlighting inconsistencies in subjective accounts of the events by contrasting their statements with the reception history in essays by art historians and a biography of Matta-Clark. In my oral history, Andrew Anker, who helped build the exhibit as one of the Institute's interns, indicated even that it might not have been Matta-Clark at all who shot the windowpanes, but someone else.

485 Matta-Clark's preference for alternative art spaces was already noted by Crawford in 1979, only one year after the artist's early death from cancer, in an interview, when the first large retrospective at the Städtische Kunsthalle Düsseldorf marked the beginning of Matta-Clark's reception, see *Gordon Matta-Clark: One for All – All for One* (Düsseldorf: Städtische Kunsthalle Düsseldorf, 1979). Here Crawford spoke about Matta-Clark's training as an architect at Cornell University and individual projects. She also touched on "Window-Blow Out," which addressed the abandonment and decay of housing, in her eyes a "very strong, very powerful piece, since this is what was relevant, a major problem;" for further reception of "Window-Blow Out," see Crow, 1996; see also Deutsche, 1999.

486 Pommer, 1981, 6.

itself as being progressive and now came across as quite conservative, came off badly in the process, and subsequently proved to be the venue of the architecture establishment.

The Ten-Year Anniversary

The steady growth of the Institute and the associated "growing pains" were evident in 1977, the year of its tenth anniversary, when it hosted a conference with the evocative title "After Modern Architecture" organized by the *Oppositions* staff.[487] The editors of *Oppositions* had invited colleagues from like-minded journals in Europe—*Arquitecturas Bis* (from Spain), *A.M.C.* (France), *Controspazio* and *Lotus International* (both from Italy)—to present an overview of postwar architecture and its coverage. At this "little magazine" conference, sponsored by MIT Press and exclusively covered by Ada Louise Huxtable in the *New York Times*, Eisenman, Frampton, Gandelsonas and Vidler introduced their personal manifestos from *Oppositions* 4, 5, 6, and 7 for discussion, followed by thematic workshops, thus asserting their claim to leadership in the historicization and theorization of postmodernism among their peers—again behind closed doors, by invitation only, and with only a few guests, with the difference that this time, instead of art and architecture, the topic of conversation was textual, editorial, and publishing work, and thus cultural production.

At the same time, the Institute exhibited a more open and accessible approach than ever before, with "Architecture 6," funded once again by the NEA, in the spring semester of 1977. This time, it offered a comprehensive program of nine lecture courses, including a workshop on street photography, and an educational trip to the Netherlands and England.[488] At the conclusion of the three-year Evening Program, as it had been organized since 1974, academic approaches no longer played a role due to the fact that the long-term Fellows did not present lecture courses. Instead, Stern, the one constant over the years, continued his investigation into a postmodern turn, inviting notable architecture critics from the conservative camp (Charles Jencks, Brent Brolin, C. Ray Smith, Paul Goldberger, John Morris Dixon, Vincent Scully, Peter Blake) to debate the polemically phrased question "What is Happening to Modern Architecture?" with him under the heading "Critics Speak." In addition to thematic lecture courses on such topics as "The Interior Room," "The Making of the Natural Landscape," "Human Behavior and the Physical Environment," as well as "Frank Lloyd Wright

487 Ada Louise Huxtable, "Architecture View: A Sense of Crisis About the Art of Architecture, Architecture in Crisis," *The New York Times* (February 20, 1977), 99. The status of the conference at the Institute was not clear, and the question of which division should bear the costs was an in-house problem, since neither *Oppositions*, nor public programs, nor IAUS Central felt responsible.

488 The Institute's educational tours were to be led by Frederike Taylor and Julia Bloomfield, who were both newly elected Institute Fellows, but were most probably not carried out due to lack of interest.

and the Rise of European Modernism," one highlight of "Architecture" was the relaunch of the "New Wave of European Architecture" series, now limited to six participants, Peter Cook, Rem Koolhaas, Robert and Leon Krier, Elia Zenghelis and Massimo Scolari, all of whom returned to the Institute. Compared to the previous year, the series had dropped its avant-garde appeal and was now advertised more widely. The Institute took on a more glamorous image, treating participating architects like pop stars by flying them by helicopter from JFK Airport to the heliport on the Pam Am Building, not far from the Institute.[489] Gandelsonas took over the contextual framing this time with his lecture "Rowing Upstream. An American View of A New Wave," while Suzanne Stephens, an architecture critic at *Progressive Architecture*, provided a summary and commentary with "European Transfer." One innovation, which was to transform cultural production at the Institute, was that after their lectures there, the "European New Wave" participants were sent as a bookable package on a lecture tour to thirteen architecture schools across the United States. This was made possible by an extremely affordable round-trip ticket from Pan American World Airways, and MacNair was also able to secure the airline as a sponsor of "Architecture." This redesign of the "New Wave" series proved a game changer for the Institute's market positioning as it expanded its sphere of influence as a cultural institution across the North American continent and significantly raised its profile nationwide. The Institute brought European architects into the national public eye by simple and direct means and, as they began to take on their first teaching positions at American universities, established a monopoly on the reception and overarching institutional framing of contemporary European architects in the United States.

A unique event in the history of the Institute, if not of architecture culture in New York occurred concurrently with "Architecture 6," when MacNair and Shanley organized "City as Theater," an independent series of lectures that represented a discursive and institutional innovation precisely because it was made possible by a grant from the New York Council for the Humanities. In doing so, the Institute took advantage of the opportunity that presented itself and adopted the underlying idea from the newly established humanities funding body which, as it happens, was located across the road on the other side of Bryant Park on 42nd Street. Contact had already been established by the end of 1975, when the Council's director Ronald Florence, a regular in the Institute's "Architecture" series, approached the Institute's leadership with a proposal for a thematic event focusing on the intersection between architecture and the humanities. The young Richard Sennett, who at the time was a professor of sociology at New York University and also directed the Center for Humanistic Studies there, was initially mooted as a cooperation partner for the Institute.

489 In the spring of 1977, the midtown heliport reopened for a short time until a tragic accident ended this commercial chapter of the city's transportation infrastructure, depriving the Institute of some of the glamour of the jet-setting age.

Sennett's hypotheses from his forthcoming book *The Fall of Public Man* were already reflected in an initial concept for the series from 1976, which brought together contemporary urban issues and performative approaches from the arts.[490] Since Sennett himself was at the time in the process of founding his own institution with historian Thomas Bender, the New York Institute for the Humanities, which opened at NYU later in 1977, he played a smaller role in "City as Theater" than originally planned.[491] The Institute's grant application to the New York Council for the Humanities, ultimately penned by Vidler, revealed his influence and focused on public space, criteria for publicness, and measures to improve the quality of urban life. It was successful. Vidler, in turn, enlisted Carl Schorske, a historian who specialized in Central European intellectual and cultural history and who, like him, taught at Princeton University and directed the "Program in European Cultural Studies" there, as an outside consultant for "City as Theater" to lend academic legitimacy to the one-off series.

What was special about "City as Theater" was that the Institute was able to offer it free of charge as a non-commercial event, thanks to funding from the humanities. Incorporated into "Architecture 6," it included four lecture courses, for which once again well-known personalities, mainly journalists and other public figures, were enlisted as presenters: Erika Munk (editor of *Drama Review*, who also wrote the "Cross Left" column in the *Village Voice*), John Rockwell (music and dance critic for the *New York Times*), Joan Davidson (chair of the J.M. Kaplan Fund, which also sponsored the Institute), and Paul Goldberger (architecture critic for the *New York Times*). Drawing directly on "What is a City?" an essay by Lewis Mumford from *Architectural Record*, and explicitly on his 1938 classic work *The Culture of Cities*, "City as Theater" focused on an expanded, transdisciplinary concept of architecture and the city and on a multi-layered analysis of modern life. On the poster, also designed by Vignelli (this time in landscape format and in bold constructivist colors, black and red, the Institute's signature colors), the Institute announced the concept with a lengthy quote from Mumford, printed in large letters: "The city in its complete sense, then, is a geographic plexus, an economic organization, an institutional process, a theater of social action, and an esthetic symbol of collective unity. On one hand it is a physical frame for the commonplace domestic and economic activities; on the other, it is a consciously dramatic setting for the more sublimated urges of a human culture. The city fosters art and is art; the city creates theater

490 Sennett's objective in *The Fall of Public Man* was to analyze the link between metropolitan culture and theatrical performance against the backdrop of the formation of a capitalist mode of production; see Sennett, 1976.

491 Apart from the concurrence evident in the naming of both the Institute for Architecture and Urban Studies and the New York Institute for the Humanities, it is curious that the two once briefly converged, when the Institute flirted with the humanities, only to clash shortly thereafter due to very different understandings of architecture, urban studies, institutions, the humanities, and criticism.

and is the theater. It is in the city, the city as theater, that man's more purposive activities are formulated and worked out through conflicting and cooperating personalities, events, groups, into more significant culminations."[492] While the performing arts had to be relegated to the background, the city in its multiple meanings was brought back to the foreground again, if only for a moment.

As part of "City as Theater," a program of eighteen panel discussions was held at the Institute every Tuesday at 7:30 p.m. from March to June 1977, with a total of fifty-two lecturers: prominent figures from cultural and intellectual life, professionals, established academics, journalists, city politicians, and up-and-coming activists. The topics were the city and the theater in the broadest sense, both literally and figuratively.[493] Ultimately, "City as Theater" became one of the few Institute events to present a truly public forum for anyone interested in the spectacle of urban life. Strikingly, not one of the long-term Fellows gave a lecture; from the Institute's circles, only Krauss contributed. In general, with a few notable exceptions (Renyer Banham, Martin Pawley), architects and planners were hardly represented in this series—for the purposes of the humanities, the Institute was thus entering into completely new territory. In contrast to its involvement in city planning and public housing projects in the early years and its interdisciplinary theorizing, the Institute was for the first time opening up to a more humanities approach to urban studies. Individual lectures addressed topics in urban sociology (William H. Whyte), urban psychology (Donald Kaplan, Karl Linn, Harold Proshansky), urban planning (Doris Freedman, the first director of cultural affairs in New York) and urban politics (John Lindsay, the mayor of New York from 1966 to 1973). MacNair arranged for "City as Theater" to be advertised on one of the first digital displays in Times Square. Because a larger crowd was expected for at least some of the panels, he booked a City University auditorium in the immediate vicinity of the Institute. Ultimately, "City as Theater" might ideally have stimulated a

492 Lewis Mumford, "What is a City?" *Architectural Record* 82 (November 1937), 92–96.

493 For example, there was a panel with contributions by writer and philosophy professor William Gass on "Inside: External Stimulation and Internal Contemplation: True Drama, External Events and the Atmosphere of Paris," by art historian Irving Lavin on "Outside: The Relationship Between the Baroque Stage and the Baroque Piazza," and by New York architect Roberto Brambilla on "In-Between. Pedestrian Drama in Contemporary Public Spaces." Sennett (on "Clothing: Street Dress as Barometer of Public Health") and Schorske (on "Promenade: Otto Wagner and Gottfried Semper") were joined by Max Kotzloff (executive editor of *Artforum*), Jason Epstein (co-founder of the *New York Review of Books*), Brooks McNamara (professor of theater studies), and Richard Foreman (theater director and founder of Ontological-Hysteric Theater). Other panels focused on various popular culture formats (folk and rock music festivals, the entertainment program in professional sports, Latin American music and Puerto Rican bars, department stores as temples of consumption, newspapers, and television as mass media), or the design of public space (sidewalks, bus shelters, lobbies, plazas). Other contributions addressed specific sites and buildings in New York City (Bloomingdales, Times Square, Coney Island, World Trade Center). It was striking that the quota of women was quite high compared to other series of lectures at the Institute, including contributions by Charlayne Hunter-Gault ("Talk of the Town" column in *The New Yorker*) or Liz Christy (founder of the first community garden, here representing the Green Guerrillas).

multi-, if not transdisciplinary exchange of knowledge, not just among the Fellows; architects, professionals, and students, who normally made up the Institute's audience, were given the opportunity to hear and meet with literary scholars, theater professionals, journalists, artists, and so on.[494] All this, however, can obscure the fact that "City as Theater" ultimately proved to be a strategic move on the part of the Institute's leadership to secure new funding opportunities.

In the Institute's anniversary year, the two management fields "Development" and "Communication" became very important, and MacNair was not only given the task of securing media contacts at the local and national levels but also, in addition to Taylor's work, looking after the sponsors of the two public programs, as well as the individual donors.[495] In contrast to the Evening Program, much less effort was expended on the Exhibition Program at the Institute in the first half of 1977. The exhibition "Princeton's Beaux-Arts and Its New Academicism," with student projects from Princeton under Dean Robert Geddes, was followed by monographic exhibitions on European architects who participated in the "New Wave" series, this time by Rob Krier and O.M. Ungers, with posters again being sold in small editions, like those for "Idea as Model." In this context, the copying machine played a central role as a contemporary reproduction technique: in the mid-1970s, Xerox launched a color copier as a technical innovation for the broader market. Combining mass production techniques and manual labor, the Institute's interns reproduced the motifs for the exhibition posters that year with a photocopier, which were then partially recolored by hand by the exhibiting architects and pasted onto the template designed by Vignelli to retain the graphic identity and identify them as a product of the Institute. Printed in an edition of a few hundred and valorized by customization, the posters were sent out to donors and sold during the exhibition. To foster relationships with donors, especially with members of the Architects' Circle, it was announced that they would not only receive a personal invitation to special events and openings but also an original poster as a collector's item.

A New Self-Image

It was no coincidence that at this point in time changes in architecture culture and the changing role of architects in society became a major topic of discussion in the American architecture community, and the Fellows and friends of the Institute contributed to this discussion as well. This was reflected in the May 1977 issue of

494 However, no conclusions can be drawn about the response, since there is no documentation of the number of visitors; apart from an extensive interview with Taylor in the *Soho Weekly News*, possibly for public relations, if not outreach, the series was not reviewed in either the local or the architecture press; nor was "City as Theater" as the one-off event mentioned in any particular way in the Institute's historiography.

495 Peter Wolf, "Proposal for Development," June 9, 1977. Source: CCA Montréal: IAUS fonds, A.2-7 / ARCH401152.

Progressive Architecture, which asked fundamental questions about the future of the profession and a recasting of the function and social role of architects. This multi-layered coverage also reflected the new cultural paradigm in architecture, especially (but not only) historiography and the production of theory as practice. According to the editorial, the aim was to draw new insights from the "changing cast of characters" in order to present a possible role model for young architects for discussion or to suggest alternatives.[496] In accordance with the discursive and institutional debate of the time, the stage metaphor was deliberately selected to address the public appearance of architects as actors of themselves, regardless of whether they slipped into one of the existing roles, or took completely new paths (the term "role-model" was used here in a double sense, combining the exemplary and the performative)—after all, for architects it was primarily about being in the limelight. This issue featured an article about the recent evolution of the profession by Robert Gutman, a sociologist of architecture who had been familiar with the Institute from its founding, having himself served on the faculty in its early years, and followed the New York architecture scene closely, as he was repeatedly called in as a sociological consultant on various projects over the years.[497] In his article "Architecture: The Entrepreneurial Profession," Gutman posited that architects in the 1970s held outdated ideas of themselves and an exaggerated self-image. Drawing on this diagnosis, based on quantitative research, and starting from four distinctive characteristics of the profession—first, that there is no urgent need for architecture, second, that architects share design activities with other professions, third, that their work is subjective in nature, and fourth, that demand for architecture is contingent on the economic cycles of the real estate market—Gutman argued that architecture had become entrepreneurial and that architects must take the initiative and create demand themselves. He acknowledged that architects were then offering other services and involved in other media, exhibitions, and graphic design. While he noted that the profession had increasingly shifted to large, industrial-type offices with specialized subdivisions, he did not believe that the alternative was for architects to limit themselves by viewing architecture as art and asserting themselves as artists, in imitation of avant-garde practices. Committed to scholarly objectivity, Gutman obviously held a mirror up to the Institute and explicitly to his old companion Eisenman by criticizing the ideology, doctrine, and system of autonomous architecture. Instead, he demanded that architects take their competencies and responsibilities seriously and create not only forms but buildings that must also meet the requirements of their inhabitants and users.

496 In a 1972 discussion of the role of intellectuals in society, Michel Foucault and Gilles Deleuze pointed out that theory "does not express, translate, or serve to apply practice: it is practice." Discourse is thus always directed against power, a "counter discourse," see Foucault and Deleuze, 1977.

497 Gutman, 1977; see also Dana Cuff and John Wriedt, eds., *Architecture from the Outside in. Selected Essays by Robert Gutman* (New York: Princeton Architectural Press, 2010), 32–42.

The bulk of the issue consisted of a multi-page feature, conceived and partly written by Suzanne Stephens as senior editor of *P/A*, dedicated to the "Multiple Protagonists" of American architecture, the different types of firms and architects, which can be read both as an architecture debate on the understanding of architects' roles in the present and in the history of the Institute and as a compelling case study and insightful analysis of the identity crisis of the New York architecture community.[498] In addition to the roles of "the individual" (exemplified by Richard Meier), "the corporate architect" (Paul Kennon), and "the gamesman" (Jaquelin Robertson), which were prevalent in the mid-1970s, Stephens also analyzed the relatively new role model of the "the polemicist-theorist" (Stern and Eisenman).[499] While the feature suggested a clear distinction, the examples make it clear that they all in some way emphasized the new entrepreneurial spirit, thought, and activities within the architecture profession, while the Institute was a place where the associated ideas, values, and practices converged in cultural, social, and symbolic forms. In Stephens' view, however, the "polemicist-theorist" as a distinctive type was in the first case to be characterized by staging a debate—"stirring up controversy, debate, excitement"—and achieving an enormous outreach—"to students, magazines, foreign architects, and even (to some degree) mass media."[500] "And while each together or apart was considered elitist, exclusivist, and clubby, what they had done was turn the theorist-polemicist image around. They had taken it out of its anti-hero, outsider role and put it center stage, made it a star." With this, Stephen described what was crucial for the formation of a scene and forms of communization, as well as the beginnings of what came to be called "starchitecture:" the multiple mechanisms of differentiation and demarcation, the adoption of artistic practices, and the play with elitist strategies of inclusion and exclusion. Stephens ultimately presented her feature as a kind of history of intellectual work at the Institute, whose network of relationships was in her opinion characterized not only by discursivity and criticality, but above all by institutionality and exclusivity; as it was a closed circle, she used the term "coterie-ism" in reference to the context of networks of communication, evaluation, and emotion. It is noteworthy that Stephens was one of the few to discuss the complementary pairing of Stern and Eisenman, which was later alluded to in architecture historiography, and which she described as the greatest "coup du theatre."[501] In her view, they were both in their own way "impresarios of exotica,"

498 Suzanne Stephens et al., "Role-Models. Multiple Protagonists," *Progressive Architecture* (May 1977), 59–71.

499 Stephens points out that several other roles of architects were not addressed in the feature, e.g., the "architect-developer," the "architect-researcher," or the "architect-who-has-chosen-to-leave-the-field," i.e., the professional dropout.

500 Suzanne Stephens, "Polemicist-theorist," *Progressive Architecture* (May 1977), 68.

501 Martin, 2010, 66.

but with "different orientations as well as design attitudes"—a media masterstroke, yet one in which she—in her role as *P/A* editor—was not entirely uninvolved. Although Stephens focused on male role models, the issue of *P/A* was an exercise in introspection at a time of increasing differentiation and representation that prompted further analyses of the social networks, relationships, and dependencies in the New York architecture community. While well observed, the journalistic presentation of architectural types—itself a form of embedded architecture journalism due to its access to the underlying evidence base, insider knowledge, information strategies, and human interests—nevertheless leaves readers with the bitter taste of publicity-mongering and self-promotion.

This became pronounced again in the next issue of *P/A*. For Eisenman himself had, at about the same time, compiled three separate reviews of *House VI* published in the June 1977 issue under the title "Critique of Weekend House by Philosopher, Sociologist and Architect Himself," which discussed the underlying design process, meaning, and use of this cottage house of the Franks in Connecticut, with the furniture in the photographs curated by Vignelli. In addition to a critique from a literary and philosophical perspective, for which he enlisted the writer William Gass, and one from a sociological perspective by Robert Gutman, it also featured a text of his own from an architecture perspective, in which Eisenman portrayed himself as an interpreter of his own designs.[502] This form of orchestrated architecture criticism had become almost a trademark, since over the years Eisenman had repeatedly succeeded in enlisting renowned theorists and historians from among the Fellows and friends to write reviews of one of his ten experimental house designs, *House I* to *House* X, 1967–77, for national and international journals.[503] After Gandelsonas and Frampton had reviewed the first projects and while Gass and Gutman were critiquing *House VI*, he was already able to persuade top-ranking art and architecture critics Rosalind Krauss and Manfredo Tafuri to review his first book project *Houses of Cards*, which would not appear until ten years later.[504] In his

502 Peter Eisenman, William Gass, Robert Gutman, "House VI. Residence. Critique of Weekend House by Philosopher, Sociologist and Architect Himself," *Progressive Architecture* (June 1977), 57–67.

503 The idea of producing ten house designs in ten years apparently originated with John Hejduk, who designed according to his Nine Square Grid method. Hejduk himself first exhibited his Diamond series (1962–1967) in The Architectural League in November 1967; see Michael Jasper, "Working It Out: On John Hejduk's Diamond Configurations," *Architectural Histories* 2, no. 1, (2014), https://journal.eahn.org/articles/10.5334/ah.cb/ (last accessed: May 31, 2023). Regarding his house designs, Eisenman, like the postmodern project maker he was, took ideas and made them big, often overdoing it: while others started with an idea and then abandoned it, Eisenman often started without a plan and then ended up draping a concept over his projects.

504 Mario Gandelsonas, "On Reading Architecture," *Progressive Architecture* (March 1972), 68–88; "On Reading Architecture," *Architecture + Urbanism* 2, no. 9 (September 1972), 51–69; "Linguistics in Architecture" & "Due opere di Peter Eisenman: Castelli di carte," *Casabella*, no. 374 (February 1973), 17–31; "On Reading Architecture II [House IV]," *Architecture + Urbanism* 4,

choice of critics, Eisenman always acted according to the principle that negative attention is also a form of attention, as long as it is intellectually stimulating, with both sides ultimately gaining in reputation and prestige. Thus, in the 1970s, Eisenman—through the seductive power of the ironic iconoclasm displayed by his projects and the persuasive appeal of his masterful public relations strategy—succeeded in drawing attention both to his design approach and to himself as Institute director and project maker. In addition to his teaching position at Cooper Union and his fees as an architect, the Institute was an essential working context and source of income for Eisenman, enabling him to see himself as an autonomous and critical architect, who could project an image of himself as independent and free from vested interests. In this context, Gutman wrote in his *P/A* article that architects often chase the image of the "romantic loner," free and independent, "cultivating personal relationships with an understanding and appreciative client," while the majority were actually wage-earners.[505] Not only did the focus on the architectural autonomy of the artist-architect, communicated and maintained in cultural production, mask the shift of the construction industry that created a global flexiblized workforce in the 1970s, the understanding of the architect's role soon underwent a change as architectural drawings and models were assigned a monetary value on the art market, in addition to their artistic value. This was exemplified by the exhibition "Architecture I" at the Leo Castelli Gallery, which opened in the fall of 1977—the most important and profitable point in time in the gallery world—once again on the initiative of Jakobson in collaboration with Ambasz like the sales show "Architectural Studies and Projects" at MoMA two years before.[506]

no. 39 (March 1974), 89–100; see Kenneth Frampton, "Criticism: Eisenman's House I," *Architecture + Urbanism* 3, no. 11 (November 1973), 190–192; "Five Architects," *Lotus International*, no. 9 (1976), 136–151 (English original 231–233); "Maison VI," *L'Architecture d'Aujourd'hui*, no. 186 (August/September 1976), 63–66; see Rosalind Krauss, "Death of a Hermeneutic Phantom. Materialization of the Sign in the Work of Peter Eisenman," in *Houses of Cards*, ed. Peter Eisenman (New York: Oxford University Press, 1987), 166–184; see Manfredo Tafuri, "Peter Eisenman: The Meditations of an Icarus," in *Houses of Cards*, ed. Peter Eisenman (New York: Oxford University Press, 1987), 167–187.

505 Cuff and Wriedt, 2010, 37.

506 Leo Castelli Gallery showed contemporary architects in a cycle of three exhibitions every three years, "Architecture I" (October 22 to November 12, 1977), being the first, followed by "Architecture II: Houses for Sale" (October 18, to November 22, 1980) and "Architecture III: Follies: Architectures for the Late-Twentieth Century Landscape" (October 22 to November 15, 1983); see "Architecture I" In Eeva-Liisa Pelkonen, ed., *Exhibit A: Exhibitions That Transformed Architecture 1948-2000* (London: Phaidon, 2018), 196; the architects featured in "Architecture I" were: Raimund Abraham, Emilio Ambasz, Richard Meier, Walter Pichler, Aldo Rossi, James Stirling, Roberert Venturi, and John Rauch. See Paul Goldberger, "Architectural Drawings Raised to an Art" *The New York Times* (December 12, 1977), 50; Eisenman then exhibited in "Architecture II," together with Emilio Ambasz, Vittorio Gregotti, Arata Isozaki, Charles Moore, Cesar Pelli, Cedric Price, and O.M. Ungers; and again in "Architecture III".

3.3 Representing the Institutional Establishment

Despite its recent successes, the growth of the Institute was deceptive. With *Oppositions* 5 and the "Idea as Model" exhibition, the academic year 1976–77 had indeed begun with a bang, and the Institute had achieved great things in the previous three years—not just as an educational, but as a cultural institution, organizing lectures every night, regularly showing exhibitions, and publishing two accompanying journals. However, in its anniversary year, the Institute was once again facing organizational and programmatic changes. For at the end of fiscal year 1976–77, funding from both the John Edward Noble Foundation for the "Undergraduate Program" and the NEA for the "Evening Program" expired and was not renewed. The previously successful tripartite business model of tuition fees, private and public grants, and individual sponsorship was proving vulnerable. Against this background, Eisenman took the initiative in early January 1977, addressing the Board of Trustees with a memorandum, several pages long. As Institute director, he was accountable to them, aware that it was they who defined Institute policy. With his "Director's Memo," he not only took stock of the Institute's activities and tasks to date and described the present situation but, building on this, outlined future goals for the next decade.[507] In framing the Institute's position and specifying a path of consolidation, Eisenman, in order to redefine the Institute for the next ten years, undertook a detailed consideration of "its position in the specific community and in the society at large." The "Director's Memo" was a strategy paper and was thus based on conceptual and financial, political and economic considerations. In launching this initiative, he was, of course, also pursuing his own institutional agenda, boldly claiming to give the Institute "a definition and a limitation" and "in short a sense of structured purpose" for the first time. Subsequently, Eisenman once again pitched the Institute, much as in the first version of the 1967 by-laws, as a "unique cultural institution" that could not be compared to other academic institutions or professional practices. Leading the way for the ambitious project of further institutionalizing the Institute—here, Eisenman emphasized the "careful choice of the term 'Institute' in its title"—were all those institutions he cited as models for a possible new orientation. He had in mind an architecture institution that was comparable to "a policy group such as the Brookings Institute in Washington, or a think tank such as the Institute for Advanced Studies in Princeton." These references and comparisons, however much they may have differed in function and operation and however pretentious they may have seemed, highlight that Eisenman was obviously concerned with the future scope of the Institute's research, educational, and cultural activities, and not least with maintaining or even expanding his power in his capacity as Institute director.

507 Peter Eisenman, "Director's Memo," January 11, 1977.

Eisenman had so far been opposed to institutionalizing the individual fields of work, or at least institutionalizing them completely, and had thus, for example, not founded an Institute publishing house or introduced a degree program, preferring instead to rely on networks. The situation for the public programs was somewhat different. In his "Director's Memo," however, he made it clear that, as a charismatic leader, he continued to believe in the cultural and ultimately architectural project that had been built at the Institute over the past three years. Consequently, he set very high goals for its future development. The Institute was to be transformed into a "cultural resource" with a twofold structure, "concerned with the creation of information about architecture and the public environment, the nature of design and the design of the public environment," and "concerned with the dissemination of this information through publication, exhibition, and educational programs." According to this realignment, architecture education would remain a strategic cornerstone but was to be consolidated and refined. However, by defining the Institute as a site for the production, reproduction, and dissemination of architectural knowledge, Eisenman laid claim to intellectual hegemony: "Such an agency has the capacity to become an international center for research, design and discussion which will place the Institute at the center of future thinking on the nature, design, and maintenance of this country's major undefined resource: the public environment." The "public environment," then, was Eisenman's new buzzword, which he used abundantly in his "Director's Memo." The inclusion of the socially relevant and nationally fashionable debate about the relationship between public space and the built environment in the Institute's program, realized with "City as Theater," can perhaps be explained by the fact that the memorandum was the basis for a "major capital development fund raising drive" to apply for major grants from America's two federal funding agencies, the National Endowment for the Arts (NEA) and the National Endowment for the Humanities (NEH), both established under President Lyndon B. Johnson with the Arts and Humanities Bill on September 29, 1965. In the mid-1970s, it was the allocation of greater amounts of funding that made the work of museums and smaller institutions possible.

Eisenman's initiative was rhetorically adept for it was once again a matter of rallying the trustees behind the Institute's continued existence. He believed that it was fundamentally important for the Fellows, as the Institute's most important resource, to be retained for the longer term, e.g., by finally compensating them adequately for all their work. But Eisenman was also concerned with the diverse social, cultural, and other capital of the architects at the Institute. Above all, he emphasized their intellectual work and academic affiliation as a special feature of the Institute—in his eyes an architecture elite—and once again, as he had done in 1971, stressed its "think tank component."[508] Unlike in the Institute's early years,

508 Ibid, 3.

the Fellows' contribution was now defined as that of scholars and educators, built environment experts and policy consultants, architecture intellectuals and cultural producers, and not as practicing architects. In keeping with the emerging information society, the focus was now on the creation of "qualitative and software" information "as a basis for the future development of a new cultural policy toward the public environment." The Institute was thus to be understood as: "1. A place to conceptualize basic issues of design related to the public environment in its most fundamental issues: its iconography, its history, its design, and its use," "2. A center for discussion groups, conferences, and lectures, concerning the work on these basic issues," "3. A cadre of leaders from schools, and the profession," and "4. A focus for the development of the discipline of architecture." This multi-faceted definition of the Institute and the architects networked within it encompassed content and format, discursive and institutional aspects, structures, and functions. From a sociology of culture perspective, Eisenman thus defined a clear picture of the Institute's role as a sanctifying and disseminating authority, comparable to the classical academies, the salons of the nineteenth century, or the universities, museums, and publishing houses of the twentieth century.

Eisenman concluded his "Director's Memo" with a call to take advantage of the opportunities presented by the NEA's invitation to apply for a Challenge Grant and the NEH's funding under their "Cultural Institutes Program" [sic!].[509] These grants, he believed, could help expand the existing program in adult education into a comprehensive and even more audience-oriented program as "a public cultural facility;" for fiscal year 1977–78, the Institute's leadership anticipated an additional US$600,000 in revenue from these two funding sources alone. On the one hand, Eisenman's interest lay in continuing the three successful education offerings as instruments for the dissemination of knowledge and securing the financing for the Institute's operations. On the other hand, Eisenman was particularly concerned with the publications *Oppositions*, now academically legitimized, and *October*, while plans were already in place for new publication projects: he was negotiating with Roger Conover of MIT Press for a book series in which his Terragni monograph would be the first. Above all, however, in this "Director's Memo," he informed the Board of Trustees for the first time that they were now looking for an "expanded, and possibly rent-free, centrally located building or space" in order to finally be able to accommodate their own library in addition to providing adequate office spaces and exhibition spaces. The 1970 stepped rent for the 8 West 40th Street penthouse had in the meantime become a real financial burden: in 1976–77, the rental costs of US$44,562.50 accounted for about one fifth of the budget. Ultimately, the "Director's Memo" did not contain many new ideas, a realistic plan, or a genuine vision for the Institute, but rather a description of the status quo mingled with

509 Ibid, 5.

inflated expectations. At best, it could be explained by the opportunities offered by the still broad funding landscape in the United States. However, developments already hinted at a conflict that was to become even more important: the imminent professionalization and bureaucratization of all fields of work and the financing of a "Building Project" as a basis for further institutionalization.

On the same day that Eisenman submitted his "Director's Memo," he was confirmed in office by the Board of Trustees as Institute director. Likewise, all other board positions were confirmed: Armand Bartos as chairman, Arthur Drexler as treasurer, and Richard Meier as secretary. Thus, the organizational foundations for the Institute's work in the years to come were laid. At the same time, the dual leadership of the Institute was awarded a salary increase for 1977, so that both received compensation of US$18,000 each annually: Eisenman for his job as Institute director and Wolf in his capacity as chairman of Board of Fellows, with both continuing to share responsibility. With a workload of half a position each, their duties included "responsibilities for budgetary matters, program development, financial assessment, liaison between Trustees and the Fellows, annual reports and meetings." In addition, Eisenman continued to draw a salary as director of the "Undergraduate Program in Architecture" for the next three years, while his work as editor of *Oppositions* remained unpaid. But apparently, he had overshot the mark with his uncoordinated initiative, for less than two days later the trustees responded to his "Director's Memo" with a written statement, asserting their authority and, more importantly, their primacy over the Institute's leadership.[510] In their statement, they emphasized that it was they, and not the Institute director, who would set the Institute's medium and long-term policy; the administration and day-to-day work, on the other hand, would be the responsibility of the Institute's leadership and the Fellows. Moreover, they spelled out that it was they who assessed the Institute's work and ensured that high quality was maintained by reviewing the integrity and efficiency of individual programs in addition to other measures. They stressed that interventions in setting priorities could only be made in consultation with them and that they had the final say in all major decisions: "The trustees thus exercise a prior and general review in such matters as the allocation of a significant proportion of the Institute's resources, the setting of priorities for development, changes in programs of broad bearing for the institution, the determination of tuition or fees, plans calling for new construction, the establishment or abolition of new departments or schools, changes in admission policies affecting sizable categories of potential students, and changes in relations with outside educational and social institutions and government agencies." The trustees also asserted their authority over financial planning and property ownership through the formulation of policies and business administration. In addition, there was to be a governance committee and a finance committee to guide the Institute's business: "The trustees

510 Board of Trustees, "Statement of Trustees' Authority," January 13, 1977. Source: CCA Montréal, IAUS fonds: A.1-13.

establish fund raising policies, approve major development programs, help to identify important sources of potential financial support, and raise funds." With this statement, an important document about the structure and constitution of the Institute as it had actually existed since its founding, the trustees communicated their relationship to the Institute and its leadership; accordingly, they were willing to give advice and offer criticism but demanded to be informed about new conditions and requirements in a timely manner. Whatever the trigger may have been, whether it was the "Director's Memo," which was far more demanding than earlier "Director's Reports," or a growing dissatisfaction with Eisenman's tendency to overstep the freedom he had been given in previous years, the trustees responded to his perhaps somewhat premature and precipitous actions and impressively demonstrated their leadership by reinstating the hierarchy between them and the Fellows as originally set forth in the 1967 by-laws. In this dispute, a power struggle was emerging that would increasingly preoccupy the Institute and ultimately wear it down in the years to come.

Cultural Institution Grant

After the spring of 1977 had, in view of the Institute's upcoming anniversary, seen the acquisition and establishment of contacts with the worlds of industry and business, globally active corporations, the realms of architecture and construction in general, various foundations, and academia, it became apparent in the summer of 1977 that Eisenman's solitary push to define the Institute as a "cultural resource" had not been in vain, and would eventually pave the way for his greatest coup to date. No sooner had the last "Architecture" and "City as Theater" events been held, than the Institute was awarded a Cultural Institution Grant from the NEH totaling US$357,000, having originally proposed the introduction of a "NEH Leaning Institute Program" in addition to the existing Evening Program as well as the transformation of the Institute into a Center for Public Education and an International Study Center: an immense sum for such a project.[511] Not only was this the largest grant in the Institute's history, it was also the largest grant the NEH had ever awarded to an architecture institution. This grant, awarded by a federal agency, elevated the Institute to the rank of other cultural institutions, having previously qualified for a grant from the New York Council for the Humanities for "City as Theater." This was because the Institute, as host and organizer, had demonstrated interest in the humanities—not only in the arts, but in cultural history, sociology, and anthropology, while at the same time impressively demonstrating that it could play an important, if not leading role as a cultural space in the broader academic and intellectual culture of New York.

511 IAUS, application to the NEH for a "Cultural Institution Grant" (EH-28433-77-547). The peer reviews, much more than the required four, were submitted by Philip Johnson, John White, William Turnbull, Norbert Birnbaum, Paul Rudolph, Lee Copeland, Thomas Hess, Barry Ulanov, Carl Schorske, Edward Logue, and Charles Moore.

Finally, with the NEH grant, the Institute's leadership launched "Open Plan" in the fall of 1977, an interdisciplinary, more tightly curated and structured series of lectures and additional events, as a successor to "Architecture." Although the ambitious plans from the NEH proposal were implemented only rudimentarily at the time, with the planned restructuring not realized and the educational claim watered down, the immense sum provided the Institute with exceptional planning security for the following three years. "Open Plan" once again blurred the distinction between education and culture, while operations, from an organizational sociology perspective, continued largely as usual. Nevertheless, cultural production was selectively expanded and intensified, and high-profile programs were professionalized, which was reflected in the quantity and quality of overall output. Finally, the redefinition of the Institute as a "cultural resource" and the consecration and legitimization through the NEH brought about institutional change, as the Institute needed to network differently. In the summer of 1977, the composition of the Board of Trustees changed, with Charles DeCarlo and June Larkin stepping down and representatives of both the universities (William Porter, Colin Campbell) and the profession (Edward Logue, Tim Prentice, Charles Gwathmey, Ulrich Franzen) stepping in to replace them. In addition, two wealthy influential representatives of New York society, Christophe de Menil and Marietta Tree, both philanthropists and socialites, were added to the board, and Carl Schorske represented the humanities. Massimo Vignelli, the Institute's long-term graphic designer responsible for its graphic identity, brand image, and institutional reputation, was also rewarded for his commitment to a position as a trustee while continuing to work unpaid on all printed materials and new publication formats. At the same time, the Fellowship was also expanded: with the 1977–78 addition of new Fellows Carla Skodinski, Frederieke Taylor, and Anthony Vidler, who had contributed to the Institute as coordinator of the undergraduate program, director of development, and editor of *Oppositions*, the number of Fellows grew to thirteen. The Institute's history took a decisive turn in the course of the professionalization necessitated by the high level of funding, as women, in particular, were subsequently appointed to leading positions, although from a feminist perspective, it should be emphasized that these were mostly still subordinate positions, ranking below the more veteran Fellows, and thus perpetuated the established patriarchal and hierarchical structure of the Institute.

With federal funding, the professionalization of the management of adult education and the Institute's work as a cultural institution in general were imperative, as was the greater bureaucratization of the Institute's operations, since it was now held more accountable than before.[512] Immediately after the

512 Ockman, 1988, 199. Ockman, in her history of the journal *Oppositions*, pointed out the connection between the Institute's departure from its original purposes and the increasing bureaucratization that accompanied its institutionalization. However, she locates this development far later, although it was evident by 1977–78 at the latest, ironically with the opening up to the humanities.

grant was announced in the summer of 1977, Terry Krieger, the Institute's contact person at the NEH, announced that he would collaborate closely with the Institute in conceptual and administrative matters, which also meant close control over the design and implementation of the planned program. And although programmatic changes were apparently not an issue, the Institute initially had to completely revise its budget because the NEH finance department was surprised by the extremely high projected overhead costs. The NEH grant, paid in three annual installments of US$127,000, US$125,000, and US$105,000, eventually covered the rising operating costs and salary expenses of the Fellows and staff. During the grant period, the Institute was required to submit six-monthly reports on the progress and success of the program. This meant that, beginning in fiscal year 1977–78, for the first time since the Institute's inception, financial reports were prepared annually by official auditors demonstrating the budgeting of all programs and the proper use of funds—a practice that was maintained for the next three years.[513] Additional staff had to be hired or contracted to bring administration and accounting up to the requisite standards. The NEH grant thus brought greater transparency to the Institute's operations. The Institute's hopes in this regard rested on both Taylor and MacNair, both of whom were seen as playing a critical role in terms of development and communication. Wolf had drafted a two-tier job description with the NEH application, under which Taylor would henceforth be primarily responsible for the administration of adult education and the NEH grant, further fundraising, communicating with the trustees, overseeing the Architects' Circle, which was to be expanded, and increasing local and national outreach. MacNair, on the other hand, was to be primarily responsible for the implementation and coordination of all public programs, communications with foundations, the NEA, and NYSCA, as well as sponsor relations and press contacts. This new division of responsibilities reflected the fact that public relations, along with external acquisition, philanthropy, and cultural sponsorship, had become an important area of action and business activity for the Institute, combining self-presentation and external perception, and helping to ensure the Institute's health and financial growth. Coincidentally, communication had become a much-vaunted panacea in the very year that New York itself was elevated to a brand with the "I ♥ NY" image campaign designed by Milton Glaser and implemented on July 15, 1977: urban branding was intended to boost urban tourism, and the Institute, like the metropolis, arguably became a symbol of neoliberalism.[514]

513 Berlin and Kolin, "Accountant Report," 1977–78, June 30, 1978; "Accountant Report," 1978–79 & "Accountant Report," 1979–80, May 30, 1980. Source: CCA Montréal, IAUS fonds: A.2-10.

514 Greenberg, 2008.

"Open Plan"

Following the four courses described in the original NEH proposal to provide adult education on a larger scale and with more exposure for an additional three years, the fall semester of 1977 saw the launch of "Open Plan." Initially coordinated by Andrew MacNair and administered by Frederieke Taylor, with Mimi Shanley assisting them, the name translated the modern architectural principle of floor plan organization into a didactic approach, although the humanistic "NEH Learning Institute Program" originally outlined in the grant application was only implemented in a greatly scaled down and eventually commercialized version. Like "Architecture," "Open Plan" served as a communication tool. It had a clearly structured poster in a typical Vignelli design, printed in a circulation of 20,000 copies and mailed to addresses taken from the databases kindly provided free of charge by established New York institutions and the editors of periodicals. Accordingly, "Open Plan 77" included four courses on "Architecture," "The City," "The Arts," and "Design," each of which ran on one weekday, from Mondays through Thursdays. As presenters, Frampton, Vidler, and MacNair offered courses on the history of large-scale architectural forms ("Cities within Cities"), modernism in the various arts ("The Modernist Vision"), and the contemporary practice of architects and designers ("The Languages of Design"), respectively. The fourth instructor was once again Robert Stern (instead of Krauss), who still did not hold Fellowship status but once again drew a large audience with his course on current trends in American architecture ("Style and Meaning in American Architecture"). The "Open Plan" offering thus once again combined academic and industry knowledge production, covering high-brow and popular culture, now dubbed humanities research, but ultimately not so different from its predecessor and repeating its recipe for success. Each course comprised ten dates with eight lectures from 6:30 to 8:00 p.m., with a fee of US$60 per course. As an add-on, course participants could attend eight accompanying seminars following each lecture, for which an additional fee of US$45 was charged, making the educational package more intense for learners and teachers, and more lucrative for the Institute. The special feature of "Open Plan," however, was a so-called "Open Plan Week" inserted into the fifth and tenth weeks: a special format that, e.g., offered participants the opportunity to hold a panel discussion on the main topic of each course. The course participants benefitted from this because they could attend all the events in these weeks and thus shop for ideas for the next course. The programming and tiered price structure made it clear that "Open Plan" was once again a cultural, educational, and ultimately commercial format. And although prices were still lower than those charged by other institutions for comparable offerings, the public programs guaranteed the Institute additional revenue from admission fees in addition to the NEH grant.

Apart from the fact that the lecture series was better structured, the content, methods, and objectives were fairly well coordinated, and there was a recognizable overall concept, the main difference between "Open Plan" and

"Architecture" was that there was much more money involved. This time, course instructors received a salary of US$3500 and, in return, took on more responsibility, contractually agreeing to design courses and produce teaching and learning materials, on top of delivering a total of three sessions themselves, including the introduction and facilitation of the "Open Plan Weeks." At the beginning of the program, participants received course notes that included a schedule, a description, and a bibliography. Presenters were paid a fee of US$200. Despite the overarching humanities framing, "Open Plan" turned out to be a far more architectural program than advertised, if only because architects, historians, and theorists had been commissioned as instructors, as well as lecturers. Unlike "City as Theater," there were hardly any speakers from other disciplines or professions; the focus on culture was either dropped, or architecture was interpreted as a cultural asset that interacts with other arts and design, and materializes within urban space. In addition, there was an even stronger focus on course instructors. Frampton and Vidler, who had progressed their careers at Columbia and Princeton University, respectively, were to make a name for themselves as architecture historians. The "Open Plan Weeks," which were intended to stimulate interdisciplinarity dialogue or even scholarly exchange, ultimately also functioned more as promotional events—both for the signing up for the next course in the following semester and for the participating architects. From an institutional point of view, they were instrumentalized by inviting members of the Architects' Circle to the discussions in order to stage topical debates in front of a live audience. These included, for example, Philip Johnson, Charles Moore, and Charles Jencks on "Eclecticism, Revivalism, and the Issues of Modernism," Leon Krier and O.M. Ungers on "Revising the Modern Movement: London, Berlin, and New York," and Massimo Vignelli and Ivan Chermayeff on "Forms of Order: The Grid and the Column." With "Open Plan," the Institute then continued to benefit from market and management-oriented strategies rather than the public-focused strategies that had previously been introduced and maintained with "Architecture." From 1977, the generous humanities funding from the NEH enabled the Institute to make all of its efforts bigger, louder, and more profitable, and to present itself to a New York audience as what was later criticized for being "a fashionable salon and power base" of the architecture intelligentsia.[515] Under these circumstances, with this mix of actors, interests, networks, and stakeholders, "Open Plan" eventually institutionalized the debate on forms, ideas, and values of architecture, a historiography of modernism, including poststructuralist approaches drawn from French theory, in response to the varieties of architectural postmodernism that, following philosophical postmodernism, came to dominate the debate and education at the time.

515 Ockman, 1988, 199.

Society Events

Throughout the year, preparations were underway for the anniversary celebration in the fall of 1977. In January, on Eisenman's initiative, several committees were formed to prepare, among other things, a benefit dinner and—quite classically, but perhaps a bit prematurely—a *Festschrift*, all of which was combined with fundraising activities.[516] But when the Institute celebrated its tenth jubilee, there was no sign of this originally planned comprehensive program. Nor did the hoped-for US$1 million in donations that would have financed a library and six fellowships from 1977 to 1980 materialize. Other activities that year, including *Oppositions*, seemed to have exhausted all the Institute's capacities. Nevertheless, at the height of its power in 1977–78, the Institute reached its creative climax, due in no small part to the successive expansion of its public programs and funding from the NEH grant. The anniversary was duly celebrated on November 11, 1977, with a grand ceremony, a string quartet, and in evening attire.[517] In addition to the invitation, Vignelli designed a poster for the event, very pared down, with a black bar and red lettering on a gold background, and only the dates of the Institute's founding and anniversary printed in Roman numerals and the abbreviations IAUS and NYC in capital letters. Flags were hung in the Institute's stately main hall for the ceremony, and Vignelli was responsible for designing a banner, on which IAUS—now used more and more frequently for the Institute's branding—was emblazoned in large capital letters. In addition, the Fellows, Visiting Fellows, students, and interns of the Institute were invited to design individual posters to contribute to the festivities, which were displayed that day. A meeting of the Board of Trustees was held in the morning, and notables from the field of architecture were welcomed in the evening. The character of the celebration, with all its pomp and circumstance, underscored the fact that the Institute was more firmly rooted in mainstream, middle-class culture than it had purported to be with its supposedly radical, autonomous, and critical stance symbolized by its banner in Russian constructivist shades of black and red. The showcasing of the Institute and all its stances was not meant to be ironic but corresponded with the often elitist, rather conservative ideas of architecture that figured prominently at the Institute. The extent to which the Institute had by then become a fixture in New York society became obvious when Brendan Gill later reported on its big anniversary as one of the major social events in New York in his society column "Talk of Town" in *The New Yorker*, which usually combined local reportage and political commentary, but on this occasion bore the headline

516 IAUS, "Structure of Working Committees for IAUS 10th Anniversary," February 1, 1977. Source: CCA Montréal, IAUS fonds: A.2-7. In keeping with the thematic focus indicated in his "Director's Memo," Eisenman also planned a major conference on "The Design of the Public Environment as it Affects the Public Interests."

517 Because of his penchant for number symbolism, Eisenman scheduled the anniversary for November 11, 1977, even though the Institute had been charted on September 29, 1967.

"Partygoing." Indeed, the guest list displayed here was a veritable who's who of the New York architecture community at the time.[518]

In fact, communication with society and the media became increasingly important at the Institute. The Institute took advantage of its good contacts, not only with architecture critics in the trade press, but especially with journalists at the major New York dailies and weeklies, such as the *New York Times*, *The New Yorker*, and even *The Village Voice*. The reports about the Institute and especially the reviews of its exhibitions raised its profile and attracted new audiences to its public events. For example, Paul Goldberger, who had long been acquainted with the Institute, included the NEH grant in his annual review of major architecture events in the *New York Times* in 1977.[519] In it, he placed the Institute's new sponsorship alongside the opening of the Citicorp Center (architect: Hugh Stubbins), the expansion of the Frick Collection (Harry van Dyke and John Barrington Bayley), and the construction of the new Bronx Development Center (Richard Meier). In the context of these major building projects that marked the end of the economic downturn in New York, Goldberger described the growth of the Institute as follows: "The Institute for Architecture and Urban Studies, which started out as a rather cliquish think tank, had evolved by its 10th anniversary last autumn into a lively diverse center of architecture exhibitions, seminars, lectures and classes for the general public. The NEH recognized the Institute's role last year with a 350,000 grant and given the Institute's remarkable ability to bring architectural ideas to a wide public, that grant has to rank as one of the major architecture events of 1977." Clearly, Goldberger welcomed the new developments at the Institute. To single out the highly endowed funding for "Open Plan" and thus for education and culture at the Institute as an important architecture event, comparable to a building, was as surprising as his argument that the Institute would excel particularly in its ability to bring architectural issues to the general public. So while Goldberger was once again drawn to promote the Institute, public relations, and press relations were used ever more effectively to compete for national and international attention. The Institute, which had long positioned itself as a complement to existing offerings, now entered into direct competition with the major art and cultural institutions in New York: with museums, theaters, libraries, but also universities, when it came to grant money, audience favor, and reputation.

518 Brendan Gill, "The Talk of the Town. Partygoing," *The New Yorker* (November 28, 1977), 45.

519 Paul Goldberger, "How the Cityscape fared in 1977," *The New York Times* (January 5, 1977), *The Home Section*, C1 & C11. In his review of the year, Goldberger also explicitly addressed the Department for Housing, Preservation and Development's new J-51 tax incentive, which facilitated property redevelopment and, in his view, had a significant impact on the cityscape for the first time in 1977, justifying the conversion of commercial space into luxury lofts. He cited the landmark status for Grand Central Terminal, which was thus saved from demolition, with relief. He also felt that new restaurants could now be expected to offer good interior design, mentioning the River Cafe in Brooklyn as an example.

"Open Plan" Contd.

From 1977 to 1980, in tandem with its consolidation and maturation as an educational and cultural institution, the Institute's "Open Plan" played a key role in fostering public debate about architecture, urban history, art, and design in New York, with themes like American architecture and suburbanization clearly taking center stage at first. However, its role in reinventing the symbolic economy in New York architecture culture and serving an emerging consumer culture in American architecture was perhaps even more crucial. In the second year of the series, Frampton continued to teach the "Architecture" course and Vidler the "The Arts" course. MacNair stepped down from directing "Open Plan," which Vidler took over on an interim basis in 1978 (first with Silvia Kolbowski, then with Joan Copjec as coordinator) in order to devote himself to other duties at the Institute, most notably the publication of the Institute's own newspaper format, *Skyline*, which featured a calendar of cultural events in New York, including the Institute's Evening Program and Exhibition Program, which were thus placed in this context. Nevertheless, he continued to lead the "Design" course. The program of events was well filled with notable architects, designers, and artists: Georges Nelson, Milton Glaser, Ivan Chermayeff, Gyorgy Kepes, Mario Salvadori, Frank Gehry, and Michael Graves, to name but a few, made an appearance as part of "Open Plan 78." And after Stern held the "City" course for the last time in the spring of 1978 with a course on "The Anglo-American Suburb: Village, House, Garden," this was followed in the fall of 1978 by a course on "Forum on New York. The Place of Urban Design" (instructed by Craig Whitaker), which once again recalled the former focus on urban studies, albeit for the last time. After that, "Open Plan" was supplemented by other, additional formats such as seminars and film screenings, eventually eliminating the rigid arrangement of four thematically defined and discipline-bound courses altogether.[520] With Craig Owens ("Visual Arts: Critical Encounters," spring 1979) and Patrick Pinnell ("The American Monument," fall 1979), both of whom were working as editors for *Skyline*, "Open Plan 79" finally offered the Institute's own junior staff the opportunity to make a public appearance as lecturers in their own courses.

"Open Plan 78" already had a strong historiographical focus, especially with the "Architecture" and "The Arts" courses led by Frampton and Vidler, but also provided space for engaging with current theoretical debates in the other courses. Twice, in the fall of 1978 and in the spring of 1979, a so-called "Advanced Seminar" was offered under the supervision of Gandelsonas, designed specifically as an in-depth study for participants of earlier courses or graduate students in architecture. This

520 Copjec, who had previously studied film at the Slade School in London, learned about the position of Kolbowski through a mutual friend with whom she shared a reading group on feminism and psychoanalysis. She was interviewed by Eisenman and Vidler and immediately offered the job on the strength of her knowledge of French theory. Copjec received her PhD in Cinema Studies from NYU under Michelson and then worked as her assistant. From 1981 she worked on the *October* editorial staff, taught theory courses at the Institute (1982–1984) and worked as a ghost-writer for Gandelsonas.

was a unique offering in architecture theory, with the goal of providing an introduction to current structuralist and poststructuralist philosophy, which in the English-speaking world often goes by the name "French Theory," and a related analysis of contemporary architectural projects. While Gandelsonas gave the general introduction to classical and modern architecture, other Fellows, especially the *Oppositions* editors, led the individual sessions. Frampton introduced Sigfried Giedion's *Space, Time and Architecture* and Vidler Manfredo Tafuri's *Architecture and Utopia: Design and Capitalist Development*—examples of different ways of writing the history of architectural modernism that can be described as operative or critical. Eisenman presented his formal-aesthetic approach using *House X* as an example, again taking the opportunity to introduce his own projects to a wider audience through the Institute.[521] Agrest drew upon her text "Design vs. Non-Design" (from *Oppositions* 6, Fall 1976) for her reading of architecture and the city. Finally, Gandelsonas discussed Michel Foucault's *The Order of Things* as a new model for theory production in architecture. The two international Visiting Fellows, Giorgio Ciucci and Massimo Scolari, both of whom were professors at the IUAV in Venice, were also involved in the seminar, each with their own sessions on "Modes of Representation." With sophisticated courses such as the "Advanced Seminar," the Institute proved that it had become a stronghold of the architecture intelligentsia and a guardian of intellectual debate. Once again, it was evident that there was a common interest in history and theory among the Fellows and that they still shared an intellectual, if not architectural project, even if individual attitudes, for example regarding the question of the autonomy of architecture or the modernist dichotomy of form and function, were quite divergent. The "Advanced Seminar" was offered a second time, but this time the focus was no longer on guided readings of historiographical classics or theoretical writing, but on the idiosyncratic interpretation of three contemporary architects. Essentially centering on the contemporary debate on style in the spirit of postmodernism, following an introduction "On Architectural Languages," two seminar sessions were each devoted to the elements in the work of Robert Venturi, composition in the work of Peter Eisenman, and comparison in the work of Aldo Rossi; Gandelsonas was joined by Agrest, Frampton, Vidler, and Swiss architecture historian Werner Oechslin as speakers. Finally, Gandelsonas himself spoke on semiotic and linguistic aspects in a session on "The Architectural Text." Through Gandelsonas' framework, seminar participants were schooled in a poststructuralist, at times post-Marxist theoretical discourse. However, by presenting them with contemporary projects as arguments for theory, the Institute also engaged in fame-making in terms of a discursive, autonomous, and critical architecture.[522]

521 Eisenman, who first presented *House X* at the 1976 Venice Biennale, subsequently lost the commission; see Peter Eisenman, *House X* (New York: Rizzoli International, 1982).

522 Following the "Advanced Seminar," Gandelsonas wrote his essay "From Structure to Subject" in December 1978, in which he acknowledged the autonomy of form in principle but criticized

In the spring of 1979, "Open Plan" provided the Institute with a platform for another format, the "Saturday Seminars." The concept of this offering, "Against Historicism," was that on five Saturdays in April and May, seminar participants were guided by renowned lecturers from various disciplines through a full-day program that included a thematic lecture followed by a discussion and an afternoon workshop. These "Saturday Seminars" were less of an academic seminar, and more of an exclusive event aimed at an educated middle-class audience that could afford to take the time on weekends to attend such educational offerings. Again, the Institute recruited distinguished scholars, critics, and architects to speak to a select audience; Alan Colquhoun, Richard Sennett, Peter Brooks, and William Gass were invited as keynote speakers. The seminar, however, was introduced by none other than Eisenman himself with a session on "Image and Text," though he was otherwise absent from "Open Plan." Drawing on the literary theory and criticism of structuralist/poststructuralist Roland Barthes and using the example of the postmodern architecture of Michael Graves, John Hejduk, and Aldo Rossi, he addressed key contemporary approaches such as textual analysis and close reading rather than biographical or contextual interpretation.[523] With the success of the "Saturday Seminars," the Institute proved that adult education in architecture was a viable option for the premium segment as well. The discussion of architecture-related, social, cultural, and humanities topics, as framed by Eisenman, could apparently also be sold as an intellectual treat over lunch; however, this one-time offer was to be the only one.

During the period from 1974 to 1980, the Institute held public events almost exclusively on topics intrinsic to architecture—"City as Theater" being the major exception. Criticism of relevant urban planning or broader socio-political issues, on the other hand, was hardly ever voiced. The major contemporary issues of the decade with implications for the profession and the discipline, such as the housing crisis in the context of the shifts in economic and social policy in the United States, global issues such as the energy crisis or the realization that our resources are finite, or local issues such as the economic crisis or urban development policy were not debated—at least not publicly or in front of an audience. When the neoliberal restructuring of federal and urban policies in the wake of the financial and

Eisenman for not taking the subject into account in his designs. He did not reintroduce the subject until his 1976 *Oppositions* editorial "Post-Functionalism," after which he put it into practice with *House X*; see Mario Gandelsonas, "From Structure to Subject. The Formation of an Architectural Language," *Oppositions* 17 (Summer 1979), 6–29.

523 While poststructuralist theory was debating the author during the decade in which Eisenman produced his designs for *House I* through *House X*, Eisenman himself was instrumental in establishing an American version of the figure of the artist-architect that would rise to stardom in the wake of cultural and economic globalization; see Roland Barthes, "Death of the Author," *Aspen Magazine*, no. 5–6 (1967); republished in *Image-Music-Text* (New York: Hill and Wang, 1977), 142–148; Michel Foucault, "What is an Author?" in *Language, Counter-memory, Practice Selected Essays and Interviews*, ed. Donald F. Bouchard (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1977), 113–138.

fiscal crisis in New York became a trial run for transformations on a global scale, when privatization and deregulation of all areas of the economy and society, including architecture and the construction industry, set in and the state withdrew, the New York architecture community was forced to realize that its place in the postindustrial or information society, marked by the transition to a service-based economy, i.e., a networked and knowledge society was now fundamentally different. Eisenman, for example, presented an image of himself as an architect-intellectual primarily concerned with design-related decision-making, Frampton and Vidler pursued their own social and intellectual agendas with their historiography of questions of style and epochs, historic periodization, and critical genealogies of a 1970s cryptomodernism, while Gandelsonas and Agrest, on the other hand, were influenced to some extent by Barthes, Foucault, and others on whom they based their postmodern practice of architecture and urban design, etc. The Institute's example, however, shows that not all architects were content to limit themselves to interior design or corporate work, but wanted to break new ground.[524] By focusing on a supposedly autonomous creative practice and emphasizing the formal and contextual, the Institute designed images, roles, and functions of the profession and discipline that were artistically conceptualized, if not necessarily critically reflected. However, as a contribution to postmodernism as a broader cultural phenomenon, the Institute's activities were also symptomatic of "the cultural logic of late capitalism" discussed in literary and cultural criticism at the time and that involved both architectural and cultural production, affecting both material and immaterial culture, images and text.[525] The history of the Institute shows how, by the end of the decade, it had evolved into a major and dominant player in education, culture, and publishing, and had forgotten its origins. This is reflected, among other things, in the fact that the Institute's development and communication now increasingly turned to the establishment and the real estate industry, not only as sponsors but as collaborators. Instead of practicing institutional critique itself, and criticizing the museum and university with their constant assertions of avant-gardism, the Institute, despite maintaining close contact to and friendly relations with major institutions, now tended to confirm and reinforce the status quo, promoting a postmodernization in the educational and cultural spheres through its powerful and pivotal position between the college and the university and its close collaboration with the world of museums and galleries and the economization of everything.

524 Marxist urban and economic geographer David Harvey discussed objects of postmodern architecture, explicitly Philip Johnson's AT&T Building, as a cultural expression of globalized financial capitalism; see Harvey, 1989, 292.

525 The Marxist literary and cultural critic Fredric Jameson, writing along similar lines, saw postmodern architecture as the most visible expression of changes in aesthetic production; see Fredric Jameson, "Postmodernism, or, The Cultural Logic of Late Capitalism," *New Left Review*, no. 146 (July-August 1984), 59–92. Indeed, Jameson even explains that his own conception of postmodernism was born primarily out of an engagement with architecture, which was initiated at the Institute.

Comprehensive Product Range

From 1978, the Institute's exhibition activities were further expanded and professionalized, coordinated by Andrew MacNair, at first primarily with funding for arts and culture. Cross-financed by other programs and, in some cases, even financed by the exhibiting architects themselves, the exhibitions later became largely self-supporting, although low-budget productions still continued. Now managed as an Exhibition Program in its own right, the exhibition activities also served to showcase architects from the Institute's immediate circle—as a way of expressing appreciation or thanks for their contribution and support, as it were. In 1978, for example, it featured solo exhibitions by Charles Gwathmey and Philip Johnson shortly before they were appointed as trustees. The exhibition "Gwathmey Siegel Architects. Twenty-four Residences" (December 15, 1977, to January 15, 1978), which featured axonometric drawings and additional documentation of the firm's 1966–67 residences, was the first for which the Institute received a grant from the New York Council on the Arts. Subsequently, Gwathmey even took on a leading role at the Institute as president. Generally speaking, the Exhibition Program had become more hegemonic and exclusive, and so it was a great honor and distinction for architects to exhibit at the Institute. Contemporary European, Asian, and American practices such as Rob Krier, O.M. Ungers, Leon Krier, Arata Isozaki, Ron Herron and Peter Cook, Lauretta Vinciarelli, Gaetano Pesce, Aldo Rossi, John Hejduk, Mark Treib, or Massimo Scolari were presented to an American audience, in some cases for the first time, but group exhibitions also remained a fixture, now with an overarching theme, such as "The Image of Home: Giuliano Firenzoli, Nancy Goldring, Michael Webb" or "Beyond Historicism." Retrospectives were introduced as a further category, featuring protagonists of European and American modernism, who had previously played no or only a minor role in architecture historiography, and external curators were often commissioned, as for example for the exhibition "Ivan Leonidov: Russian Visionary Architect, 1902–1959" (February 1–20, 1978), which Gerrit Oorthuys of TU Delft presented as Visiting Fellow together with Rem Koolhaas, with photographs the two had taken on their individual research trips through the USSR, and which was a success with both the public and the press. In 1978, a total of eight exhibitions were shown at the Institute, more than ever before in a single year, which led to MacNair being assigned a coordinator, the architect Laurie Hawkinson, who soon became a curator as well.

Not surprisingly, it was the conceptually inclined architects who benefited from the Institute's new exhibition opportunities beyond MoMA or one of the commercial galleries. Following the activities of the Junior Council and the Art Lending Service, however, the dynamics of the art market, and thus the architecture market, changed dramatically in the second half of the 1970s, and architectural drawings and models were now increasingly valorized and marketed as works of art. This became evident at the latest in the fall of 1978, when the Max Protetch Gallery, an established marketplace for minimal and conceptual art founded in

1969 in Washington, D.C., moved to New York, opening a space on 37 West 57 Street that focused on various architectural representations and techniques alongside works of art.[526] For its inaugural exhibition (September to October 1978)—which in addition to Eisenman featured Michael Graves as the other architect, as well as artists Siah Armajani, Richard Fleischner, and Denise Green—Eisenman contributed an anamorphic model of *House X*, shown only at Cooper Union and Princeton University, with which he sought to prove that his experimental house designs, theoretical texts, and autonomous artworks were less concerned with subjectivizing the formalist approach than with individualizing architectural practice. The attention-grabbing strategies displayed by Eisenman, both as a practicing theorist and writing architect, made it clear that he obviously placed more emphasis on the media presence of his projects than on their structural solidity: in 1978, for example, he designed *House El Even Odd* (11a) for a competition called by *Progressive Architecture* on behalf of Kurt Forster, an axonometric model that was never intended as a building but always had a sculptural quality.[527] With a view to enforcing commercial values and norms, the transformation in the New York gallery system set new standards in the field of architecture as well. At the same time, a new exhibition landscape developed beyond the museum: in 1978, for example, P.S.1 opened the Architecture Room, a non-commercial exhibition space initially curated by Lindsay Stamm Shapiro and devoted exclusively to hip North American architects.[528] The Institute, at the latest with its collaboration with Max Protetch, would eventually contribute to an increasing commercialization of architecture culture.[529]

Interestingly enough, 1978 was the year that AIA ended the long-standing advertising ban for architects, an issue that Paul Goldberger had reported on repeatedly.[530] In the same year, also coordinated by MacNair, the Institute launched the "National Architecture Exchange," a platform designed to create synergies between adult education, exhibition activities, and publishing, providing clients with a comprehensive cultural offering and expanding the Institute's

526 Kauffman, 2018, 224ff. According to Kauffman, Max Protetch regularly met with Eisenman and Hejduk during this time to discuss whom to show and what might constitute an architecture gallery in the first place. Protetch is quoted here as saying that he had in mind something similar to the Institute, only commercial. Eisenman later designed the interior of his gallery for him.

527 "Citation: Architectural Design (House 11a)," *Progressive Architecture* (January 1979), 84–85.

528 The Architecture Room at P.S.1 run by Lindsey Stamm Shapiro featured exhibitions on Frank Gehry, Diana Agrest and Mario Gandelsonas, Stanley Tigerman, Melvin Charney, Friday Architects, Studio Works, and Bernard Tschumi. Stamm Shapiro then worked for the Institute, serving in the position of a curator and editor.

529 Kauffman, 2018, 236. The Institute and the Max Protetch Gallery showed four coordinated exhibition pairs: Aldo Rossi (1979), John Hejduk (1980), Massimo Scolari (1980), and later OMA (1982).

530 Paul Goldberger, "Architects Will End Ban on Advertising," *The New York Times* (May 25, 1978), A20; "Institute of Architects Keeps Bans on Advertising and Contracting," *The New York Times* (June 9, 1977), 45.

sphere of influence, although it was only short-lived. As of July 1, 1978, institutions across the United States and Canada were offered the opportunity to book the Institute's lecture series and exhibitions, resulting in a kind of nationalization of a "best-of" the Evening Program and Exhibition Program. For this service orientation, which built on and expanded the "New Wave" series, the Institute again received substantial funding from the NEA and NYSCA. Four exhibitions and two series of lectures were slated to tour each year as part of the "National Architecture Exchange." According to the text on the accompanying poster, the new cultural and educational platform had two main goals: first, building a network, or more precisely, "establishing a network of communication among American universities, museums, and organizations in the city and the suburb," and second, opening up a new market, "offering for national circulation a new series of lectures, exhibitions, catalogues and slide packages." By providing teaching and learning materials, already advertised as a central mechanism in the NEH proposal for the Cultural Institution Grant, the Institute now sought to benefit nationally from the production, circulation, and dissemination of architectural knowledge. Had the platform been operating as planned, all of the Institute's cultural activities, including its publications, with the IAUS Exhibition Catalogues as a new product, would have been subject to a capitalist commodity-type market, rather than a humanist educational mission. The production of a catalogue series, which distributed documents on all the important exhibitions and enabled the Institute to apply for further grants from art and cultural foundations, was meant to cross-finance the organization and realization of exhibitions. The publishing portfolio was thus to be supplemented by the catalogues as a further, ultimately independent, and above all autonomous print product. In this context, the poster for the "National Architecture Exchange" already referred to eight catalogues that were planned retrospectively for the exhibitions of 1976, 1977, and 1978.

Furthermore, the Institute's leadership even envisioned new types of Institute satellites in other North American metropolises. These were advertised to the NEH as part of a decentralized network for regionally adapted content and cooperation with international institutions with a view to developing a program of lectures, seminars, and exhibitions. This plan ultimately failed to find funding.[531] Nonetheless, the Institute established a presence across North America, initially with "A New Wave of Japanese Architecture," a continuation of the "New Wave" series that had already been promoted as part of the 1978 "National Architecture Exchange," this time with a traveling exhibition and slide series.[532] Having focused on the local scenes in a number of European

531 Frederieke Taylor, NEH proposal, 1979. Source: CCA Montréal, IAUS fonds: A.2-10.

532 The following further series of lectures were conceived: "Debates on the Current Scene (Ten Young American Architects)" for spring 1979, "The Berlin Builders (Six German Architects Leading the Way for the 1980 International Building Exposition in Berlin)" for fall 1979, and "South

metropolises before presenting a distinct European practice in its first two iterations, the "New Wave" concept now packaged nationally defined architectural trends from selected countries: first architects from Japan (winter 1978–79), bringing Arata Isozaki, Hiromi Fujii, Toyo Ito, Monta Mozouna, and Osamu Ishiyama to New York for a series of lectures that subsequently toured to nine more cities in the United States and received two favorable reviews in the *New York Times*.[533] The poster exhibition, however, was not on view at the Institute until later (December 20, 1978, through January 30, 1979). In each case, the Institute collaborated with local architects as external curators in designing the exhibitions and accompanying catalogues, but clearly put its own stamp on the cultural productions by prescribing its own specifications for the design of the poster and publications. Here, even more than before, the Institute acted as both cultural entrepreneur and artistic director, a central clearinghouse for maximum publicity. The smaller, sometimes provincial partner institutions, most of which were unable to raise a large production budget of their own, became mere purchasers of cultural products. By offering other institutions the opportunity to efficiently and cheaply book lecture series and traveling exhibitions, trademarked by the Institute, they became involved in the self-organized, flexibilized, and precarized form of cultural production at the Institute as part of a centralized network, in keeping with a cultural critique of postmodernism. And although it is impossible to speak of mass production for a mass audience in a way that would bear comparison with the culture industry, the Institute's advertising for its niche products, which were (self-)produced in small batches, tends to reveal aspects that have now become characteristic of flexible production systems.[534] Ultimately, both the "National Tour," as the "National Architecture Exchange" was affectionately called, and the "New Wave" series proved to be a commercial failure; they were very labor-intensive to produce and were quickly abolished.[535]

American Movement (Visiting Architects, Interior Designers and Planners will Discuss the Last 20 Years of Latin American Design)" for spring 1980 (ultimately, none of these came to fruition). Further slide series included: "Twenty-Four Houses by Gwathmey/Siegel" and "Arcadias and Insertions: Peter Cook and Ron Heron" (it is not clear whether these were ever produced).

533 Paul Goldberger, "An Overview of Japanese Architecture," *The New York Times* (December 22, 1978), C26; Ada Louise Huxtable, "The Japanese New Wave," *The New York Times* (January 14, 1979), D27. Huxtable's verdict was clear: "Stunning and provocative.... If there is an active avant-garde today, this is it."

534 Baird, 2001, 11.

535 Further "New Wave" series on contemporary architectural trends from Switzerland, Spain, and South America had already been planned and announced by the Institute but did not happen due to lack of financial support.

3.4 A Lack of Follow-up Financing

The trouble with the large NEH grant was that plans had to be made for follow-on funding while it was still in place, in order to be able to even sustain operations at this size, especially since the Institute was not built on an endowment. While expansion was already in the cards for the publishing portfolio of *Oppositions*, *October*, and *Skyline* in 1978, with the IAUS Exhibition Catalogues and Oppositions Books as new formats for channeling earlier efforts for a book series, all the Institute's educational, cultural, and publishing activities were increasingly driven by fundraising, public relations, and marketing, with the "cultural resource" being part of the sales pitch. Branding became key, and while Vignelli's strong, distinctive graphic design for all printed materials, not just publications, and especially for the posters, provided an institutional identity, the acronym "IAUS" was now more frequently used as a brand name for the Institute. The impending termination of "Open Plan" ushered in the next hurdle and the Institute's redesign eclipsed everything in the 1978–79 fiscal year. In light of the reconfiguration of government funding for the arts and humanities, a foreshadowing of the neoliberal turn in federal grant policy-making, the task of increasing patronage tied in with previous development work; it first manifested itself at the Institute in late 1978 with the production of a new brochure, compiled by Taylor with Abigail Moseley under a grant from the Charles E. Culpeper Foundation, which provided an updated overview of the Institute's history, its current structure, and program organization, as it became more commercially oriented.[536]

The Institute's brochure was not only a means of communication but can also be read as another institutional document. For the forty-four-page, richly illustrated publication presented the Institute, past projects, current programs, and even future products from an institutional point of view that applied to not one particular person: a retrospective and statement of intent in its best light. To provide clarity, it opened with an organizational chart designed by Vignelli with an overview of the Institute's various fields of work; curiously, the "Public Programs," under which "Exhibitions" and "Open Plan," the "National Architecture Exchange," but also the "High School Program" and all "Publications" were grouped, took center stage here. In 1978, "Research and Development" and "Education" were relegated to the sidelines in the interests of outreach and public relations. While information on the housing projects and educational offerings was placed in the front section of the brochure with a double-page spread, cultural production was portrayed by merely listing details of, for example, all the exhibitions shown to date, the titles of lecture courses, and the names of everyone involved, especially the presenters, but also the lecturers, highlighted as the Institute's network. Just as importantly,

536 Ockman, 1988, 199. Ockman referred to this as the "solicitation of mainstream patronage."

the back section of the brochure listed all the names of the Institute's trustees, Fellows, staff, and faculty at the time. In this well-designed "we"-construct of the Institute, the photographic depiction of the 1978–79 Fellowship now framed the sixteen Fellows as individuals rather than a collective with portraits and roundels, proof of individuation and differentiation.[537] As all areas of the Institute grew and became even more professionalized and bureaucratized, the proportion of female Fellows increased significantly to nearly one-third, albeit in service roles, since women were brought in to perform administrative tasks. The brochure can thus be viewed as a kind of collective biography, a comprehensive documentation of the life and career of the Institute that eliminated all the inconsistencies through seemingly neutral information and networks described in the lists of names. Ultimately, this form of presentation obscured the fact that, in contrast to the cliquish, hermetic group of the early years, the organization of the Institute in the late 1970s now consisted of an inner and an extended circle, was organized hierarchically, and highly stratified in terms of race, class, and gender, and that, starting with a conservative, male representative at its center, it was not simply a reflection of societal conditions, but a social construct in its own right.

On the other hand, the brochure was also an extremely revealing historical document that concealed gaps, breaks, turning points, and ruptures and, with the number and variety of activities, testified to the Institute's current position and marketability in entrepreneurial processes, while still being listed as a nonprofit organization. Page by page, it listed the names of individual supporters, the members of the Architect's Circle, the sponsors of "Open Plan" and *Oppositions*, and the public and private foundations that had financially supported individual areas of work. By the time Taylor began mailing the brochure, it was clear that after the Cultural Institution Grant, the financial base would need to be diversified further. In the future, the Institute would hope for an NEH's Challenge Grant. This first required the collection of private donations and public grants, which would then be matched by government funding—a practice widely used in North America for cultural funding. Beginning in 1979, the Architects' Circle, which Taylor had now expanded and formalized as administrative director, played a crucial role through which the Institute's leadership hoped to find common ground with established architectural firms and successful builders. This circle of friends now included: Edward L. Barnes, Davis, Brody & Associates, Conklin and Rossant, Ulrich Franzen, Philip Johnson & John Burgee, Richard Meier, Mitchell/Giurgola, I.M. Pei, Paul Rudolph, Skidmore, Owings & Merrill, and Robert Stern. In fiscal year 1979–80,

537 The Fellows of the Institute in 1978/79 were: Diana Agrest, Stanford Anderson, Julia Bloomfield, William Ellis, Peter Eisenman, Kenneth Frampton, Suzanne Frank, Mario Gandelsonas, Andrew MacNair, Stephen Potters, Carla Skodinski, Leland Taliaferro, Frederieke Taylor, Anthony Vidler, Myles Weintraub, and Peter Wolf.

one year before the existing NEH grant for "Open Plan" expired, the Institute first entered into negotiations with the National Council on the Humanities in Washington, D.C., for this purpose.

Philip Johnson and the Institute

The 1979 IAUS brochure featured a close-up of Philip Johnson as a representative of the Architects' Circle, arguably the most prominent and provocative exponent of his guild at the time, who was to play a key role at the Institute as a benefactor.[538] Johnson had featured repeatedly in the years before as a donor of *Oppositions* and "Architecture," but had otherwise remained in the background as more of an *éminence grise*. Since Johnson's influence in the world of architecture and building in New York was as great as ever, he advanced to become the most powerful patron of the Institute and was to become closely tied to its fate. Now, as illustrated by the brochure, he was increasingly feted by Eisenman, in a postmodern hagiography, and included in the Institute's various cultural activities.[539] Previously, Johnson had been courted by the Institute's cultural productions in a variety of ways: the tenth issue of *Oppositions* in 1977 was devoted almost entirely to Johnson, exploring his writing and hailing his *Glass House* as a masterpiece,[540] and in the May 1978 issue of *Skyline*, Johnson was given a lot of space to justify his new postmodern stance in an in-depth interview (the first interview in the tradition of Andy Warhol's *Interview Magazine*),[541] and finally, in the fall of 1978, the Institute mounted an exhibition on the AT&T Building.[542] The tremendous attention paid to Johnson at the time by all areas of the Institute—a genuine media hype—was largely due to Eisenman's strategy as Institute director; others were much more critical. The Institute's tribute to Johnson, whose reputation as a corporate and postmodernist architect had been damaged, exemplified the complex mechanism of heightened attention, as public events and publications were used to orchestrate targeted media exposure and

538 In the 1970s, Johnson held the position of power broker in the New York architectural world. In interviews, Eisenman indicated that Johnson regularly helped him by writing checks. No evidence of Johnson's financial support of the Institute before the early 1980s, however, is found in the CCA's IAUS fonds.

539 With the demise of the Institute, Michael Sorkin in The Village Voice retrospectively criticized Eisenman for engaging in hagiography with his publications about Johnson; see Michael Sorkin, "Reforming the Institute," *The Village Voice* (April 30, 1985), 102; republished in *Exquisite Corpse: Writing on Buildings* (New York: Verso, 1991), 110–113.

540 Peter Eisenman, "Behind the Mirror: On the Writings of Philip Johnson," *Oppositions* 10 (Fall 1977), 1–13; Robert Stern, "The Evolution of Philip Johnson's Glass House, 1947–1948," *Oppositions* 10 (Fall 1977), 56–67.

541 Philip Johnson (interview w/ Martha Carroll and Craig Owens), "Skylights: Philip Johnson on Philip Johnson," *Skyline* (May 1978), 7–8.

542 IAUS, ed., *Philip Johnson: Processes. The Glass House, 1949 and The AT&T Headquarters, 1978*, Catalogue 9 (New York: The Institute for Architecture and Urban Studies, 1979). The Institute visited the completed AT&T Building in 1984.

create a longer-term media presence. As part of the power structure, Eisenman made no secret of the fact that he was well aware of Johnson's central importance in the New York architecture community. In a mixture of whitewashing and caricature, he himself had written a short article for *Skyline*, albeit under a pseudonym, about the premier league of New York architects around Johnson.[543] Under the title "The Philip Johnson All Stars" and the pseudonym of Ernesto di Casarotta, he had composed a piece in the jargon of a sports report, providing insights into the web of relationships in the architecture community. While there was talk of "long-standing jealousies and rivalries," Eisenman unabashedly flattered Johnson under the protection of his pseudonym by awarding him a pivotal position. Obviously, there was no way around Johnson at that time if one wanted to become part of the American architecture establishment.[544] Typically, Eisenman also inserted himself into this narrative, virtually a sociogram of the relationships between those who considered themselves the most important New York architects, as one of the protagonists. The fact that he could take the liberty of publishing such an odd piece in *Skyline*, which combined human interest, hype, and gossip, underscored his unique position of power at the Institute, which he refers to here, in passing, offensively as "Istituto nero" [sic!]. Johnson, in turn, benefited from this publicity at the Institute, which he approvingly nicknamed "The Eisenman Institute," while reinforcing its credentials, partially rehabilitating his reputation in the architecture scene.

The exhibition "Philip Johnson: Processes" (September 12 to October 31, 1978), in which the design of Johnson/Burgee Architects for their AT&T Building at 550 Madison Avenue in Midtown Manhattan, i.e., the skyscraper that would become an icon of postmodern architecture upon its completion in 1984, was presented comprehensively for the first time and published in a catalogue, played a decisive role in this respect both for Johnson's profile and for the position of the Institute.[545] The plans for the new, prestigious headquarters of the market-dominating American communications company had just been made public in the spring, whereupon the high-rise, which differed significantly from the Seagram Building, for example, immediately attracted attention because of its postmodern design. This recalled the Roman and Florentine Renaissance, not least because of its striking interpretation of the tripartite structure: an extra-high loggia at the base, a luxurious marble façade for the office floors, and a pediment that immediately evoked associations of broken Chippendale furniture. The Institute itself, where the exhibition was not entirely uncontroversial and provoked strong reactions from some of the Fellows, who rejected the design

543 Peter Eisenman [Ernesto di Casarotta, pseud.], "Quarta Roma: Report from Rome" *Skyline* (August 1978), 6.

544 Plunz and Kaplan, 1984.

545 IAUS, 1979.

out of hand because of its historical eclecticism, came under fire at the time. In his exhibition review in *The Village Voice*, for example, young architecture critic Michael Sorkin sharply attacked the incestuous conditions that specifically underlay the exhibition's conception, before revealing himself to be a harsh critic of the Institute's work in general; the crucial role played by Johnson for the Institute at the time, as "both the prime benefactor and éminence grise," was thus well known in New York.[546] Criticism of architectural production and cultural production, and an analysis of social relations and institutional networks, arose time and again.[547] The major publishers, in turn, supported Eisenman in his efforts to reinstall Johnson as a central figure in American architecture. The volume *Philip Johnson: Writings*, which he edited with Stern, once more a congenial partner, and which was published by the New York office of Oxford University Press in 1979, with a preface by Eisenman and an introduction by Vincent Scully, was a celebration of Johnson the author. Like Stern, Eisenman thus secured a special position in Johnson's entourage and was high up on his list, before Richard Meier, Michael Graves, and Frank Gehry.

For Eisenman, this alliance with Johnson came to play a key role in his search for further financial backing and corporate patronage. In his quest for power and fame, and to secure the Institute's continued operations, Eisenman got involved with Johnson, even though it was fairly well-known in the American architecture world that Johnson had sympathized with fascist ideology in the 1930s and had even, as a correspondent for the German Reich, published anti-Semitic texts in the leading American newspapers *Examiner*, *Social Justice*, and *Today's Challenge*.[548] Eisenman, like many others, was apparently not that concerned; on the contrary, he continued to court Johnson and tried to use this knowledge to his own advantage. Over the years, a close yet complicated relationship developed between Johnson and Eisenman, one of mutual esteem and dependence, and by supporting him, he made the Institute dependent on

546 Michael Sorkin, "Philip Johnson: The Master Builder as a Self-Made Man," *Village Voice* (October 30, 1978), 61–62; republished in *Exquisite Corpse: Writing on Buildings* (New York: Verso, 1991), 7–14.

547 Kazys Varnelis, "The Spectacle of the Innocent Eye: Vision, Cynical Reason, and the Discipline of Architecture in Postwar America," PhD diss., Cornell University, 1994.

548 Franz Schulze, Johnson's biographer, was the first to thoroughly review Johnson's fascist past; see Franz Schulze, *Philip Johnson. Life and Work* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1994). On Johnson's political activities in the 1930s, see also Kazys Varnelis, "'We Cannot Not Know History:' Philip Johnson's Politics and Cynical Survival," *Journal of Architectural Education* 49, no. 2 (November 1995), 92–104. Varnelis argued that Johnson's entire career, indeed his entire life, must be seen against this backdrop and compared his reappraisal of Johnson's right-wing past to discussions of Paul de Man and Martin Heidegger. There was little discussion of how Eisenman and the Institute dealt with this knowledge.

Johnson's favor, even turning it into his metaphorical backyard.[549] Eisenman may have been acting out of responsibility towards the Institute, and perhaps towards the Fellowship, but he was entering dangerous territory, turning a blind eye to reality and pursuing a policy of double standards—and double-speak. Institutionally and discursively, the Institute became Johnson's ally or accomplice and was also to benefit from the attention economy, as the latter rose to superstardom in the American architecture world.[550] In January 1979, Johnson was featured on the cover of *Time* magazine, holding a striking model of the AT&T Building, which announced an in-depth feature on "U.S. Architects. Doing their own thing."[551] At the latest, this cover, which turned the architectural model into a media event, made it clear that architecture was entering into a new relationship with the market in the wake of geo-economic restructuring, which made it interesting for the Institute again.

In the process, from the perspective of a Marxist critique of urban development and the profession, architects were now increasingly assuming a merely decorative role for the new global accumulation regime, for which they provided the enticing images: "fiction, fragmentation, collage and eclecticism, all suffused with a sense of ephemerality and chaos," these were the strategies adopted by postmodern and deconstructivist architecture and urban design at this time in order to attract even more investment.[552] Changes in architecture and media politics in general, like the coverage of notable architects, already indicated that in the coming decade, some would achieve celebrity status, turning into commodities themselves. Johnson knew how to play this particular game like no other. In May 1979, the seventy-two-year-old architect was awarded the Pritzker Prize for lifetime achievement. Already compared to the Nobel Prize in the announcement, this was the first annual Pritzker Prize in Architecture to ever be awarded, and thus a particularly symbolic one. Johnson received it, according to the jury, "for 50 years of imagination and vitality embodied in a myriad of museums, theaters, libraries, houses, gardens, and corporate

549 Eisenman's dependence on Johnson defined the Institute until its closure in 1985, and finally culminated in 1988 in the "Deconstructivist Architecture" exhibition at the Museum of Modern Art (June 23 to August 30, 1988); see MoMA, "Deconstructivist Architecture," Press Release no. 29 (March 1988), https://www.moma.org/momaorg/shared/pdfs/docs/press_archives/6526/releases/MOMA_1988_0029_29.pdf (last accessed: May 31, 2023); see also Philip Johnson and Mark Wigley, eds., *Deconstructivist Architecture* (New York: Museum of Modern Art, 1988).

550 Varnelis used the example of the contract awarded to Johnson/Burgee for the AT&T Building to discuss the underlying networks, see Varnelis, 2009.

551 *Time Magazine* (January 8, 1979): "U.S. Architects. Doing their Own Thing." Varnelis also pointed out that the photo of Johnson in the pose depicted there is reminiscent of Moses and the tablet with the Ten Commandments, see Varnelis, 2009.

552 Harvey, 1989, 66ff., especially 98.

structures."[553] In his extraordinary way, Johnson dedicated the award to the art of architecture, ennobling himself in the process. In an attempt to tie the newly crowned superstar to the Institute as closely as possible, and thus intensify contacts in the building and real estate world, Johnson was appointed a trustee on February 1, 1980, which gave him more influence on Institute policy than before—a conscious decision that in the medium term led to Institute business now also being negotiated at the Century Association, an exclusive New York social club headquartered on 43rd Street, not far from the Institute, i.e., in the heart of New York high society, where Johnson held court.[554]

The Beginnings of "Starchitecture"

Through a thorough analysis of its cultural productions and its cultural politics, a critique of the Institute as one of the "cultural spaces" of the New York architecture community will, by undertaking a close examination of the interplay between education, culture, and publishing, ultimately help us understand the emerging phenomenon that was subsequently described with the neologism "starchitecture."[555] From a sociology of culture perspective, the Institute offers important insights into how the genesis of the star system obscured or normalized the interconnections between architecture and the market, i.e., the economic mechanisms of a capitalist construction and real estate economy.[556] The Institute illustrates not only how architecture became intertwined with other arts, the humanities, and the cultural sphere in general, but also how, not least due to the growing sectors of the creative and cultural industries, an economization of all forms and formats of cultural production took place in the 1970s. The Institute's remarkable list of lecture series and exhibitions demonstrates that even then, before the key events of postmodernism in the 1980s, a celebrity culture and eventually a global star system were established, which received an additional boost when architects became brands themselves and increasingly competed as actors for the realization of iconic projects in a globalized architecture world. Through the program and organization of "Architecture," "Open

553 Philip Johnson, 1979 Laureate, www.pritzkerprize.com/laureates/1979 (last accessed: May 31, 2023).

554 The Century Association was frequented by architects; in addition to Johnson, who had belonged to the club since 1968, Stern (since 1976) and Eisenman (since 1977) also became members, as did many others. Among the Institute trustees: Armand Bartos (since 1978), John Burgee (1979), Colin G. Cambell (1978), Henry N. Cobb (1974), Charles DeCarlo (1974), Gibson Danes (1960), George A. Dudley (1971), Ulrich Franzen (1983), Edward Logue (1972), Richard Meier (1976), Cesar Pelli (1983), T. Merrill Prentice (1966), Jaquelin Robertson (1974), Edward L. Saxe (1984), Frank Stanton (1948), John F. White (1964), and Peter Wolf, (1976); see *The Century Yearbook* (New York: Century Association), see also Plunz and Kaplan, 1984.

555 Davide Ponzini and Michele Nastasi, *Starchitecture. Scenes, Actors, and Spectacles in Contemporary Cities* (New York: The Monacelli Press, 2016).

556 Andreas Reckwitz, "Die Genese des Starsystems," in *Die Erfindung der Kreativität. Zum Prozess gesellschaftlicher Ästhetisierung* (Frankfurt: Suhrkamp, 2012), 239–268.

Plan," the "New Wave" series, and the "National Architecture Exchange," as well as various exhibitions, the Institute furthered the popularity of various architects—emerging architects from Europe such as Rem Koolhaas, Elia Zenghelis, Robert and Leon Krier, Aldo Rossi, and Massimo Scolari, alongside established firms from the United States, as well as architecture historians—and was thus partly responsible for the economization of creativity and criticism. In the second half of the 1970s, reviews by the two regular architecture critics writing for the *New York Times*, Ada Louise Huxtable and Paul Goldberger, now appeared more frequently and reported favorably on the Institute. This is indicative of how and how much the Institute, personally championed by Eisenman, shaped Rossi's reception in North America. Under Laurie Hawkinson as program director, "Aldo Rossi in America. Città Analoga Drawings" (September 19 to October 20, 1979), Rossi's second solo exhibition at the Institute after 1976 and the first to be coordinated with the Max Protetch Gallery, tried to satisfy both intellectual interests and commercial ones, though this distinction made was not clear or unequivocal. While the Institute showed drawings by Rossi made during his previous stays in the United States, the Max Protetch Gallery, with "Aldo Rossi: Architectural Projects," (September 18 to October 13, 1979) offered drawings of realized and unrealized projects for sale.[557] The two exhibitions opened on two consecutive evenings, with Max Protetch first, highlighting the commercial interests.[558] The symbiotic nature of the arrangement along the culture/commerce axis was reflected in the exhibition catalogue produced by the Institute with an edition of 1500 copies at a retail price of five dollars; in exchange for a certain number of free copies and the placement of ads in *Skyline*, the Max Protetch Gallery covered the costs of shipping and framing the images. Then, in the October 1979 issue of *Skyline*, Rossi was thoroughly hyped with an exclusive but oddly edited interview by Diana Agrest, and his drawings were featured on the cover and inside the paper.[559] At the time, reviews in both the *New York Times* and *Progressive Architecture* were uniformly positive.[560] This enormous exposure in New York greatly increased Rossi's popularity and reputation in the United States, in part because the Institute subsequently sent the exhibition on tour, stopping off at ten North American cities as part of the National Tour. In addition, Eisenman had previously paved the way at the Institute for two monographs: the long overdue English-language translation of *L'Architettura della Città* and the valuable first publication of *A Scientific Autobiography*, for

557 Kauffman, 2018, 236, 264. Legend has it that even some of drawings by Rossi exhibited at the Institute may have been sold, with Eisenman acting as a facilitator.

558 "Skylights: Rossi Opening Crowds" *Skyline* (October 1979), 15.

559 Diana Agrest, "The Architecture of the City: An Interview with Aldo Rossi," *Skyline* (September 1979), 4–5.

560 Ada Louise Huxtable, "The Austere World of Rossi," *The New York Times* (October 1979), D31; see also "Aldo Rossi: Two Exhibits," *Progressive Architecture* (October 1979), 21, 23.

which negotiations with MIT Press had begun. By acting as an intermediary in the sale of Rossi's drawings off the wall, Eisenman overstepped his competencies as Institute director; likewise, he overstepped his authority as a critic by contributing his creative misinterpretations of Rossi's understanding of autonomy and architecture in his preface to the exhibition catalogue, or, later on, in his introduction to one of the books.[561] More than that: Eisenman used this cultural management in his usual manner to disseminate his own ideas of culture, sociology, and art.

At the beginning of the new decade, the Institute held its first major retrospective of an American architect, titled "Wallace K. Harrison: New York Architect" (December 18, 1979, to January 12, 1980). This was apparently the first-ever major retrospective of Wallace Harrison, who was best known for his contribution to Rockefeller Center, the design of the UN Headquarters, and Lincoln Center, all prominent New York modernist buildings.[562] Once again Koolhaas, who had become something of a star himself with the publication of *Delirious New York* in 1978, an exhibition at the Guggenheim Museum that same year, as well as a portrait in *Interview Magazine*, was invited to curate the exhibition—a new chapter in the Institute's historiographical endeavors.[563] Koolhaas used the same tactics as when researching for his monograph that brought Harrison out of obscurity: having gained access to Harrison's private archive, he selected sketches, plans, and photographs of realized and unrealized projects, both well-known and unknown, to celebrate the American corporate architect for his metropolitan architecture as well. Koolhaas also knew how to use exhibition design as a provocative device and built a curved wall as a special feature, copying Harrison's formal language, creating more wall space, and, to top it off, mocking the orthodox Le Corbusier reception of the Institute's Fellows. Reviews in the *New York Times* were favorable.[564] Immediately thereafter, the Institute was to partner with the Max Protetch Gallery on two more occasions. First with a coordinated exhibition on Hejduk in the winter of 1980, with "John Hejduk: Seven Houses" (January 22 to February 16, 1980) on display at the Institute, and Max Protetch showing "The Works of John Hejduk" (January to February 16,

561 Peter Eisenman, "The House of the Dead as the City of Survival," in *Aldo Rossi in America: 1976–1979*, Catalogue 2, ed. IAUS (Cambridge: MIT Press, 1979), 4–15; Peter Eisenman, "The Houses of Memory: The Texts of Analogue," in Aldo Rossi, *The Architecture of the City* (Cambridge: MIT Press, 1982), 2–11.

562 Kim Förster, "The Institute for Architecture and Urban Studies: Wallace K. Harrison. New York Architect (Press Release)," in *Architecture Itself*, ed. Sylvia Lavin (Leipzig: Spector Books, 2019), 121–124.

563 Rem Koolhaas, *Delirious New York. A Retroactive Manifesto for Manhattan* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1978).

564 Paul Goldberger, "Architecture: Harrison Retrospective," *The New York Times* (January 2, 1980), C 15; Ada Louise Huxtable, "Reexamining Wallace Harrison," *The New York Times* (January 6, 1980), D23.

1980)—both the series "The Thirteen Watchtowers of Cannaregio" and a selection of house designs. This was all the more remarkable because Hejduk had been excluded from the MoMA exhibition "Transformation in Modern Architecture" shortly beforehand in 1979 because of Drexler's curatorial approach, which had dictated that only photographs of realized projects be shown there,[565] a provocative statement that was highly contested at the Institute, which in 1980 also published Hejduk's book of poems, *The Silent Witness and Other Poems*.[566] The Hejduk exhibition was followed by a coordinated exhibition on Massimo Scolari in the spring of 1980, with "Massimo Scolari: Architecture. Between Memory and Hope" (May 6 to June 20, 1980) at the Institute, and Max Protetch showing "Massimo Scolari: Drawings and Watercolors" (May 13 to June 7, 1980). For the time being, however, no further cooperation with Max Protetch was to take place. The early 1980s saw exhibitions on a less regular basis, when the opportunity arose: "Mark Treib: Some Posters on the Theme of Architecture" and "A New Wave of Austrian Architecture," coordinated by Missing Link, the last iteration of the "New Wave" series.

The End of Plenty

With the inevitable expiration of the NEH Cultural Institutions Grant at the end of fiscal year 1979–80, the Institute's publicly funded output as a cultural space within a carefully balanced range of education offerings, public programs, and publications began to shift. The roles and responsibilities for the Evening Program and the Exhibition Program had been switched around repeatedly in previous years, leaving little continuity. For the final year of "Open Plan," Patrick Pinnell had been entrusted with directing the program, with Vidler as his advisor. Nearly all of the veteran Fellows contributed to the series of lectures in one way or the other, however, to justify the NEH funding and to endorse the Institute's application for follow-on funding. Gandelsonas and Vidler co-taught a course on "Piranesi/Le Corbusier," with lectures on the modern reception of the Italian artist and the modernist urbanism of the Swiss-French architect, and Frampton presented "Housing versus the City," with lectures on building and settlement types in Europe and North America—explicitly on the perimeter block, the estate, and the suburb, and for the last time on the Institute's prototype of low-rise, high-density housing. By the late 1970s, New York architecture culture had certainly changed, and the Institute was implicated. As his substantive contribution, Pinnell now offered a course called "The American Monument," which presented

565 Paul Goldberger, "Architecture: Houses Designed by John Hejduk," *The New York Times* (January 32, 1980), C15; Ada Louise Huxtable, "John Hejduk: A Mystic and Poet," *The New York Times* (February 3, 1980), D25.

566 John Hejduk, *The Silent Witness and Other Poems* (New York: The Institute for Architecture and Urban Studies, 1980). Pieter Sanders collected works by John Hejduk in particular, and the two became friends. He also financed the production of Hejduk's book of poems with US$ 5000, an investment he called "big business."

fairly national positions on the current monumentality debate, with lectures on the Capitol in Washington, D.C., and the National Gallery, on Wallace K. Harrison, on Frederick Law Olmstead, on Frank Lloyd Wright, on Levittown, and on the skyscraper as a building type in general. Staying true to his earlier approach, MacNair presented the course "Architecture in the 1980s," anticipating developments of the new decade, which would be all about postmodernism. In it, he paired two architects at a time to exchange ideas, including some of the Institute's trustees and friends: Charles Gwathmey and Stanley Tigerman, Richard Meier and Ulrich Franzen, and, as newcomers to the scene, Friday Architects and Arquitectonica. Even Wallace Harrison made a personal guest appearance during "Open Plan Week."

But in the second semester, "Open Plan," as it had existed since 1977 with its humanistic structure of courses on "Architecture," "The City," and "The Arts," as well as "Design" ended. In its last iteration in the spring of 1980, the conservative traits that dominated the transformation of the American economy and culture of the 1980s and ultimately led to a drastic restructuring and polarization that culminated in the culture wars, were already becoming palpable. Thus, "Open Plan," now with the subheading "Architecture in American Culture," was transformed into a more profitable and popular format, with eight smaller courses organized in two blocks, and featured a wider range of topics, some of which were quite a delicate affair. In the first block, Frampton and Gandelsonas each presented a course with American content: "Louis Kahn. Modernism as Tradition" and "America vs. Europe: Symbolic Exchanges and Transformations." Given the Institute's history and social standing, the invitation of Michael Sorkin—architecture critic for *The Village Voice* and troublemaker—who had previously followed the Institute closely, to present a course was a new departure. Titled "The Family: Sources of the Architectural Status Quo," he took the opportunity to focus on the powerful networks in American architecture culture and in particular the role of educators, clients, curators, gallery owners, critics, and architects: the clearest attempt yet at an institutional analysis, even as a critical, conceptual, and curatorial approach. In addition, Mary McLeod, the first female presenter at "Open Plan," offered a course on "Architecture and the Social Order: Style, Politics, and Regeneration," which not only focused on political interdependencies and reformist approaches but also outlined a feminist critique of architecture and the city. The second block showed that the debate surrounding postmodernism was only just gaining momentum, reproducing the prevailing ideologies of tradition and innovation, author and work, to reflect and reinforce the origins and lines of development of the new American architecture culture. Pinnell presented a course on "Frank Lloyd Wright: Tradition as Modernism" and William Howard Adams on "Architecture and the Ideology of Nature: Gardens as Ideal Forms." Vidler, however, offered a course with the title "Shadowboxing: Modern and Postmodern in the 1980s," which focused on the analysis and meaning of new positions and approaches, the discourse and culture of postmodernism from a

humanities perspective. With his own contribution, a lecture titled "Beyond the Isms: The Question of Architecture Itself," and lectures by Eisenman ("Ghosts in the Stadium. Players and Programs"), Rosalind Krauss ("Is there Culture without Style?"), John Hejduk ("Is there a Fascia in Mies?"), and Alan Colquhoun ("Newspeak? Architecture Parlante in the Eighties"), Vidler's course, unlike MacNair's, dealt with the big unresolved questions of the new, all-important decade of architecture as a brand, culture, politics, and style.

According to the agreement between the Institute and the NEH, the original plan was to organize another event to conclude the cultural promotion of architecture as part of the humanities in 1980. At that time, there were serious plans to organize a conference on "The Architect and the Developer" (with, among others, Tafuri as the most prominent speaker, who was to contribute a capitalist critique of real estate), which promised not only to furnish a genuine debate but also at the same time facilitate bridge-building with the construction and finance industries. By 1980–81, negotiations were already underway with Jonathan Barnett, formerly a partner in the City Planning Commission, who had presented a course in the framework of the Evening Program on architecture as an art, profession, and business, and who was now developing and revising a concept for a conference on the topic of "Architecture, Development and the New Investment Pattern: Can They Co-Exist?" already scheduled for September 25, 1981 (it is not clear, however, whether the conference actually took place).[567] Ultimately, it was Vidler who, after helping to write the concept in 1977 but then remaining largely in the background, submitted a final report on "Open Plan" to the NEH in which he explicitly and confidently attested to the institutional and discursive success of the program.[568] At the end of the report, Vidler retrospectively concluded that the adult education offering had indeed not reached as much of the "wide and general non-professional audience" outside of architecture and had not contributed as much to "the study, discussion and understanding of architecture in contemporary culture" as hoped, openly admitting that the main goal had not been achieved. But despite these concessions, he concluded that "Open Plan" had nevertheless succeeded, at least in the first two years, in stimulating a dialogue between a wide variety of disciplines "ranging from history, city planning, aesthetics, cultural studies, interior design, urban design, to architecture." In his opinion, it had been extremely successful in promoting "a discussion of the relations among the different arts and the humanities" (though he did not say that he himself was instrumental in this with the "The Arts" course) and, to a certain extent, in demonstrating "the central role of architecture as a humanistic discipline." According to Vidler's

567 Jonathan Barnett, proposal for a conference, October 20, 1980, November 10, 1980, November 11, 1980, April 6, 1981, April 10, 1981. Source: CCA Montréal, IAUS fonds: A 5-11.

568 Anthony Vidler, "Report on Open Plan for the NEH," July 22, 1981. Source: CCA Montréal, IAUS fonds: A.1-6.

self-evaluation, the Institute had made an important contribution to fostering a greater awareness of "architecture and its public role" in metropolitan society and the mass media. In its response, the NEH acknowledged the Institute's work with "Open Plan" and the quality of the individual courses but criticized the Institute for not holding the long-planned conference on the relationship between architecture and the humanities as the culmination and conclusion of the Cultural Institution Grant.

The end of the generous funding in the summer of 1980 marked the beginning of a new era. The Institute lost one of the most important cornerstones of its programming and funding model. This not only led to considerable destabilization and uncertainty; above all, with the end of the "Open Plan," it lost the public character it had been cultivating since 1974 with its educational and cultural work, holding lectures every evening during the semesters over a period of six years—first with "Architecture" and then with "Open Plan." When this collapsed, the Institute was left with no high-profile forum for debate in the New York architecture community and no central mechanism for generating attention. Besides the education offerings, only the Exhibition Program continued after 1980 and, along with the IAUS Exhibitions Catalogues, became an important component. When Lindsey Stamm Shapiro took over as program director in 1981, the production of exhibitions became larger and more professional, powerfully networked, and on several occasions built on collaboration: "Le Corbusier's Saint-Pierre de Firminy, Early Drawings: 1961–1962," curated by José Oubrerie and shown as a double exhibition at Cooper Union as well, "Clorindo Testa: Architecture and Personal Mythology," curated by Jorge Glunsberg, "Kazuo Shinohara: 11 Houses (1971–1976)," with Frampton as the driving force behind it (and which later travelled to UQAM in Montréal, sparking regionalist debates), "Raymond Hood," curated by Robert Stern, "Office for Metropolitan Architecture. Toward a modern (re)construction of the European city: Four Housing Projects," conceived by the office and coordinated with the Max Protetch Gallery (March to April 3, 1982), "William Lescaze," curated by Barbie Campbell Cole, with the support of Syracuse University's School of Architecture, and "New Symbolism: The West Coast Architects," coordinated by Frank Gehry and Mark Mack. In many cases, the NEA and NYSCA funding and further corporate and private sponsorships once again revealed the entrepreneurial side of cultural production at work alongside the curatorial one. Apart from "Idea as Model" in the early days, none of the Institute's practicing Fellows had been granted a solo exhibition: Eisenman's Terragni show did not materialize, and an exhibition on projects by Agrest Gandelsonas that was still under discussion in 1981 was eventually overturned by Eisenman.

By 1980, the Institute's Fellows had turned primarily to publishing as a cultural practice. The various formats were to become the Institute's primary mission, based on the contracts with MIT Press for *Oppositions*, the IAUS Exhibition Catalogues, and, most recently, the Oppositions Books. Implementing this and

making it at least somewhat profitable required further restructuring and reinvention of the Institute, which would continue to operate as an architecture school, working primarily as an editorial office, but would function differently from the cultural space when it came to creating synergies between the various areas of activity. The Institute's contribution to architecture culture, as a network of networks, was to have enabled and promoted a mode of cultural production that created an attention economy that was not only symbolic but also political. More than that, by producing and reproducing knowledge, information, and communication, by talking about individual positions and approaches, and by exhibiting the *dispositif* of creativity and autonomy, it had demonstratively staged a new canon of theoretically and historically considered practices. By facilitating and encouraging architects, historians, and theorists to work as cultural producers in the 1970s—when jobs in New York were scarce—especially since funding for the arts and the humanities had been available for a time as an important source of income, the Institute, as cultivator, contributed decisively to the assertion of postmodern architecture as a fashionable style and to postmodernism as a cultural phenomenon.