

4.

Publishing Imprint

In the fall of 1976, Peter Eisenman received a letter dated October 15 informing him of the publication of *Oppositions* 5 by MIT Press.⁵⁶⁹ What is remarkable about this document, printed on the journal's stationery, is that the sender was Peter Eisenman himself, who as editor of *Oppositions* had signed and also mailed the letter to his own address—a truly postmodern expression of self-referentiality. It is evidence that *Oppositions*, which had provided the Institute with a base of loyal readers, subscribers, authors, and sponsors, was currently in the process of repositioning itself in the marketplace. Sent to all of the journal's sponsors, it informed them of the recent signing of a contract with MIT Press, after long negotiations, and the promise of what would now be a regular quarterly publication. Eisenman, always the provocateur and publicist, not only promised the continuation of a dialogue but combined this with an appeal for financial support for the forthcoming volume, a donation of US\$130 for the issues *Oppositions* 5, 6, 7, and 8—a rhetorically clever, if transparent, move. This appeal for donations was not just another promotional tool of the Institute after the new issue had already been sent to its erstwhile sponsors, but ultimately a written document, one that historians would call an ego-document: a source of insight into how Eisenman perceived and represented himself at the smallest intersection of the circle of editors and the circle of sponsors. *Oppositions* had already been on the market for three years, and in the meantime, not least due to Eisenman's constant advertising—whether after lectures or during interviews—it had earned a reputation as a sophisticated journal. While donations

569 Peter Eisenman, letter to Peter Eisenman, October 15, 1976. Source: CCA Montréal, IAUS fonds: D.4-7.

had once been the prerequisite for launching the journal as a self-published initiative, the letter announced that now, after the successful pilot issues, the next step had been taken to guarantee the publication of *Oppositions* in the longer term. But despite the conclusion of the contract, Eisenman, the publisher, said they were still dependent on donations. For this, along with all the authors and essays, editing, and production, was the capital that the Institute brought to the collaboration with MIT Press. But the letter does not only testify to a politics of journal-making, a combination of architecture journalism and cultural management. Since the sponsors were simultaneously invited by Institute director Eisenman to one of the “Forum” events celebrating the publication of *Oppositions* 6, a closed event at the Institute exclusively reserved for the sponsors and dedicated to the last major MoMA exhibition titled “Beaux-Arts,” the letter testified, above all, to an economy of culture that was practiced there, more than to a belief in discourse or the interplay of ideas and criticism, and as a document of philanthropy as practice, set the future course of financing the publication of the Institute’s own journal through cultural sponsorship. Along with ensuring the survival of *Oppositions*, Eisenman’s announcement of the conclusion of the MIT Press contract flattered the sponsors—for by including himself in the list of addresses he put himself on par with the other sponsors, be they private individuals, institutions, or corporations. Moreover, the letter testified that the Institute was now distancing itself from plans to start its own publishing house. The price for this, however, was that the editors had to bury the myth of the journal as merely a “little magazine.”

4.1 Investing in Academic Journals

For when in 1973, a circle of Fellows at the Institute once again set out to found their own journal to stimulate architecture discourse, this time successfully, the main questions, apart from the appointment and composition of its editorial board, concerned the content and financing of the first issues, i.e., the traditional tasks of a publishing house: production, marketing, and distribution. Publications had always played an important role for Peter Eisenman, and the launch of the Institute’s own journal had thus been particularly important to him since its founding, as he was well aware of its historical role in establishing interpretative sovereignty. Not only was Eisenman a passionate collector of avant-garde periodicals of European modernism, but in 1968 he even exhibited his private collection at Princeton University.⁵⁷⁰ At the time, he also

570 Eisenman exhibited his private collection at the Princeton University Library under the title “Modern Architecture 1910/1939: Polemics, Books, Periodicals and Ephemera from the Collection of Peter D. Eisenman” (February 16 to April 15, 1968). Tafuri highlighted Eisenman’s passion: “Not to be overlooked is the fact that Eisenman is an avid collector of magazines and

published essays, reviews, and theoretical articles in international magazines such as the Italian *Casabella* and the British *Architectural Design*. Otherwise, he favored *Perspecta*, edited by students at Yale University, *Design Quarterly*, published by the Walker Arts Center, and the short-lived *Architectural Forum*. For him, these were the only serious architecture journals and magazines in the United States, in contrast to the major American architecture press such as *Architectural Record* and *Progressive Architecture*. At an early stage, Eisenman therefore gathered people around him who had experience in publishing, such as Kenneth Frampton (as a Fellow) and Stuart Wrede (as a Research Associate), from whom he hoped to acquire the necessary knowledge and skills. In the early 1970s, Eisenman and Mario Gandelsonas planned a series of books on architecture theory, edited by the Institute, in cooperation with MoMA, and with support from the Graham Foundation, as a response to Robert Venturi's publication *Complexity and Contradiction in Architecture* (1966). This never materialized. There were in fact contacts with MIT Press, which at that time was already considered the best publishing house in the field, via Stanford Anderson. But even after five years of the Institute's existence, it took a long time for any major publication projects to materialize, whenever the opportunity to publish presented itself—only *New Urban Settlements* (1970), a comprehensive research report on British and American New Towns and French *Villes nouvelles*, the two exhibition catalogues *Art & Architecture USSR. 1917–31* (1971) and *Another Chance for Housing. Low-Rise Alternatives* (1973), and “The City as an Artifact,” a special issue of *Casabella* (1971), for which the Institute had taken over the guest editorship, had been published. By 1973, several attempts to launch a journal had already been made, including by Anderson and Anthony Vidler, among others. Now, in the spring of 1973, when the question of publishing was revisited with *Oppositions*, there was even internal discussion on Gandelsonas's initiative for the Institute to found its own publishing house—the proposed names were “The IAUS Publishing Corporation” and “IAUS Publications, Inc.”—i.e., to define an entity with legal capacity, to which certain rights and, above all, limited responsibilities would have been attached. Above all, however, these considerations regarding the business model also concerned the economic intentions and safeguards associated with the planned publications.

However, the Institute did not start a publishing house operating on its own account, neither at that time nor at a later stage. Following the failure of the joint attempt by Eisenman, Gandelsonas, and Diana Agrest to capitalize on theory production by applying for impressive grants, *Oppositions* was launched

documents of the avant-garde. The spirit of the collector is not that of the bricoleur, but presupposes a process of selection.” See Tafuri, 1976, here 49. Oddly enough, the essay is titled “European [sic!] Graffiti. Five x Five = Twenty-five” in the journal, which adds to the confusion as to who is appropriating whom.

in November 1973, two months late, and self-produced as a supposedly “little magazine.” The first issues were financed by private funds and donations from a network of private, institutional, and corporate sponsors. Despite recurring financial difficulties during this period, the Institute, as a societally and culturally well-networked organization, provided the framework that made this journal possible. From then on, publishing *Oppositions* offered Eisenman and the long-serving Fellows, as well as selected external authors, the opportunity to develop their own ideas as essays, to contribute them to the larger, more widespread debate, and confer on them the weight of a publication. Writing, i.e., historicizing, theorizing, and critiquing, provided them with the opportunity to make a name for themselves on a national and soon international level. When the first three issues of *Oppositions* were produced between 1973 and 1975 as pilot issues alongside the Fellows’ other teaching and cultural production, they were successful in raising the Institute’s profile beyond New York and the East Coast of the USA, first in architecture circles, and later in other circles as well. After that, the Institute was not only frequently equated with *Oppositions* from an outside perspective, but Eisenman’s reputation in the profession as a “publisher” and “collector of many fetishes” soon preceded him.⁵⁷¹ In an interview that he gave to Alvin Boyarsky, the head of the Architectural Association in London, in their television studio at the beginning of 1975, he talked about the Institute as a site of theory production with reference to *Oppositions*, thus elevating it to an almost mythical site of architecture: “And then we have a magazine, which we are using to try and develop a level of discourse internationally about ideas, and to see architecture as a critical vehicle.” While Eisenman referred to the different values, motivations, goals, and intentions of the editors and external, in some cases international authors in this context, he once again did not clarify what exactly he meant by “discourse” or “critical.”⁵⁷² At the same time, it was precisely the unresolved publishing situation that meant that, in winter 1975, the continuity of this ambitious project was anything but assured, and *Oppositions* 4, the issue to be published by the New York publisher Wittenborn Art Books, was thus delayed.

571 Eisenman, 1975.

572 Ibid. Eisenman was using a rather broad concept of “discourse” here, for especially in architecture the term colloquially denotes any form of debate. In contrast, public intellectuals in the 1970s increasingly used the concept of “discourse” to refer to the approaches of post-structuralist philosophy and linguistics in the wake of the theoretical turn, above all by Michel Foucault, who theorized his historical-genealogical approach in *The Archaeology of Knowledge* ([1969] 1972) and delivered his 1970 inaugural lecture at the Collège du France on *The Order of Discourse*. In a 1972 conversation with Gilles Deleuze, Foucault emphasized that for him, discourse analysis was always directed against power, as a “counter-discourse;” see Foucault and Deleuze, 1977. In addition, Eisenman first elaborated on what exactly he meant by “critical” in a lecture he gave at Cooper Union in the fall of 1986, see Eisenman, 1988, 190–193.

The crucial factor for the Institute's self-perception as a publishing house, regardless of its legal status, was that the role and importance of its publications changed fundamentally in the spring of 1976 when Eisenman managed to negotiate a contract with MIT Press for the publication of *Oppositions*. This led to the expansion of the editorial team. Next to Eisenman, Frampton and Gandelsonas were initially responsible for *Oppositions* in their dual function as editors and publishers, with Julia Bloomfield soon taking over as managing editor. The circle of editors was soon expanded to include Vidler, who was later joined by Kurt Forster and eventually Agrest. Yet *Oppositions* was not to remain the Institute's only publication, for as a result of its repositioning in terms of teaching and cultural production, the Institute's publishing activities were also expanded and extended to include other formats. Thus, although the Institute was never an independently operating publishing business, even in the medium term, it was subsequently also run—quite efficiently—as an editorial department, and at least some of the Fellows and an increasing number of editorial staff practically served as a writing and editing workshop, constantly devising new formats and content. Following the example of *Oppositions*, which had to provide for sections such as “History,” “Theory,” “Criticism,” and “Documents,” *October*, a quarterly journal for art theory and criticism, was launched in 1976, and then, after the Institute's 10th anniversary, *Skyline* (starting in April 1978), a monthly tabloid aimed at the New York architecture, art, and culture community.⁵⁷³ This was followed by the series of IAUS Exhibition Catalogues (from 1979 onwards), which began with a documentation of the Institute's “Exhibition Program,” and finally by the canon-changing series *Oppositions Books* (from 1982). This development was aided by further collaboration with MIT Press as an academic publisher, at least for *October*, the catalogue and the book series, and later with Rizzoli International as a commercial publisher—both providing

573 The publication of *Oppositions* as possibly the Institute's prime print product has been historicized extensively, the first account coming from Joan Ockman, herself a former member of the editorial staff, who nevertheless maintained a historical distance. As part of the inner circle, she first noted—in relation to *Oppositions'* history and to the relationships within the editorial staff—that over the years, in the twenty-six issues produced between 1973 and 1984, there had been a shift from theory to historiography and that, on balance, less architecture criticism was published than initially anticipated; see Ockman, 1988. This dichotomy was reproduced later on, with the *Oppositions* revival on the occasion of the publication of the *Oppositions Reader* (1999); see Hays, 1998. Since then, much emphasis has been placed on the beginnings of *Oppositions* with regard to the emergence of a theoretical debate in North America, the initial idea of founding a journal, the cultural technique of journal-making, and the interplay of “the real and the theoretical,” but without clarifying the extent to which the theory, history, and criticism of architecture intersected with institutional, educational, and cultural politics. Drawing on Ockman's essay, Louis Martin elaborated on the prehistory of *Oppositions*; see Martin, 2008; Beatriz Colomina, together with PhD candidates at Princeton, compared the practice of journal-making in the 1960s and 1970s; see Colomina and Buckley, 2010; Lucia Allais linked theoretical research at the Institute to the rhetoric of grant proposals; see Allais, 2010. However, the fixation on *Oppositions* failed to recognize that the Institute became a legitimating and consecrating institution precisely because of its synergetic effects.

professional production, publicity, and distribution for prestige projects. At the time, while the Fellows' editorial work was mostly either unpaid or offset by other sources of income, editorial staff and production were cross-financed by foundation grants and donations.⁵⁷⁴

The Institute's shift in emphasis toward publishing is representative of, contributed to, and performed pioneering work for general growth in the journal and book market in architecture and urban studies in the United States, and had a symbolic significance for the increasing professionalization of the Institute's work. With regard to the textual and editorial practices of the Fellows, new insights into the postmodern turn in North American architecture culture can be gained by combining the histories of production and reception and reading and analyzing the individual formats. Once again, the combined study of the real social and discursive formations, while also taking into account the everyday work of editing and publishing, the way the editorial offices and editorial boards were organized in each case, and the associated institutional economy, will highlight the paradigm shift toward redefining the professional image of the architect and celebrating the figure of the architect as artist. This is not to question the very large significance attached to *Oppositions* by the editors and other Fellows, and by authors and readers alike, in terms of the novelty of the approaches and topics presented there, nor the strong identification of the Institute with the journal. Nevertheless, studying the conditions and constraints under which *Oppositions* was produced also helps to clarify the extent to which the Institute's knowledge production at the transition from Fordism to post-Fordism, in terms of the emergence of what was understood as a neo-avant-garde discourse on concepts such as "autonomy" and "criticality" in architecture or in terms of the creativity and intellectuality involved, was based on the enforcement of flexibilized, precarious labor: ultimately the expectation of dedication and, accordingly, self-exploitation.⁵⁷⁵

By publishing *Oppositions* and through the establishment of a complex and interlocking textual and editorial apparatus for *October*, *Skyline*, the IAUS Exhibition Catalogues, and *Oppositions Books*, the Institute fostered a

574 The work of the editorial staff for all other publication formats—the architecture newspaper, the exhibition catalogues, and the book series—has not yet been critically examined and reviewed, except in a few cases, e.g., Aldo Rossi's two monographs, *A Scientific Autobiography* and *The Architecture of the City* (both 1982). Architecture historian Mary Louise Lobsinger analyzed these two *Oppositions Books* by Rossi as prominent publications of the American architecture debate in the 1980s for the specific textual format chosen, as autobiography and urban theory, respectively; see Mary Louise Lobsinger, "That Obscure Object of Desire: Autobiography and Repetition in the Work of Aldo Rossi," *Grey Room*, no. 8 (Summer 2002), 38–61; Mary Louise Lobsinger, "The New Urban Scale in Italy: On Aldo Rossi's *L'architettura della città*," *Journal of Architectural Education* 59, no. 3 (February 2006), 28–38.

575 Somol, 1998; *Perspecta*, no. 33 (2002): "Mining Autonomy."

transatlantic dialogue between a genuinely North American postmodernist architecture debate and a truly European one, thus helping to found, if not significantly shape a publishing practice in architecture that can be understood as both a discursive formation and a cultural configuration. Not unlike MoMA before it, with its exhibitions on modern architecture, the Institute promoted a certain sense of global architecture culture, albeit viewed from New York. *Oppositions* in particular published the next generation of Japanese and Latin American authors and architects, next to European (especially Italian) ones, and was accordingly disseminated abroad. The Institute's publications also helped to establish a new kind of postmodern textual and editorial production across all publishing formats that combined both scholarly and popular, critical and autobiographical writing and included: theoretical and historiographical essays, programmatic, sometimes polemical editorials in *Oppositions*; architecture reviews, book and exhibition reviews, event listings, popular culture interviews, shopping and reading tips, obituaries, insider reports, reportages in *Skyline*; monographic texts, and forewords, prefaces, and articles, which increased or demanded credibility, in *Oppositions Books*. Through publishing, the Institute, as the self-proclaimed architectural avant-garde in North America (or at least the East Coast) ultimately projected a self-image and legitimized itself with regard to narrative structures, plot, and setting—precisely because of the general thrust of neo-avant-garde formalism or modernism against other backward-looking postmodern styles such as historicism, classicism, and eclecticism—with reference to architectural and artistic strategies, but not necessarily the social role of the political avant-garde movements of the twentieth century. The architecture debate at the Institute, according to Hayden White's 1973 classification of historiography, sometimes took on the form of "drama" or "comedy," or, more specifically, the kind of situation comedy that was particularly popular in North America at the time, and the publications broadcast this to the world.⁵⁷⁶

Contrary to outside perceptions, which have also been reproduced by architecture historians, the Institute and *Oppositions*, although not congruent, were not simply responsible for "teaching" and "discourse" vis-a-vis the discipline, although the two respective groups at the Institute—the teaching staff of the various education offerings and the editorial staff of the journal—took on both pedagogical and discursive tasks in their day-to-day work.⁵⁷⁷ Moreover,

576 In the 1970s, the American historian and literary scholar Hayden White, borrowing from French post-structuralism, developed his approach of meta-history; see Hayden White, *Metahistory. The Historical Imagination in Nineteenth-Century Europe* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1973). Translating historiography to architecture history, it can be interpreted as a discursive strategy of inscription in history, what White calls "emplotment;" he distinguishes four forms: "romance," "tragedy," "comedy," and "satire," which are accompanied by different "tropes," "modes," "arguments," and "ideologies."

577 Martin, 2010, 66.

the Fellows' teaching and cultural production served to finance not only the Institute's publishing activities but also its overall operations, since both the textual and editorial practices and the educational operations at the Institute also played a significant role in producing the next generation of architects and academics. The work on the two academic journals, as well as the exhibition catalogues and the book series, was primarily concerned with disseminating ideas and criticism, changing both architecture and art discourse—with lasting effects. Then again, by publishing *Skyline*, which appeared alongside the other more respectable formats only to eventually outdo them, the Institute, with all the media formats developed and produced there, also represented a market for attention from a sociological perspective, if not of vanities from a psychological one.⁵⁷⁸ And although the Institute was never a real publishing house according to economic standards, i.e., with professional marketing and distribution structures, it was more than just an institutional framework for the *Oppositions* editors who, in addition to the professorships they held at New York universities and colleges, increasingly portrayed themselves there as architects, theorists, or historians, often with other publication projects up their sleeves.

Again, Pierre Bourdieu's sociology of cultural production, art, and literature can serve as a lens to better understand the history of the Institute's publications and its publishing networks, as it would not have been able to successfully manage the individual productions without the collaborative efforts of Fellows, Research Associates, assistants, students, and interns, as well as the numerous others involved. Kenneth Frampton, who took on a central role in the newly created position of director of publications towards the end of the 1970s, was responsible for all publication formats of the Institute. Working from the assumption of an interrelationship between society, architecture, and other fields of cultural production, the focus here is on the extent to which the interplay between the fields of activity at the Institute, including education and cultural production, was fundamental for writing, editing, and publishing, not only in terms of the cross-fertilization of ideas but also cross-financing and cross-promotion.⁵⁷⁹ Yet the Institute's contribution to the new discursive formation of architectural postmodernism can only be understood by examining its collaborations with the multitude of external authors, with Massimo Vignelli as the Institute's longstanding in-house graphic designer (later replaced by Michael Bierut, Vignelli's erstwhile employee), with the publishers of choice—MIT Press represented by Roger Conover and Rizzolli represented by Gianfranco Monacelli—and with the editors of other publications on the book and journal market. Once again, the Institute's overall publishing

578 Bourdieu, 1983a; Franck, 1998 & 2000; Tzonis and Lefaivre, 1978.

579 Bourdieu, 1983b.

apparatus, its ambition, and its ability were grounded in the interplay of architecture, knowledge, and power. At the start, it was about the sovereignty of interpretation over two argumentative contexts that were characteristic of post-modernism, namely the production of theory inspired by French theory and a revisionist, yet mostly operative historiography of modernity, and if it was critical, then it was so in the sense propagated by the Frankfurt School.⁵⁸⁰ From the mid-1970s on, it was a matter of hegemony in terms of the production and dissemination of knowledge relating to the built environment, not only in North America but in the entire English-speaking world of architecture, academia, and culture. The aim was to exert an influence on architecture debate and education in both the short and long term, globally speaking, through the scientific, graphic, didactic, and cultural quality, visibility, and longevity of its journals, exhibition catalogues, and book series.

Pilot Issues

When, after some initial difficulties, the first issue of *Oppositions* came out in November 1973, Peter Eisenman finally had his own journal—or more precisely: “A Journal for Ideas and Criticism in Architecture,” as the subheader read.⁵⁸¹ As one of the three editors, alongside Kenneth Frampton and Mario Gandelsonas, who had equal rights, he was actively supported by other editorial staff in this ambitious and demanding publishing project: David Morton, who otherwise served as editor of *Progressive Architecture*, contributed input on editorial questions as editorial consultant and Suzanne Frank was initially assigned to provide editorial support for the first three issues, along with two interns, Jan Fischer and Susan Carter.⁵⁸² From a sociological perspective, *Oppositions*, which emphasized the relevance of writing and reading in the newly emerging architecture culture, initially tied to the East Coast, can be understood as an auto-poetic network, i.e., one that was self-constituting, self-referential,

580 Martin Jay, *The Dialectical Imagination. A History of the Frankfurt School and the Institute of Social Research, 1923–1950* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1973); see also Francois Cusset, *French Theory: How Foucault, Derrida, Deleuze, & Co. Transformed the Intellectual Life of the United States* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2008).

581 Martin, 2008. The publication date of *Oppositions* 1 indicated on the cover is September 1973, but it was not published until two months later. The first issue was thus already behind schedule, but this back-dating practice was not an isolated case. In the eleven-year publication history, none of the total of twenty-six issues appeared on time.

582 As part of Princeton’s *Clip Stamp Fold* research, exhibition, and publication project, Eisenman, Frampton, Gandelsonas, and Vidler commented on their respective contributions to editorial work in a public conversation with Beatriz Colomina, Urtzi Grau, and Daniel Lopez-Peres; see “Small Talks: Oppositions, Architeqturas Bis, Lotus” Storefront for Art and Architecture, New York, January 23, 2007, www.vimeo.com/user1360843 (last accessed: May 31, 2023); see Colomina and Buckley, 2010. Not present was Julia Bloomfield as the long-time managing editor of *Oppositions*, or Kurt Forster and Diana Agrest, who joined the editorial staff later.

and self-reproducing.⁵⁸³ Yet the editors' different theoretical, historiographical, and ultimately creative approaches and concerns—in their own words, their “respective concerns for formal, socio-cultural and political discourse”—meant that they were engaged in productive competition with one another.⁵⁸⁴ At the Institute, Eisenman, Frampton, and Gandelsonas were to play a key role because of their shared journalistic and editorial practices. From an epistemological perspective, their journal, by virtue of its formal, substantive, and institutional seclusion, shaped and cemented the Institute's inner circle. Over time, other Fellows and friends of the Institute in addition to the three editors were involved as authors and editorial board members, students and interns as additional editorial staff, and numerous outside individuals, graphic designers and their assistants, editors, and translators were involved in producing the journals. As a result, through *Oppositions*, the Institute established, developed, and strengthened far-reaching networks with the New York architecture scene, schools of architecture, and the cultural and publishing world.

The title *Oppositions* clearly signaled the postmodern, poststructuralist qualities and features of the journal. Rhetorically, it expressed contradiction, linguistically, opposition, and politically, resistance. But the provocation that lay in this nomenclature went even further. In Eisenman's design for the journal's logo, the first “P” was drawn as an outline so that the title could be read both as “positions” and as “zero positions,” i.e., both in the plural and as a negation or dissolution of any stance at all.⁵⁸⁵ Here his predilection for language games was clearly in evidence. In addition to a linguistic-discursive plane of reference, the ambiguities also had a formal-aesthetic one; the format and graphics of the journal could be read as a historical quotation in several respects. The cover and layout of *Oppositions* were developed in collaboration with the Italian New York-based graphic designer Massimo Vignelli, who had designed the corporate identities of American Airlines, Bloomingdales, Heller, and Knoll International, among others, and at the same time provided his services to

583 In their joint essay on the networks of artworks, in which they compare various approaches to the sociology of art, the architecture theorist Niels Albertsen and the sociologist and philosopher Bülent Diken argue that although these must be understood as an autopoietic system, it is precisely a matter of analyzing them in terms of their underlying networks in order to anticipate their role as mediators; see Albertsen and Diken, 2004, 35–58. Accordingly, *Oppositions* as a cultural product also performed social work and thus had social relevance.

584 Peter Eisenman, Kenneth Frampton, Mario Gandelsonas, “Editorial,” *Oppositions* 1 (September 1973), n.p.

585 In official correspondence, *Oppositions* was initially referred to with as “Positions/Oppositions.” Ockman distinguished the three ways of reading the chosen title, referring to Roland Barthes's 1953 publication *Le degré zéro de l'écriture* (English: *Writing Degree Zero*); see Ockman, 1988, 182. Suzanne Frank pointed out that the ambiguous logotype of *Oppositions* was based on a drawing by Duarte Cabral de Mello, then a Research Associate at the Institute, and that Gandelsonas had originally suggested the title, see Frank, 2010, 41–42.

nonprofit institutions such as the Institute. The layout reflected a modernist rationale, i.e., the will to order and organize all content in a structuralist grid. Only two fonts were used—Helvetica as a *sans serif* typeface for the logo and Century Schoolbook as a serif typeface for all other text—and formed the basis for the entire institutional identity of the Institute from 1973 on. The Pantone color Super Warm Red was chosen for the journal’s cover, a catchy signal color that made issues of *Oppositions* an instant eye-catcher in bookstores, libraries, offices, and on private bookshelves.⁵⁸⁶ The high-gloss finish and full cover flap gave *Oppositions* the appearance of a high-quality print product that could nevertheless be treated as a “little magazine” by the editorial team and produced in accordance with the principles of independence and cost reduction.⁵⁸⁷

To finance the journal, Eisenman attempted to raise US\$100 each from a total of 100 sponsors in the run-up to publication in early 1973 to cover printing costs.⁵⁸⁸ The three editors and Diana Agrest, who did not become an editor until much later, also subsidized the production by contributing US\$3000 each as start-up capital.⁵⁸⁹ In the following, the Institute’s textual and editorial practice was seen as an independent one in its own right. *Oppositions* was initially

586 Strikingly, the cover design and page layout of *Oppositions* bore a strong resemblance to graphic design from Switzerland that was dominant in the 1950s and 60s, e.g., of the design journal *Neue Grafik / New Graphic Design / Graphisme actuel* (1959–1965). Vignelli had been strongly influenced by the Basel School around Josef Müller-Brockmann since his architecture studies in Milan; see Kerry William Purcell, *Josef Müller-Brockmann* (London: Phaidon, 2006). For the Institute, he incorporated numerous graphic elements of the Basel School into his repertoire. For example, the color of the *Oppositions* cover, “Oppositions red,” as it became known, played a major role in Swiss graphic design of the 1960s; see Josef Müller-Brockmann, *Gestaltungsprobleme des Grafikers* (Heiden: Arthur Niggli, 1961), *Raster Systeme für die visuelle Gestaltung* (Heiden: Arthur Niggli 1981); see also Lars Müller, *Josef Müller-Brockmann. Pioneer of Swiss Graphic Design* (Baden: Lars Müller, 2001).

587 Massimo Vignelli, *Grids. Their Meaning and Use for Federal Designers* (U.S. Government Printing Office: Federal Design Library, December 1978).

588 *Oppositions* 1 was largely financed by individual sponsors; Eisenman had managed to win a total of ninety-nine sponsors. The sponsors also included two schools of architecture: UCLA and the University of Kentucky. With *Oppositions* 2, 124 private individuals, seventeen institutions, and three corporations were named as sponsors, including all the major schools of architecture at the Ivy League universities on the East Coast of the United States. The institutional sponsors of *Oppositions* were Boston Architectural Center, Carnegie-Mellon University, Columbia University, Cooper Union, Cornell University, Harvard University, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, MoMA, the New York division of the AIA, Pratt Institute, Princeton University, SUNY Buffalo, UCLA, University of Kentucky, University of Manitoba, University of Puerto Rico, University of Texas, Yale University. The neo-avant-garde ambitions and neo-Marxist attitudes of the editors and authors notwithstanding, it is striking that the three corporate sponsors who gave US\$ 100,000 each were all large American oil companies (including Exxon), after the 1973 oil crisis.

589 Initially, three issues of *Oppositions* were planned; see the list of articles for *Oppositions* 2 and 3. Source: Columbia University, Shadrach Woods Collection. The list comprised articles by Diana Agrest, Stuart Cohen, Peter Eisenman, William Ellis, Kenneth Frampton, Mario Gandelsonas, Robert Gutman, William Huff, Frederick Koetter, Colin Rowe, Denise Scott Brown, Robert Stern, Shadrach Woods.

marketed as a non-commercial journal, which meant that mailing costs were cheaper. But the list of sponsors on the back cover made it clear from the outset that the journal was not disinterested—a total of twenty-six issues was produced at the Institute over the years. Through *Oppositions*, the Institute gradually built a philanthropic patronage within the architecture, academic, institutional, and corporate culture that was already firmly established in the North American arts and culture sector. *Oppositions* offers early evidence that Philip Johnson, an influential architect and powerful broker, once a curator and a trustee at MoMA, played a crucial role, not only as a wealthy patron of the journal but also as a closet supporter of the Institute working behind the scenes.⁵⁹⁰ As a reward for this collective form of philanthropy, the publication of *Oppositions* 2 in late April 1974 brought not only public attention and a complimentary copy of each new issue, but also invitations to exclusive release events, lectures, and discussions held at the Institute under the title “Forum,” where architects and academics debated the topics of the hour, ironically behind closed doors.⁵⁹¹ With the publication of each issue, the Institute began to establish its preeminence as a “postmodern salon” in American architecture culture.

While historiographies of *Oppositions* have so far mostly highlighted the opposition between architecture theory and history as a key characteristic, thus reproducing intradisciplinary lines of conflict between the editors, a closer look at the actual contents of the journal indicates that from a cultural studies perspective, it was a genuinely postmodern journal, as can be seen from the montage of set pieces in conjunction with the very contemporary form of sponsorship.⁵⁹² The first

590 Despite his fascist leanings becoming known to the architecture audience, Johnson was given a forum with the release of *Oppositions* 2; see Philip Johnson, “Rejected Architects: The Berlin Building Exposition of 1931, Architecture of the Third Reich,” *Oppositions* 2 (January 1974), 81–94.

591 The first “Forum” celebrating the release of *Oppositions* 2 was held on April 29, 1974, and was about Ludwig Mies van der Rohe, with Ludwig Glaeser (presenter), Arthur Drexler, Philip Johnson, and Colin Rowe as guests.

592 Ockman wrote about the history of *Oppositions* in 1988, shortly after the journal ceased publication, detailing the interests and roles of the editors, editorial strategies, and significance to architecture debates; see Ockman, 1988. Ockman also elaborated on the history of the Institute’s reception of Tafuri, explicitly by *Oppositions* editors; see Ockman, 1995. The 1999 *Oppositions Reader*, featuring a selection of essays edited by K. Michael Hays, was published by Princeton Architectural Press. Following the publication, various authors in the late 1990s commented on the journal’s conception and organization, the different positions of its editors, the relationship between theory and history, and its significance for architecture debates and architecture education; see Hays, 1998; Vincent Pecora, “Towers of Babel,” in *Out of Site. A Social Criticism of Architecture*, ed. Diane Ghirardo (Seattle: Bay Press, 1991), 46–76; Schwartz, 1999; Sherer, 1999; Stern, 1999. Louis Martin began an oral history at CCA in the early 2000s with Eisenman, Frampton, and Forster, among others, and subsequently published an essay on the prehistory of *Oppositions*; see Martin, 2008. Meanwhile, Bloomfield and Frank, two other individuals associated with *Oppositions* and the Institute, respectively, published writings about the journal; see Bloomfield, 2010; Frank, 2010.

issue of *Oppositions* already offered space for the editors and some other Fellows to present their approaches in thematic essays. Agrest (along with her partner), Colin Rowe, and Vidler were featured as authors here, alongside contributions by Eisenman, Frampton, and Gandelsonas. With the second issue, the journal was then divided into five sections, in keeping with the new disciplinary logic that was just being developed in academia. “Oppositions” (later renamed “Criticism”), “History,” “Theory,” “Documents,” and “Reviews, Letters, etc.” focused on a critical, theoretically considered, and historically grounded examination of selected building projects, practicing (and demonstrating) discursivity, providing archival and historical texts, and forming opinions through the publication of book reviews and letters to the editor. The “Forum” column—which already resembled the society column “Talk of the Town” in the weekly *The New Yorker*—was, after all, a kind of glimpse behind the scenes, explicitly reporting on the preceding release event at the Institute.⁵⁹³ What’s more, the articles, written by Elis in sometimes scathingly satirical language, were illustrated with photographs of the cocktail parties that followed. These photographs placed the Institute in a glamorous light, elevated the Fellows and guests to celebrity status, and aroused the envy of those architects who had not been invited. As an early voice, *Oppositions* thus not only represented the constitution of the emerging New York architecture scene that met at the Institute in the mid-1970s, but also played a constituent role in terms of its networks. One effect was to provide interested readers with insights into the Institute’s complex social and institutional fabric without their being invited to the party.

In the editorials initially co-authored by Peter Eisenman, Kenneth Frampton, and Mario Gandelsonas, the three editors communicated that they were well aware that, as with any journalistic work, they were dealing with knowledge and power.⁵⁹⁴ In *Oppositions* 1, they expressed a common interest in influencing contemporary architecture through theory and history.⁵⁹⁵ In *Oppositions* 2, they deliberately positioned their journal in the tradition of modernist publications, such as the art magazines *De Stijl* (1917–1928) and *L’Esprit Nouveau* (1920–1925), only to immediately distance themselves from a glorified image of the avant-garde and any intention to revive a polemical discourse.⁵⁹⁶ In *Oppositions* 3, Eisenman,

593 Initially, informed book reviews along the lines of *The New York Review of Books* were envisioned, so that new publications would be reviewed from a variety of disciplinary perspectives. Starting with *Oppositions* 3, William Ellis was in charge of the “Forum” section.

594 Peter Eisenman, “Post-Functionalism” *Oppositions* 6 (Fall 1976), n.p.; Kenneth Frampton, “On Reading Heidegger” *Oppositions* 4 (October 1974), n.p.; Mario Gandelsonas, “Neo-Functionalism,” *Oppositions* 5 (Summer 1976), n.p.

595 Eisenman, Frampton, Gandelsonas, 1973.

596 Peter Eisenman, Kenneth Frampton, Mario Gandelsonas, “Editorial,” *Oppositions* 2 (January 1974), n.p.

Frampton, and Gandelsonas, then still in the additional role of publishers, lamented, in what was for the time being their last joint effort in providing an editorial line, their ineffectiveness, since the topics they were interested in, their meaning, and their significance occupied only a marginal position in the world of architecture and building.⁵⁹⁷ They interpreted their resignation or retreat into the realm of signs as political action. However, it became clear that their ideas of the social function of history, theory, and criticism in architecture diverged widely. Eisenman liked to flirt with his apolitical stance and repeatedly invoked the myth of the autonomy of architecture, for example in April 1974 at a roundtable on “Theory” at Princeton University with Lionel March, Manfredo Tafuri, Rodolfo Machado, and Mario Gandelsonas as participants. In doing so, he hoped to shift the focus back onto the architectural object, as distinct from the corporate architecture of the 1960s. He also repeatedly championed this formal approach on the pages of *Oppositions*. The authorship of the three editors was clearly discernible in individual parts of the editorials, but their joint signature presented a united front to the outside world: “Whatever our differences, *Oppositions* continues to assert our belief in the importance of theory as the critical basis of significant practice.”⁵⁹⁸ In the end, it was precisely this positioning, the flirtation with or celebration of ambiguities and contradictions, theoretical and historical approaches, avant-garde and nostalgic attitudes, and self-confident or self-reflexive behavior, that ultimately made *Oppositions* an exciting read. The journal was read by practicing architects, students, and professors alike. Eisenman took it upon himself to personally hand out each new issue from his suitcase following his public appearances—like a traveling salesman distributing discursive abilities and skills. Despite being touted as a “little magazine,” an epithet that was readily received and disseminated by contributors and outsiders alike, *Oppositions* was at best a simulation of an avant-garde magazine, since the Institute hardly saw itself as the vanguard of a social movement and instead set itself apart in an elitist fashion; after the prototype housing project was never realized, its focus shifted to education and culture and lost sight of the problems of the times.⁵⁹⁹

Aside from the fact that the pilot issues of *Oppositions* only appeared irregularly, the production had to be cross-financed by the Institute during the restructuring period, in addition to the donations, even though the editors were exempt

597 Peter Eisenman, Kenneth Frampton, Mario Gandelsonas, “Editorial,” *Oppositions* 3 (May 1974), n.p.

598 Ibid.

599 What has hardly been mentioned in the history of *Oppositions* but plays an essential role for an institutional analysis and critique, was to what extent the networks and their conditions in the 1970s and 1980s differed from those of the 1920s and 1930s—not to mention the different intentions and ambitions among architects conditioned by political, economic, and social developments.

from overhead costs of all the projects at IAUS Central. However, in contrast to the few renowned magazines on the North American market, the quasi-academic journal legitimized the Institute's academic networks, offering the editors the opportunity to set their own priorities through the choice of subject matter and approach. Eisenman initially brought to the first issues his predilection for architects from England, especially Alison and Peter Smithson and James Stirling, whose projects he appropriated with his own formalist interpretations.⁶⁰⁰ Frampton, on the other hand, formulated a socio-political critique of architecture, based largely on his reading of Hannah Arendt's *The Human Condition*, while writing about Russian Constructivism and the pedagogy at the HfG Ulm.⁶⁰¹ Gandelsonas and Agrest were concerned with a semiology of architecture influenced by post-Marxist and post-structuralist theory.⁶⁰² Further topics of the pilot issues were: in the "Oppositions" section, contextualism in projects by Venturi and Rauch and Richard Meier, respectively, and Werner Seligmann's housing for the Urban Development Corporation, in the "History" section, an essay by Colin Rowe on the vocabulary used in British architecture to describe composition, and in the "Theory" section, an essay by Rosalind Krauss on intention in Minimal Art, and one by Manfredo Tafuri on the language of architectural post-modernism in Italy and the United States and the possibilities of an architecture critique. As editors, Eisenman, Frampton, and Gandelsonas thus complemented each other very well in terms of their interests and the projects, architects, texts, and authors they selected for publication and formed a well-rounded team; even if they did not agree in their research questions, methods, and outcomes, their thinking styles at least had in common that they were all interested in the legacy of architectural modernism in their architectural practice, theory production, and historiography and were thus oriented toward Europe. At the same time, these were the cornerstones of the new order, which were being constructed and communicated with *Oppositions* in a reversal of a post-war transatlantic dialogue. As the publication's spin doctor, Eisenman challenged the other two editors to take a stand on certain issues in shorter articles, and himself pitted theory production against historiography. Based on a closer reading of all the editors' editorials, essays, introductions, and commentaries, which functioned as post-scripts, they theorized about the characteristics of architecture and historicized avant-garde practices as precedents for a postmodern architecture.

600 Peter Eisenman, "From Golden Lane to Robin Hood Gardens; Or If You Follow the Yellow Brick Road, It May Not Lead to Golder's Green," *Oppositions* 1 (September 1973), 27–56; "Real and English: Destruction of the Box I," *Oppositions* 4 (October 1974), 5–34.

601 Kenneth Frampton, "Industrialization and the Crisis of Architecture," *Oppositions* 1 (September 1973), 57–82; "Apropos Ulm: Curriculum and Critical Theory," *Oppositions* 3 (May 1974), 17–36; "On Charles Jencks and Nathan Silver's Adhocism: The Case for Improvisation," *Oppositions* 3 (May 1974), 104–105; "George Wittenborn. 1905–1974," *Oppositions* 4 (October 1974), 14.

602 Mario Gandelsonas and Diana Agrest, "Semiotics and Architecture: Ideological Consumption of Theoretical Work," *Oppositions* 1 (September 1973), 93–100.

Many contributions directly or indirectly referenced key texts in linguistics and semiotics, authors from the Frankfurt School, and contemporary philosophers from France, thus injecting them into American architecture debate via their own idiosyncratic interpretations. A glance at the references and footnotes cited in *Oppositions* suffices to trace the extent to which new architectural thinking and discursive terminologies were introduced here, based on the interdisciplinary references to other fields of knowledge. Ultimately, the journal, in keeping with Roland Barthes's aphorisms, testified to the editors' desire to disseminate and debate their own ideas, but it also always served as a powerful instrument of self-aggrandizement and self-representation, as well as management, i.e., the administration of architectural knowledge, through the handling and control of information. Moreover, even though polemical, at times cynical, and critical tones sometimes crept in, Eisenman, Frampton, and Gandelsonas all believed in the power of the text. *Oppositions* thus portrayed the Institute as a place of intellectual debate, which here took the form of postmodern, rather than modern views and thinking in its historiography and theory production.

From the outside, *Oppositions* was perceived early on as the governing body of the Institute, although texts from the immediate or extended circle of the Institute, e.g., Rosalind Krauss, Colin Rowe, Emilio Ambasz, Robert Stern, etc., were published in the first three issues, in addition to essays by the editors and other Fellows. Obviously, it would be inappropriate to equate those views and attitudes expressed by individual authors and exchanged through *Oppositions* with those of the Institute as a whole.⁶⁰³ After all, not all the Fellows and Visiting Fellows were represented in the journal over the years, and the younger generation in particular was barely granted access.⁶⁰⁴ And yet *Oppositions* set out to be the journal of history and theory and—probably out of strategic considerations and in order to address the disagreement between supposedly modern and postmodern positions—a dichotomous confrontation was set up in the pilot issues through the choice of architects (besides Stirling, Venturi, Meier, and Seligmann, these included Peter Eisenman, Michael Graves, and Aldo Rossi) and authors (Stuart Cohen, Charles Moore) featured there, thus providing a platform for the ideological battle between the Whites and the Grays. By contrast, very little was published about

603 Rosalind Krauss, "The Fountainhead," *Oppositions* 2 (January 1974), 61–70; Colin Rowe, "Character and Composition, or: Some Vicissitudes of Architectural Vocabulary in the Nineteenth Century," *Oppositions* 2 (January 1974), 41–60; Emilio Ambasz, "A Selection of Working Fables," *Oppositions* 4 (October 1974), 65–74; Robert Stern, "Yale 1950–1965," *Oppositions* 4 (October 1974), 35–62.

604 One exception was Rem, or rather Remment Koolhaas, as he was then known under his full name, who was invited to contribute to *Oppositions* twice in 1973–74, when he was visiting at the Institute; see Rem Koolhaas and Gerrit Oorthuys, "Ivan Leonidov's Dom Narkomtjazzprom, Moscow," *Oppositions* 2, (January 1974), 95–103; Rem Koolhaas, "The Architects' Ball – A Vignette, 1931," *Oppositions* 3 (May 1974), 91–96.

current affairs—apart from housing, with essays about Twin Parks in the Bronx and another UDC project, Elm Street Housing in Ithaca.⁶⁰⁵

With the emergence of postmodernism as a new discursive formation as per Michel Foucault, two editorial lines could be discerned throughout the pages of *Oppositions* from the very beginning, at a time when education, culture, and publishing shared similar patterns of concerns, perspectives, concepts, and themes:⁶⁰⁶ on the one hand, an examination of the new, self-proclaimed architectural avant-garde dedicated to critical theory, i.e., to a new, Western European Marxism, and on the other, a historiography of architectural modernism from Europe that, in contrast to classics such as the works of Sigfried Giedion, displayed revisionist streaks not only by linking architecture, technology, and urbanization but also by giving a voice to the architects themselves as protagonists. When it appeared in the fall of 1974, *Oppositions* 3—the previously ghostly letter “P” in the title had been filled in by now, giving the journal an even more combative stance—set new trends with regard to the internationalization and intellectualization of the American architecture debate and education. In this issue, the *Oppositions* editors published an article by the Italian architecture historian and critic Manfredo Tafuri for the first time. This had the effect of contributing to the creation of a whole new translation culture, however awkward and stilted some phrases and wordings may have sounded as a result of linguistic interference and theoretical terminology.⁶⁰⁷ Another factor was that *Oppositions* initiated an intellectual exchange, grounded in non-discursive formations, between the Institute for Architecture and Urban Studies and the Istituto Universitario di Architettura di Venezia (IUAV), where Tafuri had taught since 1968 and where he was head of the history department.⁶⁰⁸ In “L’Architecture dans le Boudoir,” he offered a critical reading of the formalism, or rather language games, of postmodernist tendencies on both sides of the Atlantic that incorporated both architectural and theoretical works by Robert Venturi, James Stirling, Peter Eisenman,

605 There was no mention, for example, of the solar homes built at this time by Douglas Kelbaugh, a student of Eisenman.

606 Michael Foucault, “Discursive Formations,” in Foucault, ([1969], 1972), 31–39.

607 Translations were made by Victor Caliandro, Marlène Barsoum, and Liviu Dimitriu.

608 For an intellectual biography of Manfredo Tafuri, see Andrew Leach, *Manfredo Tafuri. Choosing History* (Gent: A&S/books, 2007). The exchange between and networks of the IAUS and the IUAV have hardly been studied under discursive and institutional aspects. Following Tafuri’s death in 1995, Ockman focused on the construction of the Venice-New York axis and, among other things, also elaborated on the relationship between Eisenman and Tafuri; see Ockman, 1995. Ockman’s essay was republished in German under the one-dimensional title “‘Boudoir Architecture’ als Anschauungsmaterial: Manfredo Tafuri und New York,” in the Swiss journal *werk, bauen + wohnen* (September 1995), and yet the transatlantic dialogue worked both ways. Italian architect Ernesto Ramon Rispoli initially stated that his dissertation at the Politecnico di Torino would specifically highlight the performance of Italian architects and academics in the United States but fell short of this goal; cf. Ernesto Ramon Rispoli, *Ponti sull’Atlantico. L’Institute for architecture and urban studies e le relazioni Italia-America (1967–1985)* (Quodlibet: Macerata, 2012).

Michael Graves, and Aldo Rossi.⁶⁰⁹ In light of the transformation of the capitalist system, Tafuri, a committed Marxist, criticized the self-referentiality of contemporary architectural practice, particularly in the United States, its retreat into the realm of signs, and its disassociation from the production process. Although he did not explicitly mention the Institute here—he visited it for the first time in May 1974 on a trip to the USA that took him primarily to Princeton—he nevertheless addressed some of the Fellows, especially Eisenman, very directly in his critique of the architects' claim to power and the myth of autonomy (and criticality). In view of his diagnosis that contemporary architecture was only discussed in the "boudoir" (French for back room) as an abstract work of art, Tafuri concluded by referencing Walter Benjamin's classic essay "The Author as Producer" and outlining that the only way out for architects was to look for alternative possibilities of action within the existing relations of production; that is to say, for productive intellectual work that has an effect on the relations of production.⁶¹⁰ Not only did Tafuri later re-engage with the New York architecture scene and the new spaces of cultural production that opened up there, but *Oppositions* afforded him the opportunity on several occasions to publish his critique of the globalized neo-avant-garde and an operationalized historiography for an English-speaking readership and to define an autonomous role of the architecture historian or critic. By mediating this exchange, the Institute was instrumental in the production, distribution, and reception of an "American Tafuri," as the Italian theoretician was subsequently labeled.⁶¹¹

609 Tafuri, 1974. Tafuri's essay "L'Architecture dans le Boudoir" was based on a lecture he had previously given at Princeton in April 1974 at Agrest's invitation as part of the lecture series "Practice, Theory and Politics in Architecture"; see "Introduction," in *Oppositions* 3, 1974, 37; see also Ockman 1995, 67, footnote 4. In the panel discussion the following day, moderated by Gandelsonas, Tafuri met Eisenman, Rodolfo Machado, and Vidler, and again voiced his criticism of the architectural language of a self-proclaimed avant-garde; see audio recording of panel discussion, no date. Source: Princeton University, School of Architecture Archive. Here, Tafuri emphasized that he was interested in Eisenman, Graves et al. precisely because their architecture had had no political meaning for him and had simply been useless. In his examination of the New York architecture scene, he subsequently drew on findings from field work and participant observation. In April 1974, on the last day of his three-day stay in the USA, he was visiting the Institute, and took part in an editorial meeting of *Oppositions*. In the introduction to "L'Architecture dans le Boudoir," the editors then announced the future reception of contemporary architecture as well as history, theory, and criticism from Italy.

610 Walter Benjamin, "The Author as Producer," *New Left Review* 62, no. 1 (July-August 1970), 83–96. Obviously, the term "boudoir" alluded to Marquis de Sade's classic *La Philosophie dans le boudoir* of 1795.

611 Tafuri was first published in English in 1971 in the catalogue for the MoMA exhibition "The New Italian Landscape" that was curated by Emilio Ambasz; see Manfredo Tafuri, "Design and Technological Utopia," in *Italy: The New Domestic Landscape* ed. Emilio Ambasz (New York: The Museum of Modern Art, 1972), 388–404. Subsequently, monographs, essays in edited volumes, and other texts by Tafuri were published by MIT Press and the Institute. On Tafuri's reception in American higher education, the so-called "Venice School" and the "American Tafuri," i.e., Tafuri as adapted by American architecture circles, see *Any*, no. 25/26 (2000): "Being Manfredo Tafuri: Wickedness, Anxiety, Disenchantment," see also Ghirardo, 2002.

The third issue of *Oppositions* enabled the Institute to expand and strengthen its reputation, its services, and its market position far beyond New York for the first time; the number of sponsors and subscribers increased continuously.⁶¹² Also, as a result of the epistemological insights and effects that the expansion of the circle of authors and the incorporation of criticism had, it was able to establish itself as a new actor in the production and dissemination of knowledge, for educational and cultural purposes, outside of the traditional world of academia and academic publishing. Despite, or perhaps because of, its comparatively small circulation, the journal's editorial focus on theory and history was met with open arms and advanced another form of mediatization in the United States beyond the typical architecture press, e.g., *Architectural Forum*, *Architectural Record*, or *Progressive Architecture*, or more academically minded journals, e.g., *Perspecta*. With regard to a sociology of knowledge, culture, and media, *Oppositions* can be seen as the written manifestation of a thought collective specific to East Coast architecture in the 1970s, and even as a constitutive part of a transatlantic dialogue. One change that became crucial to the journal's development was the involvement of Julia Bloomfield as managing editor with *Oppositions* 3 in 1974.⁶¹³ As one of the few permanent staff members, Bloomfield oversaw all phases of production from text acquisition to print approval until 1982, was responsible for the editors' time and work management, communication with authors, text and image editing, coordination of graphics and typesetting, fundraising and sponsorship, communications with the publisher or printer, preparation and correction of galley proofs, printing support, and so on; after one year she was elected Fellow, which underscored her importance and usefulness at the Institute. Despite the successful establishment of *Oppositions*, however, the journal was never able to support itself financially; debts had already been incurred with the pilot issues, which was mainly due to the high production and personnel costs totaling about US\$15,000 per issue. As a result, the editorial team intensified its search for a professional publisher. At a time when a reinvention of the Institute as an architecture school and a cultural space was on the horizon, the Institute's management could not afford to continue the journal

612 Institutionally speaking, Eisenman measured the success of *Oppositions* by the number of sponsors and subscribers: "Oppositions already has three corporate, seventeen institutional, and one hundred and ten individual sponsors. It has over 400 subscriptions and is beginning to expand its distribution to Europe and western United States." Peter Eisenman, "Director's Report," June 19, 1974. Source: CCA Montréal, IAUS fonds: A.1-2. By the end of 1974, with the publication of *Oppositions* 3, there were already 576 subscribers, including 496 individuals and eighty institutions, and a total of 151 sponsors, including 129 individuals, nineteen institutions, and three corporations.

613 Bloomfield's contact with the Institute originally came about via Frampton, whom she knew from England. After Bloomfield moved to New York, she contacted Eisenman in 1973 looking for work. At the Institute, she initially worked at the front desk. She contributed the bibliography on the Smithsons to *Oppositions* 2. Bloomfield was one of the non-architect women at the Institute who worked there as permanent staff. Her salary was initially set at US\$ 2,500 per issue; with four issues per year, this amounted to US \$200 per week, which was paid when the budget allowed.

as a loss-making project. In addition, the aim was to make *Oppositions* available internationally in selected bookstores, and such distribution at home and abroad was hardly feasible for the Institute on its own. For *Oppositions* 4, the Institute had been able to reach a one-time agreement with George Wittenborn (who passed away shortly after) in 1974, so that this issue was the first (and only) to be published by Wittenborn Art Books and distributed through Wittenborn's art and architecture bookstore in Manhattan; yet editorial and financial complications meant that the production of this very issue dragged on for nearly a year and a half.⁶¹⁴

It goes without saying that by publishing *Oppositions* with the help of sponsors, the Institute assumed a new role and responsibility in American architecture culture without becoming dependent on any single person, institution, or corporation. The subscription structure and pricing policy established a differentiated readership and guaranteed consistent sales as special offers and promotional efforts appealed to architecture students and professors alike.⁶¹⁵ The institutional sponsorship secured the conceptual and financial commitment of architecture schools and other institutions and, as a positive side effect, enabled the journal to find its way into the most important libraries nationwide. As a quarterly journal, each issue provided comprehensive teaching material for history and theory courses in master's and even bachelor's degree programs that were being added to the curriculum at schools of architecture, as well as course material for the new doctoral programs in architecture that were just being developed at prestigious Ivy League universities. Partly because almost all of the editors and Fellows taught as university professors themselves and thus acted as multipliers through their extra-academic activities, *Oppositions* also introduced a new postmodern thinking style to American academia. Many articles in the journal offered guidance in the perception and appreciation of both modernist architecture as a historical period and architectural postmodernism as a contemporary architectural style. In terms of theory production and historiography, the Institute set out to promote the emergence of postmodernism in the field of architecture in general. For the historical circumstances and special characteristics of the newly interpreted publication format meant that *Oppositions*—as a fictitious or, to use Jean Baudrillard's terminology, "hyperreal," "fake" or "artificial" thought collective on which Eisenman imposed his thinking—offered manifold possibilities for the production and dissemination of knowledge, for the definition of real and apparent problems, for the reception of methods and concepts, for intellectualized and yet depoliticized reflections, and ultimately for eclipsing socio-economic and socio-political issues.

614 *Oppositions* 4, dated October 1974, did not appear until January 1976. While editing the issue, Eisenman was already working on the conceptual design of *Oppositions* 5.

615 In 1975, an annual subscription was US\$ 20 for students, US\$ 24 for non-students, and US\$ 30 for institutions. One of the sales strategies was to engage students by giving them a year's subscription for free in exchange for taking out ten subscriptions.

Professional Journal-Making

Winning MIT Press as a collaborative partner in the mid-1970s, after long and tough negotiations, was of great importance for the Institute, enabling it to not only continue *Oppositions*, but also to establish another journal, *October*, and successfully reposition, restructure, and realign itself as group, organization, and institution. What was to become the “Publication Program” at the Institute was thus decisively strengthened and even secured for the coming years. In the run-up to the contract negotiations for *Oppositions*, the Institute printed a poster for backlog issues and a flyer for upcoming issues which, in addition to the first public announcement of its association with the publisher, also named potential authors and topics for contributions for an entire issue.⁶¹⁶ Previously, Eisenman had prepared a list of potential topics for issues 5 to 8, thus setting out the editorial line of the journal, incorporating shared and individual interests of the editors while at the same time committing them to contribute.⁶¹⁷ The poster was immediately sent to all subscribers to engage them in the publicity drive for the coming issues. In addition to institutional purposes, however, the poster also served discursive purposes, since two new editorial strategies were communicated here in an info text: on the one hand, the editorial team planned to increasingly direct the focus of *Oppositions* across the Atlantic to contemporary positions in Italy and Spain (with less of a focus on architecture from Great Britain) in addition to continuing the high-profile dispute between the “Whites” and the “Grays,” on the other hand, they also intended to advance the architecture debate with individually written editorials. The *Oppositions* poster as cultural product and medium, similar to those for the “Evening Program” and the educational programs, served promotional purposes—demonstrating that the journal was to become an even more powerful instrument of knowledge, its production, reproduction, and dissemination, while the editors positioned themselves internationally as theorists or historians. By pre-selecting authors and themes and promoting a transatlantic dialogue, the Institute cast itself as an authority of legitimacy and consecration, impressively underscoring its self-appointed role as gatekeeper for the American architecture scene. Although ultimately only a fraction of the articles listed on the poster were to be published in *Oppositions*, the poster nevertheless communicated its approaches and ambitions.

With the signing of the contract for *Oppositions* on April 1, 1976, the “little magazine” became an academic publication. The in-house production with a smaller budget and a smaller print run, which had meant freedom of content and allowed for irregularities in the publication, had to subsequently be transformed into a more professional production which would benefit both

616 *Oppositions* (poster), ca. 1975. Source: CCA Montréal, IAUS fonds: C.3-7 / ARCH250449.

617 Peter Eisenman, notes on the content for *Oppositions* 5 to 8, n.d. Source: CCA Montréal, IAUS fonds: C.1-2 / ARCH401325.

contractual partners.⁶¹⁸ The deal ensured the continuation of *Oppositions* in the medium term and promised to provide the Institute with international exposure. MIT Press, which not only guaranteed scholarly quality but also promoted artistic innovation, had the necessary structures to ensure distribution at home and abroad, and to handle advertising and publicity. On top of this, the publishing house also assumed a large part of the production costs of *Oppositions* while the Institute committed itself to the regular production of four issues a year while benefitting from the international reputation of the university press. It was agreed that Vignelli, together with the editors and staff, would retain control over the graphic design, layout, and printing of the journal, which was established as a brand. One of the publisher's conditions, however, was that the Institute would continue to acquire donations from individuals, institutions, and corporations so that it could contribute its financial share. Any debts incurred were to be shared between the two contracting parties. On this basis, issues 5 through 24 of *Oppositions* were produced from 1976 to 1982, before the Institute switched to Rizzoli International in 1982. Essentially, MIT Press took care of the journal's business development, leaving the editors to concentrate entirely on content and, through journal-making, contribute to debates and education in architecture while redisciplining and intellectualizing it. Both the theoretical and historiographical approaches kept up the appearance of disinterested involvement. But this is only the first impression, for although *Oppositions* never really contributed to economic revenue, i.e., to the financing of the Institute's operating costs or to the Fellows' income, its contribution can nevertheless be measured in symbolic gains. The new collaboration with the Institute enabled MIT Press to raise its profile in the longer term, not only in the journal segment but in the book segment as well, by establishing an architecture segment, thereby strengthening its market position here alongside its segments in science and the arts. The university press became an important partner for the Institute, not least thanks to Roger Conover, who was appointed acquisitions editor at MIT Press in 1976 and was now responsible for the architecture segment there. In this role, Conover showed a strong interest in building on the relationship with *Oppositions* by establishing further contacts with New York architecture circles and expanding existing ones. For him, importing intellectually ambitious authors and publishing a new sophisticated body of texts were both quite attractive.

618 MIT Press, contract between the Institute and MIT Press, appendices and tables, April 1, 1976. Source: CCA Montréal, IAUS fonds: C.1-1 / ARCH401320. Previously, the Institute had been in talks with MIT Press regarding the publication of other print products, an exhibition catalogue for *The Streets* exhibition, a book series, and also a journal. While being dependent on the collaboration, they disputed the correct designation of the collaboration. The Institute's leadership succeeded in defining the relationship of the university press to the Institute as a subservient one. The imprint eventually stated, "Oppositions is a journal published for The Institute for Architecture and Urban Studies by The MIT Press." The copyright for the journal was held by the Institute.

The Institute also saw a shift in its work. By the time the contract with MIT Press was signed, *Oppositions* represented only one of the Fellows' activities (albeit a particularly labor-intensive and high-profile one) among multiple others. At the same time, the three editors Eisenman, Frampton, and Gandelsonas were still involved in the "Undergraduate Program," the flourishing "Evening Program," and the expanding "Exhibition Program." Nevertheless, another journal was already being developed and produced at the Institute at the same time: *October*, a new journal of art theory and criticism, edited by Rosalind Krauss and Annette Michelson. This second regular publication, which was to occupy a special position at the Institute, both institutionally and intellectually, was an excellent addition to the portfolio in terms of Eisenman's aspirations and was produced according to the same procedure. Nevertheless, *Oppositions* would remain the more important driving force, as the textual work on and controversial discussions around the journal served to stabilize the thought collective of Fellows and authors. With regard to the new epistemology of architecture debate and education, pitting a modern way of thinking, designing, and implementing against a postmodern one, two strategies and successes played a seminal role in the journal's continued authority and reputation: first, with the MIT Press deal, *Oppositions* was distributed to schools of architecture via special subscription offers for institutions and was thus represented in libraries nationwide, so that within a very short time the journal advanced to become a teaching and learning resource. Second, due in part to its text-heavy design—plans, drawings, and photographs were used rather sparingly—it supported the Institute's reputation as a center of architecture intelligentsia on both a national and international scale. A close reading of *Oppositions*, not only the first four issues but also the new edition under MIT Press, reveals that the journal was also a medium for reinventing the architect's role as intellectual or artist. By producing and distributing new architectural knowledge and featuring theorists, historians, and critics as authors whose texts would prove groundbreaking and pioneering, the editors had a strong influence on postmodern discourse, at best in terms of a critical-reflexive understanding of theory that allowed for differences, and in terms of a genealogical-archaeological understanding of history that functioned beyond established models, precedents, and references. Moreover, by providing new perceptual and evaluative criteria for contemporary and modern architecture, history, and theory from America and Europe, a central mechanism was created in a market of symbolic goods.

In 1976, Anthony Vidler was added as a fourth permanent editor to ensure professionalism in the editorial work while Frampton was mostly absent from the Institute over the next few years. Vidler, who was initially given Visiting Fellow status for a year, strengthened the architecture history focus of *Oppositions*; he was the first to work on a thematic issue on nineteenth-century Parisian urbanism in L'École des Beaux Arts. In June 1976, at a meeting of the Board of

Trustees, Eisenman reported the conclusion of the contract with MIT Press and announced an increase in productivity: according to his report, *Oppositions 5* was already in print in the summer of 1976, *Oppositions 6* was being typeset, and the first manuscript for *Oppositions 7* had already been written.⁶¹⁹ In order to cope with this new productivity, Bloomfield, as managing editor responsible for ensuring the increased editorial work and production, began working with the Institute's interns on each issue to manage the extra workload.⁶²⁰ One of these interns was Joan Ockman who, by virtue of a BA in Comparative Literature and her experience as an editorial assistant at *The New Yorker*, took over editing duties starting with *Oppositions 7*.⁶²¹ In addition, David Morton, who usually served as a senior editor at *Progressive Architecture*, now advised the Institute as an editorial consultant. In the second half of the 1970s, while Eisenman (and in other ways Frampton) continued to feed the myth of modern architecture, *Oppositions* went on to become a significant medium in disseminating, legitimizing, and consecrating the postmodern architecture debate, which continued to spread throughout the globe, initially through publications. Compared to leading European journals, such as *Architectural Design* (from the UK), *Casabella* (Italy), *L'Architecture d'Aujourd'hui* (France), *Archithese* (Switzerland), and even *Arch+* (Germany), which occasionally featured architecture from the United States, *Oppositions* was now much more internationally oriented and had a much stronger focus on intellectual discourse than on the mere discussion or presentation of individual new buildings.

“The Italian Issue”

When *Oppositions 5* finally appeared in October 1976, the issue manifested the dual ambition of its editors and the Institute to not only cover the American debate but also to link it to an international or transatlantic dialogue. It was Eisenman himself, having scribbled handwritten notes on the selection of authors and topics on a concept paper for *Oppositions 4* as early as the summer of 1975, who was responsible for the issue.⁶²² One historical factor that must be considered is that this new issue marked the onset of an internationalization of the American architecture debate at the very moment when the foundations of architectural practice were being radically altered by new neoliberal

619 Peter Eisenman, “Director’s Report,” June 10, 1976. Source: Sarah Lawrence College Archives.

620 Andrew Bartle had done the editing for *Oppositions 5* and 6. In addition, Bloomfield later worked with Raleigh Perkins and Jay Johnson.

621 Ockman came to the Institute in early 1976, initially working as an intern for Agrest, but was soon assigned by Eisenman to edit texts for *Oppositions* as well as his own publications. Eisenman was working on two publications at the time, on *Giuseppe Terragni* and on *House X*. Even after Ockman began studying architecture at Cooper Union in the fall of 1976, she remained with the editorial staff, first as editor consultant and later, from *Oppositions 11* onward, rising to associate editor.

622 Peter Eisenman, *Oppositions 4*, n.d. Source: CCA Montréal, IAUS fonds: C.1-2 / ARCH401321.

politics and the urban crisis in New York. In contrast to this historical context, *Oppositions* 5 primarily featured architects and authors from Italy, which is why the issue became known at the Institute as “The Italian Issue.” The “Oppositions” section, reserved for architecture reviews, featured two articles, the first being “Aldo Rossi: The Idea of Architecture and the Modena Cemetery,” a rather positive review of Rossi’s 1966 monograph *L’Architettura della Città* and his 1971 award-winning project for the San Cataldo Cemetery in Modena, Italy, by Rafael Moneo.⁶²³ This detailed contribution was complemented and enhanced by exclusive drawings by Rossi, printed on glossy black paper, as well as the reprint of a translation of Rossi’s project text “The Blue of the Sky.”⁶²⁴ The second contribution in this section was a text by architecture critic Manfredo Tafuri, who wrote about individual, small-scale works by the New York Five from 1965 to 1970 under the title “American Graffiti: Five x Five = Twenty-five.” Here, he resumed his linguistic-semiotic critique of postmodern language games in the United States first outlined in “L’Architecture dans le Boudoir” and provided another personal, yet theoretically justified take on contemporary architectural practice, which the editors illustrated with a specially made heroic collage of the protagonists, a farewell, so to speak, to the “Whites.”⁶²⁵ Interestingly, Tafuri’s text explicitly addresses Eisenman’s involvement with two groups, each of which resulted in exhibitions at the Museum of Modern Art: first, his role at CASE, whose urban renewal project for Harlem was shown at “The New City” in 1967, and secondly the Institute, whose design of a housing prototype was shown at “Another Chance for Housing” in 1973. Again, Tafuri censured both designs for not being based on socio-political interests, but rather on exclusively formal-aesthetic ones. Ultimately, the Italian author, with reference to contemporary French philosophers such as Jean Baudrillard or Michel Foucault who, speaking as critics and historians of the present, had begun to use terms such as “simulacra” or even “coercion,” criticized the architecture intelligentsia of the 1970s for moving far away from the original tradition of the modern avant-garde in Europe. Thus, in a feedback loop, *Oppositions* itself provided one of the key texts of the self-observation and self-description of the architectural project, whose shifts were renegotiated under terms such as “neo-avant-garde” or “post-modernism.”

623 Rossi and Tafuri were guests at the Institute in the spring of 1976: Rossi presented his latest projects in March 1976 as part of the “European New Wave” series, after which he exhibited his architectural drawings and stayed for a few days. Tafuri, following a stay at MIT, visited the Institute a second time in April 1976 and gave a lecture on “Modern Architecture: The Dialectics of Order and Disorder” as part of the “Architecture” series.

624 Rafael Moneo, “Aldo Rossi: The Idea of Architecture and the Modena Cemetery,” trans. Angela Giral, *Oppositions* 5 (Summer 1976), 2–21; Aldo Rossi, “The Blue of the Sky,” trans. Marlène Barsoum, Livio Dimitriu, *Oppositions* 5 (Summer 1976), 31–34.

625 Tafuri, 1976; Tafuri, 1974.

These contributions in the “Oppositions” section of *Oppositions* 5 demonstrated strategies that were to become characteristic of the discursive, editorial, and journalistic practice at the Institute: on the one hand, trends that were already in vogue were addressed by presenting, for example, Rossi, one of the most dazzling actors of European postmodernism, who was, however, still largely unknown in North America; on the other hand, critical voices such as those of Tafuri were presented right away and thus appropriated for the Institute itself to a certain extent. Eisenman, theoretically well-read and rhetorically gifted, knew how to use both strategies for his own purposes. His introduction to Moneo’s text on Rossi is another case of “creative misreading.”⁶²⁶ While referring to the transformation of the architectural field over the past decade, and not only situating Rossi’s approach, evident in *L’architettura della Città* and San Cataldo Cemetery, within the neo-rationalism of the Italian Tendenza but also contextualizing Moneo’s 1973 article, Eisenman presented “autonomous architecture” as the only possible concept—without, however, discussing the transatlantic differences. Eisenman saw autonomy, which conceptualizes architecture as an independent art form in contrast to the city, not only in the Tendenza, but in “the metaphysical Scolari, the romantic Krier brothers, the delirious Koolhaas” and thus not only connected these disparate figures, but classified his own approach at the same time.⁶²⁷ His introductory text, which he ended with the sentence “And who will dare cry in the face of all this-Formalism!” was a battle cry, and he used the opportunity to paint a picture of himself as an eloquent and polemical architect and theorist, in order to distance himself from his critics.⁶²⁸ He built Tafuri up as an adversary to legitimize his formalist approach and thus repeatedly used him as a fame-maker, similar to what he had done earlier with Frampton and Gandelsonas. Both profited from this: Eisenman was able to legitimize and enhance his own position through Tafuri’s criticism, negative though it was, and Tafuri used the opportunity to publish his texts in English and thus reach an international readership.⁶²⁹

The release of *Oppositions* 5, published in a run of 3,000 copies and at a new price of US\$6, was duly celebrated in October 1976 with a “Forum” on Aldo Rossi. As a good host, Eisenman could not resist personally inviting all

626 Harold Bloom, *A Map of Misreadings* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1975).

627 Peter Eisenman, “Introduction” to Rafael Moneo’s “Aldo Rossi: The Idea of Architecture and the Modena Cemetery,” *Oppositions* 5 (Summer 1976), 1.

628 Ibid.

629 A total of five texts by Tafuri were published in *Oppositions*, following “L’Architecture dans le Boudoir” (1973) and “American Graffiti” (1976) were “The Dialectic Of The Avant-Garde” (1977), “Giuseppe Terragni: Subject And ‘Mask’” (1977), and “The Historical Project” (1980). In addition, Tafuri was published in the IAUS Exhibition Catalogues and in *Skyline*. Next to the Institute, MIT Press played a major role in the creation of the “American Tafuri,” as the university publisher published *Architecture and Utopia* (1976), *The American City* (1979), and eventually *The Sphere and the Labyrinth* (1987).

the subscribers—and himself—cleverly using the occasion to remind them all to renew their subscriptions, as the contract with MIT Press demanded. The “Forum,” with which the conclusion of the contract was once again solemnly celebrated at the Institute six months later, was intended as an event for subscribers, sponsors, and friends, but also offered a well-attended panel discussion in which Rossi’s architectural projects, i.e., his drawings were interpreted by Fellows and invited speakers—in this way, Rossi did after all become the hot topic of the day in the New York architecture scene in the fall of 1976.⁶³⁰ In contrast to the previous “Forum” section, this one did not just illustrate the podium, but rather the well-attended cocktail party that followed, which was extensively documented by Dorothy Alexander as the Institute’s new in-house photographer and published in the next issue. A spotlight for the first time was cast on Philip Johnson. *Oppositions* now also had self-reporting in the style of high society, which proved to all readers at a glance that the Institute was able to attract the who’s who of the New York architecture scene, who celebrated there in style, as befitting their social status.

For the Institute, *Oppositions* 5 thus meant a new beginning and a new orientation in many respects, not only because of the academic publisher behind it. The journal subsequently served less to set up a new genuinely American theory, as originally claimed, but instead expressed itself primarily in the popularization of a rather provincial architecture debate in the first half of the 1970s, centered on the two East Coast axes “New York—Cornell” and “Yale—Penn.” Instead of engaging on a more intellectual level, *Oppositions* sought to raise its international profile. But “The Italian Issue” also showed that the polemics and division of the American architecture scene into the “Whites” and the “Grays” had been exhausted, as Manfredo Tafuri had already aptly noted in his essay “Les cendres de Jefferson,” which first appeared in French in *L’Architecture d’Aujourd’hui* in 1976.⁶³¹ The editors’ new focus took them across the Atlantic, or even across the Pacific. Along with this internationalization, Peter Eisenman had already guest-edited the issue of “White and Gray: Eleven Modern Architects” in the Japanese magazine *Architecture + Urbanism* in April 1975, together with his closest collaborator and rhetorical counterpart Robert Stern, who was very well-networked in New York architecture circles as president of The Architectural League.⁶³² However, journal issues did not only serve the dissemination of postmodern

630 IAUS, invitation card to *Oppositions* “Forum 6,” October 26, 1976. Source: Vignelli Design Center, RIT. The exhibition of Rossi’s works at the Institute in the spring of 1976 as part of the “European New Wave” series had not yet generated much of an audience.

631 Tafuri, “Les cendres de Jefferson,” 1976.

632 *Architecture + Urbanism*, no. 52 (April 1975): “White and Gray: Eleven Modern Architects.”

design and thought.⁶³³ When Institute director Eisenman was commissioned to curate the American contribution to the Venice Art Biennale in the summer of 1976, he also cooperated with Stern and was able to use and further expand his contacts in Italy, especially with the IUAV. These networks were reflected not only in the selection of authors and topics featured in *Oppositions*, but also in the public events, exhibitions, lecture series, and teaching, and later in other publications of the Institute, especially in the conception of their own book series. The transatlantic dialogue along the new “Venice—New York” axis was based on mutual interests, networks and friendships, promises and commitments.⁶³⁴

One decisive factor in the new discursive dispositions and relations in the 1970s was the fact that, following the “Italian Issue,” Manfredo Tafuri was built up by the *Oppositions* editors—Eisenman was certainly the driving force—to become the journal’s most published author. Tafuri placed three more essays in the following issues as well as two texts for publications that Eisenman was planning on Terragni and his own projects.⁶³⁵ Although his book *Architecture and Utopia. Design and Capitalist Development* had already been published by MIT Press in January 1976 (Conover’s first publication as acquisitions editor), the Institute was instrumental in Tafuri’s reception in the English-speaking architecture world, and thus in international debate and research. One great merit of *Oppositions* was that, by importing and translating Tafuri’s texts, it valorized and simultaneously vulgarized a critical approach in the style of a historiographical metafiction. In particular, the younger generation of Fellows clearly adopted Tafuri’s approaches in their sociopolitical readings of architecture. Interestingly, while the incomprehensibility of his texts and the poor quality of their translations were criticized in letters to the editors, this did not detract from this development. On the contrary, Tafuri has since become an integral part of architectural scholarship in North America (as opposed to Europe) and of the curriculum of American universities. In addition, next to Tafuri, Eisenman was vehemently committed to publicizing and popularizing the texts and drawings of Aldo Rossi, who taught at Cooper Union and became a regular at the Institute from 1976 during his trips to the USA, through the Institute’s public events and publications.

633 Patteuw and Szacka, 2018. In Europe, this task was assigned to the British *Architectural Design*, or the Swiss *Archithese*, from the mid-1970s, and later the German *Arch+*, among others.

634 Ockman, 1995.

635 Tafuri was commissioned by Eisenman to write two essays for his monographs: “Giuseppe Terragni: Subject and ‘Mask’” (1977) for *Giuseppe Terragni* and “The Meditations of Icarus” (1980) for *Houses of Cards*.

Editorial Policy

The postmodern thinking style, linked with an academic habitus, on the one hand turning away from the project of modernity and on the other hand operationalizing theory production and historiography at the Institute, was also evident in the editorials of *Oppositions*, which the editors began signing individually in *Oppositions* 4 to 7 between 1976 and 1977.⁶³⁶ With these short texts, all of them personal manifestos, Eisenman, Frampton, Gandelsonas, and Vidler communicated their different takes on the discipline and its autonomy at the transition from the late modern to the postmodern period, showcasing their influences and references, and simultaneously referencing each other and distancing themselves from one another.⁶³⁷ In this lineup, they each asserted authority over contemporary architecture. Frampton had already made a start in the spring of 1976 in *Oppositions* 4 with “On Reading Heidegger.” Writing as a historian and starting from Martin Heidegger’s thesis, “That language, far from being a servant of man, is all too often his master,” he rejected any rhetoric of autonomy since this mystified the—economic, social, and political—conditions of architecture rather than revealing them.⁶³⁸ In *Oppositions* 5, Gandelsonas continued with “Neo-Functionalism.” Under this neologism, following Tafuri’s semiotic/linguistic analysis, he combined the symbolic meaning of postmodernism with the modernist architectural doctrine of functionalism, aiming to overcome the division of the contemporary architecture world into the antagonistic camps of “neo-rationalism” and “neo-realism,” both of which he criticized as being “anti-functional.”⁶³⁹ With “Post-Functionalism” in *Oppositions* 6, Eisenman then attempted to develop the foundations of his theory of modernism.⁶⁴⁰ He self-consciously distanced himself from two trends of the 1970s, rationalism and postmodernism, both of which he believed were still indebted to a humanist approach to architecture. According to his “non-humanist attitude,” he defined modernism “as a sensibility based on the fundamental displacement of man,” and instead, by excluding the subject and denying buildings any use-value—which he outlined as an “ethical positivism of form and function”—called for the recognition of an autonomous architecture based on the transformation of geometric

636 Kenneth Frampton, “On Reading Heidegger,” *Oppositions* 4 (October 1974), n.p.; Mario Gandelsonas, “Neo-Functionalism,” *Oppositions* 5 (Summer 1976), n.p.; Peter Eisenman, “Post-Functionalism,” *Oppositions* 6 (Fall 1976), n.p.; Anthony Vidler, “The Third Typology,” *Oppositions* 7 (Winter 1976), 1–4.

637 Ockman, 1988, 196–197.

638 Frampton, 1974.

639 Gandelsonas, 1976.

640 Eisenman, 1976. Ullrich Schwarz interpreted Eisenman’s editorial as the “first sketchy formulation” of a theory of modernism, see Schwarz, 1995, 17.

bodies or the generation of form out of itself.⁶⁴¹ Although Eisenman ultimately did not succeed in writing a general theory of architecture, even though he had read Foucault and used the concept of the *épistémè* from *The Order of Things* (English translation of 1970), he did manage to expand the “Peter Eisenman brand” in line with the IAUS brand.⁶⁴² What is astonishing is that with the publication of some rather sketchy fragments of a theory, he engendered keywords for the debate on a “critical” or rather “post-critical” architecture and in doing so also proved to be the founder of an entirely new discourse based on idiosyncratic appropriations, theoretical set pieces, and historical interpretations. After various versions of his “Notes on Conceptual Architecture,” i.e., his analyses and drawings of the transformation processes in the designs of the Italian rationalist Giuseppe Terragni, and after his contributions to *Oppositions*, e.g., his analysis of the architecture of the Smithsons and James Stirling, Eisenman’s “Post-Functionalism” had an inaugural value for a new, post-modernized form of architecture theory.⁶⁴³ Finally, Vidler also contributed an editorial with “The Third Typology” in *Oppositions* 7.⁶⁴⁴ Turning away from abstract nature (Laugier’s primitive hut) and technological utopia (Le Corbusier’s machine aesthetic), he proposed—in line with the urbanism of Aldo Rossi and Leon Krier and as a critique of formalism—the traditional European city as a third typology. Thus, with a neo-rationalist typology that was both self-referential and self-reproducing, he was concerned not with isolated buildings but with the city and public space; he explicitly pointed out that the polis had always been political by its very nature. Taken individually and above all together, the contributions of the four editors thus impressively demonstrated that postmodernization, i.e., the derealization of architecture culture, was also reflected in the topics and method of *Oppositions*.

641 Eisenman, 1976, n.p. Eisenman himself referred to his programmatic text “Post-Functionalism,” as he called his reflections, in distinction to Gandelsonas’ editorial, “existing fragments of thought.” The poster for *Oppositions* 5 to 8 still announced that he had planned to publish a longer essay under the same title in the “Theory” section. Nevertheless, Eisenman’s editorial can be seen as theoretical base for the sculptural approach that was to materialize in *House VI*. Eisenman was subsequently more active as a writing architect than as a practicing theorist. In 1976 he was working on the book on *House X*, for which he had just lost the commission, but which he had just exhibited: first at the 1976 Venice Art Biennale, and later at Cooper Union and Princeton.

642 Foucault, [1966] 1970.

643 Eisenman, 1970 and 1971.

644 Vidler, 1976. Vidler’s editorial was a version of the lecture he gave at the *Little Magazine Conference* at the Institute in February 1977. The text was subsequently published in several versions. The version printed in *Oppositions* was a heavily revised paper: the remarks on the first two typologies had been condensed. Vidler’s emphasis on public space was watered down, a section on the decomposition and recomposition of fragments was added, and the critique of examples of contemporary practice was toned down; see Anthony Vidler (interview with Beatriz Colomina and Daniel Lopez-Perez), in Colomina and Buckley, 2010, 537–541.

In the end, it was very clear that each editorial was a polemic, with the authors referencing different historical and theoretical considerations to reflect on the conditions, meanings, histories, theories, concepts, methods, built examples, and textual references of contemporary practice. Taken together, these texts announced the Institute's program. While comparing different and quite contradictory positions and in the intellectual competition between the editors, they nevertheless formed a self-contained, self-sufficient, and even self-serving discussion group. Furthermore, the editorials were written according to the principle of juxtaposed positions and competition between the editors. But this was precisely because of their very special relationships with each other—their sympathies, dependencies, agreements, and disputes. As textual documents, the four editorials, while demonstrating the sophistication of their authors, testified to the extent to which postmodernism—although new poststructuralist and postmodernist theorems and concepts were only rudimentarily valorized and appropriated, if at all—had made its way into the Institute as a discursive formation, with *Oppositions* as the medium for presenting an image of oneself as an intellectual of architecture, if not beyond. Frampton, for example, as a now-recognized historian of modernism, repeatedly made his voice heard as the harshest critic of postmodern architecture, and here, with his focus on “the socially experienced quality of place,” he was already arguing for a central aspect of his approach, which he later formulated as an alternative postmodernism under the banner of Critical Regionalism.⁶⁴⁵ Gandelsonas, on the other hand, as an architect and theorist, was the most explicit advocate of postmodern thinking and design among the *Oppositions* editors. While Eisenman used the term postmodernism as a polemical concept and sought to expose architectural postmodernism as a media construct, Vidler, as a historian, countered the accusation of being an apologist, here and in other editorials, with the argument that he was less interested in a new architectural doctrine. The separation of architectural style and mindset was a workaround, albeit an inadequate one, that allowed him to address “the city and typology,” for him in a

645 Frampton, 1974. Frampton would not publish his version of “Critical Regionalism,” modelled on Alexander Tzoni and Liane Lefevre, until 1983, but then twice, in two different textual formats: a philosophical essay in Hal Foster's *The Anti-Aesthetic*, later translated into German, French, and Spanish, and a project-based architecture critique in *Perspecta*; see Kenneth Frampton, “Six Points Towards and Architecture of Resistance. Towards a Critical Regionalism,” in *The Anti-Aesthetic. Essays on Postmodern Culture*, ed. Hal Foster (Seattle: Bay Press, 1983), 16–31; “Prospects for a Critical Regionalism,” *Perspecta*, no. 20, (1983), 147–162. Frampton developed his fundamental idea on place as a central category in relation to urban development as early as the 1960s in his essay “Labour, Work and Architecture,” published in George Baird and Charles Jencks, eds., *Meaning in Architecture* (New York: Braziller, 1969), 150–168. In the 1970s and 1980s Frampton published a piece on “Production, Place and Reality” and celebrated regional alternatives to the globalized American postmodernism with publications and conference speeches, including at UQAM in Montréal in 1983. His book project, which would have collected examples of “Critical Regionalism” from around the world, did not materialize, but Frampton subsequently discussed these in his revisions of *Modern Architecture* and prefaces.

sense a continuation of the modern movement, “as the only possible bases for the restoration of the critical role of architecture;” he was thus arguing for the “public nature” of all architecture and against the “private vision of romantic individualists.”⁶⁴⁶ The *Oppositions* editors were united, however, in their criticism of the emerging architectural postmodernism, that is to say, of a mix of classicism, eclecticism, and historicism popular among architects, historians, readers, curators, museum visitors, and private and corporate clients.⁶⁴⁷ For a long time, the editors had even planned to devote two issues of *Oppositions* to debates about the heritage of modernism or a critique of postmodernism, but these never appeared. All editorials, however, were subsequently republished in other contexts, publications, and languages—in France, Spain, and Germany—which brought the individual positions to international attention beyond the typical readership of *Oppositions*.⁶⁴⁸

At the time, the Institute was opening up to the arts, humanities, social sciences, and cultural studies in order to benefit from government funding in the years to come. Yet as a postmodern salon, in terms of its funding, programming, and production, it could not escape the conservative trend and privatization wave in the country, as also evidenced by the journal. While the editors, with the backing of MIT Press, entered into a competition for the best references, since the narrative

646 Vidler, 1976, 4. Vidler’s position has been criticized as an apologia for postmodern architecture. Eisenman thus continued to polemicize that *Oppositions* turned to historicism; see Peter Eisenman (interview with Beatriz Colomina and Urtzi Grau), in Colomina and Buckley, 2010, 261–264. It remains unclear whether he is referring to his personal relationship with Leon Krier here. Krier first exhibited at the Institute in 1975 and was a guest there two more times as part of the “European New Wave” series. In 1977 they met at Princeton University, where Eisenman exhibited and Krier contributed a portrait of Eisenman for the poster. They kept up the dialogue; see Peter Eisenman, “Interview. Leon Krier and Peter Eisenman,” *Skyline* (February 1983), 12–15; see also Cynthia Davidson, *Eisenman/Krier: Two Ideologies* (New York: Monacelli Press, 2005). Several of Krier’s texts, while seen critically, were later published in *Oppositions*; see Leon Krier and Maurice Culot, “The Only Path for Architecture,” *Oppositions* 14 (Fall 1978), 38–53; Leon Krier, “The Consumption of Culture,” *Oppositions* 14 (Fall 1978), 54–59; “Vorwärts, Kamaraden, wir müssen zurück,” *Oppositions* 24 (Spring 1981), 26–37. In the late 1970s, Krier again was contributing to the Institute, lecturing as part of the “Open Plan” series, and exhibiting there.

647 For *Oppositions*, thematic issues on “Post-Modernism” and “Modernism” respectively were discussed for a long time. *Oppositions* editors planned to write editorials under the title “Against Post-Modernism;” see Julia Bloomfield, communications to *Oppositions* editors, November 2, 1978, December 6, 1978 & September 15, 1980. Source: CCA Montréal, IAUS fonds: A.5-7. During this period, Bloomfield’s salary was raised to US\$ 3,000 per issue and quarterly payments were agreed, institutionalizing her position; further professionalization occurred when Bloomfield wrote the job description for the managing editor.

648 Vidler’s editorial was republished in 1978; see Robert L. Delevoy, ed., *Rational Architecture* (Bruxelles: Archives d’Architecture Moderne), 28–31. Eisenman’s, Gandelsonas’s, and Vidler’s editorials were translated into Spanish below and published in the architecture journal *Arquitecturas Bis* 22 (May 1978). Eisenman’s and Vidler’s editorials were translated into German in 1980; see Gerald Blomeyer and Barbara Tietze, eds., *In Opposition zur Moderne. Aktuelle Positionen in der Architektur*. Bauwelt Fundamente 52 (Braunschweig and Wiesbaden: Friedrich Vieweg & Sohn, 1980), 108ff.

of *The Great Society* no longer applied and a critique of Corporate America had long since faded, some at least used *Oppositions* to voice criticism of reactionary developments in architecture. Nevertheless, real-world processes that conditioned and constrained the architectural profession were rarely addressed. For example, there was no discussion on the phasing out of the Urban Development Corporation or the competition for Roosevelt Island. Apart from selected examples of contemporary, if not avant-garde or radical practice, the major issues of the decade—the dismantling of the welfare state, the various economic and ecological crises, and the alignment of the state capitalist system with a neoliberal program, were clearly not of particular concern to the editors, or they possibly did not feel that *Oppositions* was the right medium for these topics. Instead, while the “Exhibition Program” expanded with a focus on monographic exhibitions, *Oppositions* supported a traditional and closed concept of the work, accompanied by a debate about the possibility of authorship and interpretation.⁶⁴⁹ There was no denying that *Oppositions* was the responsibility of white men, while the women at the Institute did most of the work: historical and theoretical debates about the relevance of intersecting categories such as race, gender, and class (sexual orientation did not enter the pages of *October* until later) were surprisingly absent and silent in times of postmodernism and poststructuralism.

After Modern Architecture

In early February 1977, *Oppositions* invited editors of friendly architecture journals and magazines from Europe to a multi-day conference at the Institute under the title “After Modern Architecture.” This conference, as part of the repositioning of *Oppositions*, represented another attempt to claim leadership in the international market in terms of the circulation of ideas, criticism, and authority in the coverage of postwar modernism and emerging postmodernism.⁶⁵⁰ Next to Eisenman, Frampton, Gandelsonas, and Vidler, the so-called *Little Magazine Conference* was attended by editors from *Arquitecturas Bis* from Spain, *A.M.C.* from France, and *Controspazio* and *Lotus International* from Italy. “After Modern Architecture” was actually the follow-up to an earlier conference hosted by the editors of *Arquitecturas Bis* in Cadaques, near Barcelona, in September 1975.⁶⁵¹ After the first conference had established solidarity among

649 Barthes, [1967] 1977.

650 Ockman, 1988, 197ff. Apart from shorter reviews in the architecture press and *The New York Times*, there is no further coverage or historiography of *After Modern Architecture*. There are no major references to the conference, neither in CCA’s IAUS fonds, nor in CCA’s Peter Eisenman fonds. Some documents can be found only in private archives of participants, in the Robert A.M. Stern Archive at Yale University, and in the Robert Gutman Collection at Columbia University.

651 The first conference in Cadaques was attended by editors of *Arquitecturas Bis*, *Lotus*, and *Oppositions*, see Tomàs Llorens, “Arquitecturas Bis, Lotus, Oppositions: Convencion en Cadaqués. Septiembre de 1975,” *Arquitecturas Bis* 10 (November 1975), 30–31. It is not possible to recon-

the editors, this second event was intended to consolidate and expand the common network and to compare the different editorial structures and policies.⁶⁵² To this end, the respective sociopolitical context in which the individual journals and magazines were produced was also to be reflected upon. *Oppositions* editors were working from the assumption that journals played an important role in the development of architectural ideas, both historically and culturally. Moreover, the conference was intended to offer participants the opportunity to network and explore the “possibility of future collaborations, exchange and republication.” With this in mind, they had planned to record the results of the conference in a multilingual publication at MIT Press. To prepare for this, the participating editors were asked to compile a chronology of the architectural projects that had been featured in their journals over the past 30 years. In addition, all conference participants were invited to formulate their positions on contemporary architecture so that these could be sent out in advance as a basis for discussion.⁶⁵³ In the run-up, a *Controspazio* editor had already voiced the criticism that the Institute was attempting to write a unifying history of European post-war architecture with “After Modern Architecture.”⁶⁵⁴

The conference ultimately took place behind closed doors. Apart from an opening at MoMA and a reception at the Cooper Union, only Fellows, friends of the Institute, and donors, i.e., members of the Architects’ Circle, as well as representatives of the architecture press and *The New York Times* were invited to attend the actual conference.⁶⁵⁵ *Oppositions* editors had set out to achieve a great deal: a total of four sessions with presentations by the respective editors (*Oppositions* was introduced by Joan Ockman), followed by three thematic workshops in which conference participants discussed overarching methods and concepts of historiography and theory production such as “Historical continuity and discontinuity,” “Progressist and non-progressist society,” “The problem of cultural accessibility,” on the one hand, and “Rationalism, realism

struct exactly who attended the second conference in New York. Listed as participants were: *Arquitecturas Bis* (Spain): Rafael Moneo, Oriol Bohigas, Frederico Correa, Helio Pinon; *A.M.C.* (France): Jacques Lucan; *Controspazio* (Italy): Alessandro Anselmi, Claudio D’Amato, Franco Purini; *Lotus* (Italy): Joseph Rykwert, Kenneth Frampton; *Oppositions*: Peter Eisenman, Kenneth Frampton, Mario Gandelsonas, Anthony Vidler. Of the editorial staff of the Swiss *Archithese*, Bruno Reichlin and Stanislaus von Moos were invited, but ultimately did not participate.

652 *Oppositions*, invitation to *Little Magazine Conference*, February 3–5, 1977. Source: Columbia University, Robert Gutman Collection.

653 Summaries of individual presentations were collected and mailed in advance. Source: Columbia University, Robert Gutman Collection.

654 *Controspazio*: Chronology. Source: Columbia University, Robert Gutman Collection.

655 Gutman was invited as a friend, Stern as a sponsor. Ada Louise Huxtable reported for *The New York Times*. *Controspazio* published two photographs of the conference with names of participants. Ockman highlighted Colin Rowe and Richard Meier as participants in the conference; see Ockman, 1988, 198.

and pragmatism,” “Anthropocentric built forms vs. a non-anthropocentric conception of architecture,” and “The Possibilities for a new typological structure as a strategy for a future architecture” on the other. The last workshop explicitly problematized the question of “Autonomy or the non-autonomy of architecture” for the first time at the Institute, paired with a discussion on “The role of criticism in architecture and the possibility for architecture to be criticism in itself.”⁶⁵⁶ In this context, *Oppositions* editors presented their editorials—sometimes simply reusing them, sometimes as a test lecture.⁶⁵⁷ Eisenman, for example, used the occasion to further develop his theoretical reflections on a “post-functionalism,” as he was primarily concerned with rethinking the role of the architect as author. For him “man is no longer the originating agent but rather he has a discursive and explanatory role vis-à-vis the making of the world,” and he thus introduced the figure of the reader into architecture, recalling Roland Barthes’ essay “The Death of the Author,” an instant classic that had just been published in English in an anthology, and its critique of the authority of the author.⁶⁵⁸ Eisenman, however, did not follow this poststructuralist approach to its logical conclusion, focusing more on the design process than on its use. The actual realization of the idea, as evidenced by *House VI*, which had just been widely reviewed in *The New York Times* and which he was to publish in the American architecture press that same year with further contributions curated by him, no longer played a role for him. And the peregrinations of the exhibition on *House X* after the client dropped out highlighted that he now favored the exhibition and art value of the model over the use value of the building. Frampton, on the other hand, in “Loss of Utopia,” was the only *Oppositions* editor to speak about a new subject, namely the function and success of modernist utopias. He called for a contemporary avant-garde that was less hedonistic and more political.⁶⁵⁹ If they had anything in common, then all *Oppositions* editors were ultimately interested, as was once again made clear here, in finding new criteria for the perception and appreciation of architecture, both modern and postmodern.

656 IAUS, program of the *Little Magazine Conference*. Source: Columbia University, Robert Gutman Collection.

657 *Oppositions* 8 with Vidler’s editorial “The Third Typology” had not yet been published at that time.

658 Roland Barthes’s essay “The Death of the Author” was first published in 1967 in the journal *Aspen*, 5/6 (1967), and subsequently in the 1977 essay collection *Image-Music-Text*. Barthes’ critique of biographical interpretations of texts, applied to architecture, would have meant the architect playing a much smaller role in architecture history than the focus on heroes and the formation of the cult of stardom entails; the meaning of buildings would accordingly have been derived much more from their use.

659 Kenneth Frampton, “Abstract: ‘The Loss of Utopia,’” Source: Columbia University, Robert Gutman Collection.

Ada Louise Huxtable, an architecture critic for *The New York Times* who also participated in “After Modern Architecture,” criticized the intellectual style of individual contributions in her review—curiously enough, one of the few she wrote at all about the activities at the Institute—and fundamentally questioned the meaning and purpose of this conference.⁶⁶⁰ At the same time, however, Huxtable acknowledged the relevance of *Oppositions* as the Institute’s mouthpiece; in her opinion, the projects presented there were stylistically definitive and would be copied on the architecture market over the next two decades. *Oppositions* was therefore of public interest. Other journals whose editors had attended the conference also reported on “After Modern Architecture:” Alessandra Latour wrote a short conference review for *Controspazio*, and *Arquitecturas Bis* reported in more detail, additionally publishing Spanish translations of three of the editorials from *Oppositions*.⁶⁶¹ The planned conference publication on which Eisenman and Gandelsonas had worked in 1977, along with Livio Dimitriu as an intern, was however never published. Nevertheless, by organizing the conference, the Institute contributed substantially to the historicization and theorization of postmodernism in journals on an international scale, which was henceforth subsumed under the headings of “autonomy” and “criticality,” respectively, along with the associated cultural hegemony; the Institute’s leadership even cited the conference in various grant applications. By either showing interest in contemporary architecture, less so in North America, but more in Europe and also increasingly in Asia, especially Japan,⁶⁶² or referring to its pioneering role in the debate on populism and historicism—and this was the other side of the coin, which it however cleverly exploited for its own benefit—the Institute demonstrated openness and topicality, and once again advertised on its own behalf. Different, even contradictory tendencies were discernible in the Institute’s programming: while offering one of its most public events on urban culture free of charge, only to portray itself in the next moment as a venue that generated gratitude and distributed gratuities, alongside a professionalization and economization of cultural practice, the two theory (and history) laden journals *Oppositions* and *October* and other publications that were planned at the time came to be of central interest to Eisenman. In his 1977 “Director’s Memo” addressed to the Board of Trustees, he expressed hopes the publications would have networking as well as discursive effects.⁶⁶³ Ultimately, it was a matter of building and

660 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.

661 Alessandra Latour, “Little Magazine Conference: ‘After Modern Architecture,’” *Controspazio* 9 (June 1977), 62; *Arquitecturas Bis* 22 (May 1978).

662 Arata Isozaki was a guest at the Institute at that time and they prepared “A New Wave of Japanese Architecture,” an exhibition of young Japanese architects; later Japanese architects were featured as authors in *Oppositions*.

663 Peter Eisenman, “Director’s Memo,” January 11, 1977.

expanding his own reputation and that of the Institute within a complex economy of attention, which was of relevance for publication lists that functioned as a strong currency in the academic system.

Art | Theory | Criticism | Politics

For the Institute, and especially for Eisenman, whose support and sponsorship made the second journal based on the *Oppositions* model possible in the first place, the publication of *October* represented both a friendly service and a prestigious project.⁶⁶⁴ The first issue of *October* appeared in the spring of 1976, after Rosalind Krauss and Annette Michelson, as editors, had previously been accommodated at the Institute on Eisenman's initiative following their expulsion from *Art Forum* the previous year. *October*, like *Oppositions* before it, was initially to be self-published, with the Institute acting as publisher. The title, according to an advertisement addressed to new subscribers, was a reference to Sergei Eisenstein's 1929 Russian avant-garde film. By their own admission, the goal of Krauss and Michelson was not "to perpetuate the mythology or hagiography of Revolution."⁶⁶⁵ "It is rather to reopen an inquiry into the relationships between the several arts which flourish in our culture at this time, and in so doing, to open discussion of their role at this highly problematic juncture." With the main priorities indicated in the subheading "Art | Theory | Criticism | Politics," *October* investigated the structural and social relationships between artistic practice and political discourse. As much as this highly politicized stance set the *October* editors apart from their former employer *Art Forum*, which was by far more commercially oriented toward the galleries and art dealerships, Krauss and Michelson's interests were very different: contemporary visual art forms and Russian avant-garde film.

October was characterized above all by the broad concept of art that was just emerging at the time, and which included not only video, film, and photography, but also performance, music, and literature. The editorial work was also united by the reception of what was known as French Theory and psychoanalytic and feminist theory, whether as a toolkit of methods and concepts, as can be seen in citations and references, or by printing the relevant texts. In this regard, *October* and *Oppositions* editors shared an interest in examining modernism and contemporary practice, specifically formalism. But unlike *Oppositions*, *October* shaped a more critical, deliberative discourse of postmodernism, and subscribed to institutional critique, as both were practiced in the arts and art criticism. The first issue was in many ways groundbreaking. For

664 In CCA's IAUS fonds, there is a folder on *October*. Source: CCA Montréal, IAUS fonds: A.5-9. See Yves-Alain Bois, Hal Foster, and Rosalind Krauss, "New York–Paris," in *Clip Stamp Fold. The Radical Architecture of Little Magazines. 196X to 197X*, eds. Colomina, Beatriz and Craig Buckley (Barcelona: Actar, 2010), 36–45.

665 MIT Press, *October* subscriptions. Source: CCA Montréal, IAUS fonds: A.5-9.

example, it contained “Ceci n’est pas une pipe,” by Michel Foucault, as well as essays by the editors: Krauss’ “Video: The Aesthetics of Narcissism” exemplified by the video art of Vito Acconci, Nancy Holt, Bruce Nauman, Joan Jonas, Peter Campus, and “Gravity’s Rainbow and the Spiral Jetty” by Jeremy Gilbert-Rolfe, who was actually the third editor next to Krauss and Michelson, a British painter based in New York, as well as an art critic and an educator, i.e., the first of a three-part essay (in collaboration with John Johnston), which involved a reading of the two works of art named in the title: the novel by Thomas Pynchon and Robert Smithson’s land art. From a graphic point of view, *October*, which had a print run of 3,000 and was sold at a price of US\$3, clearly classified itself as an art journal with its format, its single-column layout in justified type, and with Baskerville as its typeface, and its large illustrations, some of which were full-page and bleeding, printed right up to the edge; the cover, on the other hand, recalled Vignelli’s design for the Institute with its title in capital letters, a large number for each issue, and otherwise only text, the names of the authors and titles of their essays, and also because of its specific color choice, red and black, reminiscent of Russian Constructivism. It was designed by Charles Read, a student of Gilbert-Rolfe at Princeton University, who was subsequently hired as the journal’s graphic designer and remained on board for the first nine issues.

In the beginning, the editorial work on *October* was irregular, with two issues released in 1976 and in 1977. The journal was distributed exclusively through Jaap Rietman, an art bookstore in SoHo, which bought up a certain number; otherwise, only a few other bookstores, mainly in Manhattan, carried the journal, so it was initially read almost exclusively in New York. The first issue sold out completely, but after that advertising and sales were slow. Only *The New York Review of Books* advertised the journal. By the end of 1977, *October* had just 350 subscribers, although a subscription was offered quite cheaply at US\$10 per year and US\$18 for two years. The list of contributors to the first issue was impressive and included, in addition to the editors, Michel Foucault, Peter Handke, Noel Burch, Robert Morris, Hollis Frampton, Sergei Eisenstein, Jean Epstein, Hans Magnus Enzensberger, Yvonne Rainer, and Richard Forman. Krauss published her seminal essay, “Notes on Index,” here—a two-part essay on developments in art, the first part introducing the concept of index using Marcel Duchamp as an example, and the second discussing the inaugural “Rooms” exhibition at P.S.1 in 1976. Overall, *October* was marked by a wide variety of formats: next to theory and criticism, it also featured philosophy and poetry, and texts by artists, especially filmmakers. But after only one year, *October* was at a crossroads, like *Oppositions* before it, as both production and funding had to be organized differently. The Institute continued to provide the framework for further institutionalization, which enabled the editorial team to apply for public funding and find an academic publisher as a partner. Eisenman personally championed *October*, bringing Krauss and Michelson together with Armand and

Celeste Bartos, as sponsors of the Institute, which was immediately followed by a US\$10,000 gift from the private Gottesman Foundation to produce issue four.⁶⁶⁶ While Frederieke Taylor was responsible for fundraising, grants, and donations in general at the Institute, Eisenman himself personally handled the accounting for *October*; the budget was now balanced with over US\$17,500 in income from contributions and sales. After Gilbert-Rolfe left the editorial team after just three issues, Douglas Crimp, one of Krauss's students at CUNY's graduate school, joined the editorial team. Crimp initially worked as an editorial assistant for two issues and then served as managing editor responsible for the journal's editing and production.⁶⁶⁷ In addition, as he had done previously for *Oppositions*, Eisenman worked to negotiate a contract with MIT Press in 1977 to improve the distribution and marketing of *October* in North America and to make the leap to Europe. On the basis of sympathetic advice from outside consultants. Frank Urbanowski, the head of the university publishing house, vigorously advocated for the conclusion of a contract: he expected nothing less from *October* than a substantial contribution to the cultural sphere.

Eisenman played a major role in the contract negotiations with MIT Press; when Frank Urbanowski sent a draft contract to him and Rosalind Krauss in late 1977, he himself revised it in writing.⁶⁶⁸ However, Eisenman eventually dropped the Institute as a contractual partner, thus transferring editorial and financial responsibility directly to the two editors. Nevertheless, the Institute assumed a limited role in funding the journal, committing to acquiring grant money, again from the Gottesman Foundation, while waiving the obligatory 40% overhead to IAUS Central. *October* thus assumed a special position at the Institute, one that was even more extreme than *Oppositions*. The editorial staff worked completely on its own regarding the salaries for the editors and the fees for graphic designers, authors, and translators, the expenses for administration, telephone costs, reproductions, photographs, and the acquisition of publication rights. The Institute even agreed to pay the salary of a managing editor and to provide office space; Douglas Crimp, however, preferred to work from home in the long run, as the habitus at the Institute, which at that time was becoming an elite circle as a result of its 10th anniversary and with the expansion of the "Evening Program," was alien to him. That same year, Eisenman asked Krauss if she would write a text about his house designs for an issue of the Japanese magazine *Architecture + Urbanism* dedicated to him. The art critic prefaced

666 Bois, Foster, and Krauss, 2010, 40.

667 Mathias Danbolt, "Front Room—Back Room. An Interview with Douglas Crimp," *Trikster – Nordic Queer Journal*, no. 2, (2008), <http://trikster.net/2/crimp/1.html> (last accessed: May 31, 2023)

668 Frank Urbanowski, letter to Rosalind Krauss and Peter Eisenman, November 29, 1977, including a draft contract for *October*, 1977. Source: CCA Montréal, IAUS fonds: A.5-9.

her text, her only published commentary on Eisenman's architecture, with a personal note that the two of them were friends and had been going through a parallel development up to that point.⁶⁶⁹ As an architecture review, the essay, which displayed a certain distance towards its subject, reads as an apt classification of Eisenman's oeuvre, at the interplay of textual and architectural production, as a representative of postmodernism. Krauss criticized the fact that *House I* and *House II* were still formalist, while *House VI* turned out to be "post-formalist"—alluding conceptually to Eisenman's theory of "post-functionalism." Nevertheless, only the long-standing friendship between the two explains why *October* and with it a certain discursive formation of art theory and criticism was professionalized through MIT Press, which was ultimately to outlive the Institute.

Critical Historiography

Published in 1977, *Oppositions* 8, a thematic issue on "Paris under the Academy," for which Anthony Vidler was responsible, marked a paradigm shift at the Institute in the critique of architectural modernism and postmodernism. Vidler, who had already contributed to the Institute's research projects as a Visiting Fellow in the early 1970s, and had contributed essays to *Oppositions* 1 and 5, but never previously played a decisive role, was now finally included in the circle of Fellows as editor. This *Oppositions* issue was his response to the controversial exhibition "The Architecture of the École des Beaux Arts," curated by Arthur Drexler at MoMA in the winter of 1975–76, which caused a stir in the architecture world with its large-format drawings. As MoMA curator, Drexler, who having made the founding of the Institute possible in the first place, had long acted as a trustee, had actually intended the long-planned exhibition to call for a differentiated approach to the architectural and urban legacy of the École des Beaux-Arts, but ultimately played into the hands of advocates and protagonists of a postmodern architectural language.⁶⁷⁰ At the Institute, individual Fellows and representatives of the profession had already expressed their views on the MoMA exhibition at the "Forum" for the publication of *Oppositions* 4 at the end of January 1976, and for the most part, distanced themselves from Drexler's work.⁶⁷¹

669 Krauss, 1987; The text, written in 1977, was first published in 1980, and then in Eisenman's 1977 monograph *Houses of Cards* in a slightly altered form, see Epp, 2007.

670 MoMA's exhibition "The Architecture of the Beaux Art" (October 29, 1975, to January 4, 1976) had apparently been in the planning stages since 1967. In an oral history interview, Drexler referred to the long planning period and his original intentions and characterized the opposition that formed as schizophrenic behavior: "This is why we did the show on the Ecole de Beaux Arts." See Arthur Drexler (interview). Source: The Museum of Modern Art, New York: Oral History Files; see also Felicity Scott, "When Systems Fail," in *Architecture or Techno-utopia. Politics after Modernism* (Cambridge: MIT Press, 2007), 59ff.

671 Ellis, 1976.

In his editorial for *Oppositions* 8, Vidler positioned himself clearly and meaningfully in relation to the postmodern ambivalences of architecture and the city, the operationalization of history and theory, and the role of architects as producers and critics.⁶⁷² Here, he outlined the object and approach of a genealogical historiography of architectural modernism: inspired by Michel Foucault's writings, he called for an analysis of the origins of modernist architecture and a critique of the conditions of its production, using the example of the urbanization of Paris under the influence of the *École des Beaux-Arts*. According to his reading, the heroic modernism of the twentieth century, through its opposition to academicism, would have completely transfigured the architecture of the nineteenth century. Vidler appreciated that the MoMA exhibition sought to dispel a dogmatic view of the *École des Beaux-Arts*: "Post-modernism,' it is claimed, allows for an appreciation, if not enthusiastic espousal, of ornament, pattern, colors other than primaries, symmetry, monumental fantasy, even of the pure technique of rendering for its own sake; with the critique of functionalism, pure abstraction, and the machine utopia, realms of experience up to now forbidden by the stern purism of modernism are opened up."⁶⁷³ Vidler saw the possibility for an unbiased history of nineteenth-century, as well as a critical history of twentieth-century architecture. "The exhibition emerged in fact as the Museum of Modern Arts's auto-critical act, exorcising in 1977 the Modern Movement principles it had so heartily embraced in 1932."⁶⁷⁴ In the end, however, even he had to admit that his high expectations had not been met. *Oppositions* 8 thus called for a new historiography of modernity beyond a mere reversal of the previous reading.

In accordance with his humanistic, largely affirmative, and at least in parts critical approach to architecture history, Vidler was ultimately concerned with a better understanding of the modern and thus also the post-modern mindset in architecture. "If we are indeed entering a period of post-modern sensibility, then a clear understanding of modernism should be thought, one that begins to establish the ontological bases of its project rather than one that repeats the ideological polemics of intentions." Linking theory, history, and practice, Vidler viewed *Oppositions* 8 as a critique of a purely aesthetic and ideologically inflected attempt at explaining the MoMA exhibition and advocated a differentiated view without simple attributions. "This issue of *Oppositions* has been developed as a counter to those kinds of historical interpretations of nineteenth century architecture that rest solely on stylistic or ideological models of explanation." His ultimate aim, nevertheless, was to examine the experience of modernity and the development of a metropolis like Paris on two levels: in terms of a new architecture of bourgeois

672 Anthony Vidler, "Introduction: Academicism: Modernism," *Oppositions* 8 (Spring 1977), 2–5.

673 Ibid., 2.

674 Ibid., 2.

society and the new discipline of urban planning, and of a literary and visual representation of the city that emerged along with it, thus opening up to the humanities. Curiously, in addition to his own essay on “The Idea of Type,” other contributions included literary scholar Peter Brooks’ “The Text of the City,” an essay on the invention of the nineteenth century by Honoré de Balzac, as well as urbanist Antoine Grumbach’s “The Promenades of Paris,” an essay on urban planning under Georges-Eugène Baron Haussmann. The essays in this issue were all about spaces, buildings, and processes that alluded to a nexus of bourgeoisie, architecture, and urban planning in nineteenth-century Paris, when liberalism and the emerging industrialization were increasingly gaining political prominence, and social change was upending established ways of behaving and thinking.

While Vidler was not able to accomplish everything he set out to do, he did succeed in conveying his main intention: that *Oppositions* 8 would provide not only a critique of the 1920s architectural avant-garde but also a better understanding of contemporary architectural practice.⁶⁷⁵ He concluded his introduction by saying that his main concern was not “to find a new orthodoxy, nor to chronicle the events of the past as accomplished, knowable facts.”⁶⁷⁶ For him, historiography had another, in the words of Michel Foucault, genealogical task: “Rather, we hope to encourage the investigation of the recent past as an instrument for the analysis and criticism of the present, not once more as a fulfillment of the ‘spirit of the age,’ but now as an aid to understanding the impossible contradictions of our own practice.” With such a critical understanding of historiography, Vidler complemented the approaches of *Oppositions* editors in terms of both methods and methodology, while Frampton and Gandelsonas were also interested in socio-political conditions. But although he cited Foucault’s post-structuralist, ultimately post-Marxist philosophy of history, be it indirectly or directly, Vidler did not necessarily share its analytics of power. Rather, with his own research on the work of Claude-Nicolas Ledoux, Vidler went back to the beginnings of architectural modernism and developed an urbanist perspective on the architectural problem of typology that would be further negotiated in later issues of *Oppositions*.⁶⁷⁷

675 Stern, 1999, 69. Ralph Stern took a more general view of Vidler’s approach to critical historiography.

676 Vidler, 1977, 5.

677 Anthony Vidler, “The Idea of Type,” *Oppositions* 8 (Spring 1977), 94–115; Quatremere de Quincy, “Type,” *Oppositions* 8 (Spring 1977), 146–150; Rafael Moneo, “On Typology,” *Oppositions* 13 (Summer 1978), 22–45; see also Anthony Vidler, “On Type,” *Skyline* (January 1979), 2; Anthony Vidler, “The ‘Art’ of History: Monumental Aesthetics from Winckelmann to Quatremere de Quincy,” *Oppositions* 25 (Fall 1982), 52–67.

Labor, Work and Publishing

At the end of April 1977, a year after signing the contract with MIT Press and shortly before the publication of *Oppositions* 8, the editors began planning the third volume.⁶⁷⁸ Issues 9 through 12 show that the Institute was continuing to work with a small circle of like-minded authors, making use of existing institutional, social, professional, and discursive networks. The slight delays to the publication of *Oppositions* 8 made it clear that the greatest difficulties were encountered in professionalizing the editorial work and financing the production. Income that had been firmly anticipated failed to materialize, not least because of the irregular publication schedule. After only three issues, MIT Press demanded that *Oppositions* be published quarterly as planned. The academic publisher was also concerned about economic efficiency; the circulation was therefore to be increased from 4,200 to 5,200 copies, starting with the third volume.⁶⁷⁹ At the same time, *Oppositions* editors announced an increase in sponsorship dues to US\$150 for individuals.⁶⁸⁰ Despite the freedom of content, there were some initial disagreements between the Institute and the publisher, for example when MIT Press was planning a book-bound collected edition of *Oppositions* 5 to 8 to generate additional revenue; the project ultimately failed because the Institute demanded complete control over the graphic design and selection of paper. After Frampton returned to the Institute in 1977, he and Eisenman managed the editorial work on *Oppositions* alone at times. It was mainly Eisenman who championed the journal's programmatic and organizational concerns and continuously promoted it;⁶⁸¹ characteristically, for example, he responded to MIT Press' rebuke to be more disciplined in the future by formulating a letter to the head of the university publishing house, Frank Urbanowski, complaining about a lack of cooperation and that he was not receiving enough complimentary copies.⁶⁸² He even threatened that the Institute would not cede any more donations in the future. Frampton, on the other hand, was responsible for the time-intensive editorial work and the labor that went into the production of each individual issue, working closely with Julia Bloomfield on a day-to-day basis; they also shared an office during this time. He proofread incoming manuscripts and researched images for accepted essays. While Frampton was responsible for the editorial of *Oppositions* 9 and regularly contributed texts

678 IAUS, minutes of editorial meeting, April 26, 1977. Source: CCA Montréal, IAUS fonds: C.1-1/2.

679 MIT Press, budget for *Oppositions*, n.d. Source: CCA Montréal, IAUS fonds: A.5-7.

680 IAUS, draft letter to sponsors, n.d. Source: CCA Montréal, IAUS fonds: A.5-7.

681 Originally, Eisenman had planned for *Oppositions* 10 to appear, for the sake of the congruence of numbers, on the occasion of the Institute's tenth anniversary in the fall of 1977. For a time, he also planned an ominous "Black Issue," which, according to a concept paper, was to be devoted to the two main themes of "structure" and "metaphor;" see Ockman, 1988, 193. Like so many of his ideas, this one was not realized either.

682 The Institute had received only forty copies of each of the issues of *Oppositions* 5, 6, 7 and 8.

of his own, Eisenman kept to the background, interpreting his role as editor as encouraging others to write introductions, comments, and postscripts to the contributions to keep the debate alive. Eisenman thus exerted a strong influence, both directly and indirectly, on what was to be published in *Oppositions*, especially through his Italophilia and personal affinity with Tafuri, Rossi, and others, such as the not uncontroversial Italian rationalist Giuseppe Terragni, by publishing documents and texts. Not only did Eisenman share his interest in Terragni with Tafuri, but he also published a provocative feature in *Oppositions* on the fascist architect as another representative of modernism.

In addition, Eisenman had been in constant dialogue with Roger Conover at MIT Press since 1976 about publishing books through the university's publishing house. Eisenman's long-planned Terragni monograph was to be the first publication; he had even signed a contract—not as an author, but in his capacity as Institute director.⁶⁸³ In addition, the Institute's application for an NEH Cultural Institution Grant in April 1977, which was primarily intended to raise funds for the continuation of the "Evening Program" and the transformation of the successful "Architecture" series into "Open Plan," already cited the production of *Open Plan Books* and *Documents* as a new publication series; despite the success of the application, however, this was ultimately not realized. At around the same time, Eisenman was also in conversation with Conover about another, longer-term publication project titled *Oppositions Books*. This was to be a book series of its own, meeting scholarly demands, in which the substantive emphases of *Oppositions*, the focus on the history of modernism and contemporary theory, as well as the editorial strategies of juxtaposing different positions were to be continued. Specifically, there were discussions about an English edition of Aldo Rossi's *L'architettura della città*, which at that time had already been translated into several languages, but not into English. As early as 1974, the Institute had offered MIT Press an English translation of *The Architecture of the City*, prepared by two former Research Associates, Victor Caliendo and Thomas Schumacher, who had previously worked on the "Streets Project" at the Institute, and their translation had even already been approved by the editorial board of the university's publishing house. However, due to personnel changes in management at MIT Press, the publication was postponed for an indefinite period. At the Institute, this long overdue title was now revisited, and other titles were later added to the list, with Rossi being built up, especially by Eisenman, as the Institute's central author, with the commission for a new manuscript for his *Scientific Autobiography*. In addition to international *Oppositions* authors, in particular Manfredo Tafuri, the editors, especially Kenneth Frampton and Anthony Vidler, were to be given an opportunity to publish here.

683 Apparently, MIT Press had already received 8,000 advance orders for Eisenman's *Terragni* monograph from a publisher in Europe in 1976.

Diverging Interests

By the third year of *Oppositions* at the latest, following *Oppositions* 7, the different interests of the individual editors were becoming increasingly apparent. This was particularly evident in the transatlantic dialogue with Europe as, on the one hand, texts by European theorists and historians were increasingly being published and, on the other, the origins of contemporary American architecture practice were repeatedly traced back to European modernism. In *Oppositions* 9 to 12, most of the texts in the “Theory” and “History” sections were written by architects and academics who taught at universities in North America and Europe, and in particular by historians at the IUAV; other authors were recruited from among the editors who had participated in the *Little Magazine Conference* in February 1977, especially from *Arquitecturas Bis*.⁶⁸⁴ In addition, the “Documents” section featured extensive reprints of materials on the architectural avant-garde of Europe in the 1920s and 1930s, especially from the USSR and Italy: by Sergei Eisenstein, for example, as well as Nikolai Punin, Aleksej Aleksejevic, Sidov, Giuseppe Terragni, Gruppo Sette, and the American architect William S. Huff, who studied and taught at the HfG Ulm. An archive of this size had previously been difficult to access in North America or had not been translated. Back in New York, Frampton subsequently proved to be a tireless asset to the continued publication of *Oppositions*. Between 1977 and 1980 alone, he published five book reviews of historiographical interest, e.g., by and about Alison and Peter Smithson, Reyner Banham, Nikolai Miliutin, L'Architecture Vivante, and Alvar Aalto. Contrary to the editors' original intention in establishing the “Oppositions” section, reviews of contemporary American architecture practice were now underrepresented in the journal. Apart from more reviews of architecture by Robert Venturi, Richard Meier, and Michael Graves, the editors were unable to agree on any other current projects that they considered to be worthy of criticism.

Clearly, *Oppositions* also made institutional policy by establishing certain conditions and limits, building relationships, and making omissions. One example is *Oppositions* 10, whose publication date was given as fall 1977, but which did not appear until the following year. This issue was largely devoted to a single architect, Philip Johnson. While Johnson had been a regular benefactor of the journal since its inception and had helped establish the Architects' Circle as the Institute's philanthropic network, he did not play a major role in the Institute until 1978, on Eisenman's initiative. *Oppositions* 10, therefore, was neither financially disinterested nor editorially neutral. In the “Oppositions” section, a text by Eisenman was published in advance, which was to become the introduction to a publication on Johnson's texts and which was adorned with numerous quotations

684 The essays in the “Theory” section were written by Jorge Silveti, Jacques Guillerme, Diana Agrest, and Alan Colquhoun; in the “History” section by Kurt Forster, Eric Dluhosch, Stanford Anderson, Manfredo Tafuri, Francesco Dal Co, and Sergio Polano.

from Johnson himself in bold print,⁶⁸⁵ it also featured an extensive interview that Eisenman and Vidler had conducted with Johnson, in which they above all gave the latter the opportunity to distance himself from the International Style of the earlier days and to make a plea for decoration and eclecticism.⁶⁸⁶ In the “Documents” section, numerous original drawings for the design of Johnson’s *Glass House* (1948) were published, with an introduction by Robert Stern.⁶⁸⁷ There was not even the most rudimentary attempt at a critical examination of the architect and his work, once postulated by the editors as the purpose of *Oppositions*. Instead, the journal served solely to celebrate the architect in several respects: first, because the issue represented an attempt to draw attention to arguably the most enigmatic, but also the most controversial exponent of post-modernism in the United States and to secure him one of the front seats in the history of American architecture by constant reporting on him across all their media formats and fostering a public and intellectual debate, and second, because the editors could thus gain Johnson’s favor, possibly also an increase in their own standing, and ultimately win him over for a further, larger commitment to the Institute. For it was clear to everyone that in the New York architecture world of the late 1970s, if you wanted to build big, there was no getting around Philip Johnson: he held all the strings. Not surprisingly, *Oppositions* 10 had the highest circulation in the history of the journal, with over 5,000 copies printed.

Another example of the strategies by which the Institute’s interests were furthered through the editorial design and policies of *Oppositions* was provided by the following, eleventh issue, whose publication date was given as winter 1977, but which did not appear until the end of 1978. The “Oppositions” section of this issue featured another seminal text by Tafuri, “Giuseppe Terragni: Subject and Mask,” originally commissioned by Eisenman as an introduction to his own book on Terragni.⁶⁸⁸ But with the publication of Eisenman’s monograph drastically delayed, Tafuri had initially published the text in Italian and English in an issue of the bilingual journal *Lotus International* under the title “From the archives of modern architecture.”⁶⁸⁹ The republication of the text in *Oppositions* increased

685 Peter Eisenman, “Behind the Mirror: On the Writings of Philip Johnson,” *Oppositions* 10 (Fall 1977), 1–13.

686 Philip Johnson, “Reflections. On Style and the International Style; On Postmodernism; On Architecture,” *Oppositions* 10 (Fall 1977), 15–19.

687 Robert Stern, “The Evolution of Philip Johnson’s Glass House, 1947–1948,” *Oppositions* 10 (Fall 1977), 56–67.

688 Manfredo Tafuri, “Giuseppe Terragni: Subject and ‘Mask,’” trans. Diane Ghirardo, *Oppositions* 11 (Winter 1977), 1–25.

689 Manfredo Tafuri, “Il Soggetto a la Maschera. Una introduzione a Terragni / Giuseppe Terragni: Subject and Mask,” *Lotus International*, no. 20 (September 1978), 5–31. After MIT Press had tried for some time to publish Eisenman’s *Terragni* monograph, the forthcoming publication was still announced in the academic publisher’s catalogue in the fall of 1979 but was eventually

its importance and that of its subject matter. Tafuri in turn used the text not only to showcase the development of individual projects in Terragni's oeuvre but to place his rationalist architecture in its historical context. In the contest between Eisenman and Tafuri for interpretative sovereignty, the Italian historian was critiquing a different Terragni from the one outlined by the American architect—or the one he had his students outline—to trace transformations in the design process, although Tafuri drew on the same vocabulary as Eisenman, albeit in a different semantic context. The version of the text published in *Oppositions* has been abridged and differs from the original in that the final paragraphs have been omitted. This omission may not have been due to spatial constraints, since it was possible to publish the text in full in *Lotus International*, but rather to the fact that it directly references Eisenman's book project. In the passage in question, Tafuri directly referred to Eisenman's way of reading Terragni—he called this “redesign”—and characterized him as the prototype of an American intellectual. Moreover, he criticized Eisenman and his questionable, clumsy practice as a theorist for approaching historical figures in his own, idiosyncratic way, entering into a dialogue, “and so to carry on transforming it, sectioning it, breaking it down and putting it together again.”⁶⁹⁰ Tafuri criticized Eisenman's formalism for being anti-historical and power-obsessed and described him as a master of simulation, who assembled remnants of modernist utopias in his own projects; he explicitly denied the accusation of being appropriated. Strikingly, when it was published in *Oppositions*, the essay appeared with an entirely new series of illustrations, largely from Eisenman's private archive: original drawings and photographs of Terragni's projects that Eisenman had found in the attic above the architect's studio in Como in the early 1960s during a Grand Tour of Italy he had undertaken with his former mentor Colin Rowe.⁶⁹¹

The publication date of *Oppositions* 11 suggests that it appeared before the *Lotus International* issue—a crucial point in architecture historiography, which is concerned with originality and creativity even more than ambiguity and contextuality. The publication dates indicated on the cover, which were intended to preserve the illusion of regularity, took on a quality all of their own, both in institutional and discursive terms. For an architecture history of journal-making, it is

withdrawn from the program. Eisenman moved the book project, along with all the other Institute publications, to Rizzoli International; Conover did not hear of this until after the fact; see Peter Eisenman, *Giuseppe Terragni. Transformations, Decompositions, Critiques* (New York: Monacelli Press, 2003).

690 Tafuri, 1978, 29.

691 In an interview, Eisenman once stated that he had personally taken the documents published in *Oppositions*, which increase the significance of the essay, out of Italy in his Volkswagen; see Peter Eisenman (interview with Louis Martin), August 15, 2000, 19. Source: CCA Montréal, Oral History Project. Eisenman's story can be understood as another assertion of authorship, but could also be examined in terms of ownership, giving *Oppositions* 11 its own significance in terms of a debate about “evidence” and “narrative.”

significant that from 1977 to 1980, despite Frampton and Bloomfield's best efforts, *Oppositions* ultimately only fulfilled its contractual obligations to the publisher to a limited extent. The editorial team was producing two to three issues a year and was by now more than a year behind schedule, which was increasingly becoming both a financial and a legal problem as commitments to subscribers and sponsors were made and issues and revenue failed to materialize, causing growing irritation, more so at MIT Press than at the Institute. To advance and diversify the editorial work, Frampton invited the Swiss architecture historian Kurt Forster, who after Yale University was now teaching at Stanford, to join the journal as its fifth editor, starting with *Oppositions* 12. Forster was no stranger to the Institute, as he had previously contributed an essay to *Oppositions* 9. Moreover, in 1978 he had commissioned Eisenman with *House 11a*, another paper architecture project, which was submitted to a competition announced by *Progressive Architecture* but not seriously pursued as a building project thereafter. At *Oppositions*, Foster was primarily responsible for German-language manuscripts, but he was far from enough of a regular at the Institute to make an impact.⁶⁹²

In general, by importing theory, history, and criticism as well as documents, and by circulating, valorizing, attributing, and appropriating knowledge, *Oppositions* certainly introduced a new corpus of texts into the American architecture debate and beyond, and on top of that, influenced the formation of a canon in architecture education. *Oppositions'* readers—primarily architects, students, and teachers—were introduced to approaches such as social theory and the critical philosophy of the Frankfurt School as well as French theory, poststructuralism, and deconstruction. Ultimately, only the English translation of Theodor W. Adorno's lecture "Functionalism Today" was published in *Oppositions* 17. Yet, even if the journal did not publish a single text by French authors like Michel Foucault, Jacques Derrida, or Roland Barthes (unlike *October*, but also *Skyline*), who were very much in vogue in North America at the time, especially in the arts and the humanities, their ideas were nevertheless quoted and cited there extensively, and appropriated by its authors, including Eisenman, Gandelsonas, Agrest, and Vidler, etc.⁶⁹³ The fact that the readability of the philosophically and ideologically deliberative texts ranged from difficult

692 Potential textual contributions were discussed by the editorial staff, but in most cases rejected: Wolfgang Peht and Tillmann Buddensieg, and more specifically Stanislaus von Moos ("Synthesis and Utopia"), Werner Oechsli ("The Age of Philip Johnson," "New York's Projected Monument of Postmodernism," "Piranesi"), and Vittorio Lampugnani ("Die eigenwillige Muse," "Karlsruhe").

693 *Oppositions* editors also considered publishing texts by Roland Barthes, as well as Walter Benjamin and Martin Heidegger. The impact of the reception of European authors on academic and architecture debates can only be imagined and, at best, be measured by the publication of texts and footnotes. Meredith TenHoor once studied quotes and citations from authors associated with "French Theory" in *Oppositions* as part of the *Clip Stamp Fold* project.

to almost incomprehensible was not only due to poor translations, but can also only be explained, if only to a limited extent, by the fact that the introduction and establishment of new thinking, methods, and concepts is often paralleled by incomprehension. One thing is certain: over the years, the overall focus of *Oppositions* shifted more and more in the direction of historiography, not least due to the individual commitment and availability of its editors.⁶⁹⁴ There was a strong focus on architecture from the Western world, from North America and Europe, and to some degree from Latin America and Japan, due to the editors' personal interests and biographical ties. Despite the geographies covered worldwide, and the critique of orientalism, i.e., of Western historical, cultural, and political perceptions of the East, propounded by Edward Said at the time, *Oppositions* and later *Oppositions Books* attest to the fact that the Institute did not attempt to write global architecture history or did so only to a limited extent.

4.2 Expanding the Portfolio

From 1978, at a time when the Institute's educational, cultural, and publishing work was increasingly shaped by an entrepreneurial spirit, the public programs endowed with a large budget based on funding from the National Endowment for the Humanities (NEH) were expanded, the "Exhibitions Program" was professionalized with funds from public and private foundations—especially the National Endowment for the Arts (NEA)—and the Fellow's text and editorial work was also stepped up. After *Oppositions* and *October*, further publication formats were planned, edited, produced, and published at the Institute by independent editorial teams. Taking advantage of synergies and networking actors, these new formats fit perfectly into the institutional identity of the Institute, both in terms of their aesthetics and their rhetoric and poetics. April 1978 thus saw the launch of the tabloid-like monthly architecture newspaper *Skyline*, edited for the first two years by Andrew MacNair who previously had been in charge of organizing the Institute's lecture series and exhibitions. *Skyline* was a much more popular format than *Oppositions*, with reviews and interviews that had not existed before in this form, and most importantly offered a calendar of events for New York's burgeoning architecture and design scene that also promoted the Institute's public events. In December 1978, the IAUS Exhibition Catalogues were launched with Kenneth Frampton as editor and Silvia Kolbowski as managing editor. Most of the exhibitions at the Institute were documented, archived, and catalogued in this series, with extensive material and accompanying essays. Soon, the exhibition catalogues became a product in their own right and additionally served to cross-finance the exhibition

694 Ockman, 1988.

operations as well as the Institute. Also in 1978, the first concrete plans began for the *Oppositions Books* series, with Eisenman and Frampton as editors-in-chief and Lindsay Stamm Shapiro as managing editor, but this had to wait and was not actually published until several years later. With *Oppositions Books*, the Institute aimed to publish translations of classics of architectural modernism, as well as key contemporary European works on theory and historiography, collections of essays by eminent contemporary American theorists and historians, and monographs by American architects, and make them available to a broad readership in an elaborately, even luxuriously designed large format. If *Oppositions* continued to be conceived and perceived as the Fellows' main outlet, its primacy was nevertheless eroded by the fact that it no longer was the Institute's only publication. As a result of this reorientation, modification, differentiation, and diversification, the Institute increasingly entered the American publication market, which until then had been clearly structured in the architecture segment by commercial publishers. As part of a larger discursive, institutional, cultural, and political strategy, the Institute's new publications were nevertheless independent productions that, depending on their format, assumed specific functions in education and debate, and in culture in general. In this way, whether directly or at least indirectly, the Institute contributed to expanding the market for architecture publications in the late 1970s and early 1980s with books on architecture, some of which were of quite high quality. With MIT Press and the New York office of Oxford University Press, the university presses also participated in this expansion on the East Coast, as did Rizzoli International as the Institute's commercial publisher and the recently founded, privately owned Princeton Architectural Press.

Initially, MIT Press remained Eisenman's first point of contact as Institute director, so that for a time the academic publisher marketed, advertised, and sold almost all of the Institute's print products.⁶⁹⁵ In 1978, after years of waiting, MIT Press released another of the Institute's publications, the long-announced *On Streets*, for which Stanford Anderson, still a Fellow at the Institute since 1970, was editorially responsible.⁶⁹⁶ *On Streets* became the Institute's first major book project, a comprehensive collection of essays on the subject of the urban street, dating back to the Institute's "Streets Project" (1970–1972), which had been commissioned by the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development. Originally conceived (and paid for) as a catalogue for a planned exhibition at MoMA that never materialized, the publication testified to the Institute's long-forgotten aspirations to produce new knowledge through its own research projects. The book included both historical and theoretical contributions by Fellows and

695 MIT Press had contracted *October* (from 1978) and the IAUS Exhibition Catalogues (1979) following *Oppositions* (1976). In addition, the university publisher eventually published *Oppositions Books* (1982).

696 Stanford Anderson, ed., *On Streets* (Cambridge: MIT Press, 1978).

Visiting Fellows, in addition to Anderson's own study, essays by Joseph Rykwert, Anthony Vidler, William Ellis, Peter Wolf, Diana Agrest, Robert Gutman, and Kenneth Frampton, as well as Research Associates Thomas Schumacher, Victor Caliendo, and Thomas Czarnowski. In addition, there were two specially commissioned guest essays by Gloria Levitas and Gary Winkel, one from an anthropological and the other from a sociological perspective, underscoring the interdisciplinary nature of the project. Here, the Institute finally published its almost historic, rather than applied, research on the revitalization of downtown Binghamton, NY, as well as Eisenman's design of two prototypes of a townhouse. By the time it was published, Anderson as editor for the Institute did not want *On Streets* to be understood in any way as a handbook, but as a genuinely scholarly publication.⁶⁹⁷ Nevertheless, the texts represented for the most part the state-of-the-art American research on the subject of streets, street design, street culture, etc. in all their complexity; although in the end, Anderson himself had to admit that some of the contributions had already become outdated due to the long lead time. After the 1972 publication of *Learning from Las Vegas* by Robert Venturi, Denise Scott Brown and Steven Izenour, the American city was a hot topic in the architecture debate and architecture education on the East Coast.⁶⁹⁸ With *On Streets*, which was less semiotic and cultural and much more anthropological and sociological, but ultimately formal, the Institute found itself in good company. In 1979, MIT Press also published *The American City. From Civil War to the New Deal*, a research edition, which had been compiled in the early 1970s by IUAV historians Giorgio Ciucci, Francesco Dal Co, Mario Manieri-Elia, and Manfredo Tafuri and was now available for the first time in an English translation.⁶⁹⁹ However, compared with Rem Koolhaas' 1978 monograph *Delirious New York*, which he had researched at the Institute and produced with Eisenman's support, the Institute's publication seemed to have appeared at the wrong time, getting neither the same attention nor, most importantly, any more follow-up commissions for urban renewal projects.⁷⁰⁰

From 1978, with the expansion of its publication apparatus, the top floor office studios in the Institute's penthouse were transformed into proper writing and editorial offices within a short space of time. With *Oppositions* and

697 Stanford Anderson, "Preface," in *On Streets*, ed. Stanford Anderson (Cambridge: MIT Press, 1978), VII–VIII.

698 Robert Venturi, Denise Scott Brown, and Steven Izenour, eds., *Learning from Las Vegas* (Cambridge: MIT Press, 1972); Martino Stierli, *Las Vegas im Rückspiegel. Die Stadt in Theorie, Fotografie und Film* (Zurich: gta Verlag, 2010).

699 Giorgio Ciucci, Francesco Dal Co, Mario Manieri-Elia, Manfredo Tafuri, eds., *The American City. From the Civil War to the New Deal*, trans. Barbara Luigia La Penta (Cambridge: MIT Press, [1973] 1979).

700 Koolhaas, 1978. Legend has it that the publication was made possible by a generous financial injection of US\$ 10,000 from Philip Johnson, arranged by Eisenman.

October under contract, *Skyline* and the IAUS Exhibition Catalogues were initially self-published. As before, the editorial work was governed by the principle of self-exploitation. Because of the different text formats and editorial processes, from both an institutional and discursive perspective, the individual productions were defined by the complex networks: the productive but not always conflict-free collaborations and relationships between the Institute, the editors, editorial staff, the authors, translators, graphic designers, and potentially publishers, not to mention the readers. In addition to the creativity and intellectuality of its editors and authors, writing, editing, and ultimately publishing were always also about pursuing interests and realizing power strategies. It was more important for Eisenman, who exercised and enjoyed the rights, privileges, and benefits of Institute director, than for others to find suitable solutions for the Institute's publishing project with academic and later with commercial publishers. Eisenman maintained that after the Institute's tenth anniversary "major emphasis will be placed on the generation of critical and theoretical work."⁷⁰¹ For him, *Oppositions* and *October* remained the top priority as the Institute's "original" publications, and both journals remained exempt from overheads for IAUS Central. Yet the differentiation and diversification of the print products introduced new text formats and new visual and linguistic styles into architecture culture as particular forms of knowledge: on the one hand, the zeitgeisty star interview, previously celebrated in the art scene by Andy Warhol and *Interview Magazine*, and the literary book review, otherwise perfected by the *New York Review of Books*, mixed with current hype and gossip and garnished with sensationalist portrait photographs in *Skyline*, and on the other hand, the monographic essay on current projects and positions, like a work documentation of postmodernism rather than modernism, extensively illustrated with drawings and critically annotated in the IAUS Exhibition Catalogues. In light of the transformations in both the journal and book market and the art market, the Institute's entire publication portfolio vacillated not only between theory production and historiography, quality, and tabloid journalism, but also between acquisition, public relations, and marketing. The fact that network and mediation effects now played an increasingly important role, in addition to discourse production, was reflected in the Institute's new image brochure, produced at the end of 1978, where all the publications were subsumed under "Public Programs."⁷⁰² The buzzword Eisenman used was the "public environment," since the urban public in America was increasingly changing in the 1970s, as was the Institute's readership.⁷⁰³ By combining quite different reaches and target audiences with its various publication formats, the Institute

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

702 IAUS brochure, 1978. Source: CCA Montréal, IAUS fonds: C.3-2.

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

expanded its sphere of influence and scope. With its expanded text and editorial work, the Institute as an educational and cultural institution propelled itself into a veritable monopoly position as gatekeeper or taste-maker in terms of the dissemination of not just information, but certain postmodern thinking styles and aesthetic *dispositifs* by celebrating cutting-edge and pioneering architects and building practices in its journals and newspaper, its exhibition catalogues and book series, while simultaneously promoting the circulation of ideas and criticism. A comparative reading of its publications—*Oppositions*, *October*, *Skyline*, IAUS Exhibition Catalogues, and *Oppositions Books*—shows that parallel developments of the Institute as an educational and cultural institution were characteristic of its success and responsible for its long-term legacy: the interplay of knowledge and cultural production and their dissemination, the openness towards other disciplines, art, and theory, such as the humanities, cultural studies, and social sciences, and the transatlantic, even global, dialogue with architects, theorists, historians, and critics. It was these three qualities that, according to Eisenman in his 1977 position paper, made the Institute stand out as a “cultural resource.”⁷⁰⁴

October

The fifth issue of *October*, the first issue published by MIT Press in the summer of 1978, was a special issue on photography, with articles by Rosalind Krauss, Douglas Crimp, and Craig Owens, among others, as well as Humbert Damisch and Hollis Frampton. The contract between the two editors-in-chief and the publisher, which was signed on June 19 and 22, 1978, crossed the desk of Eisenman, who contributed significantly to the wording and content with many handwritten corrections.⁷⁰⁵ The agreement secured professional production and distribution and, in return, committed the editors to a quarterly production schedule, similar to that of *Oppositions*. According to the contract, the two editors-in-chief waived their salaries until a circulation of 6,000 copies was reached. There were also changes at MIT Press, where Ann Reinke, as head of the journal department, was now responsible for both *Oppositions* and *October*; Institute’s catalogue series also fell under her purview shortly thereafter, making her the point of contact at the academic publisher for nearly all of the Institute’s publications. One of the reasons that *October* was able to operate as a financially independent production was that the Institute received a US \$10,000 grant from the NEA for *October* in 1978–79, which was explicitly to be used for authors’ fees and translation costs. Although no longer officially published by MIT Press, *October* remained part of the Institute’s publication portfolio

704 Ibid.

705 Frank Urbanowski, letter to Peter Eisenman (including the contract between the Institute, MIT Press, and *October* editors), July 21, 1978. Source: CCA Montréal, IAUS fonds: A.5-9 / ARCH401775.

and was also listed in the IAUS brochure produced for promotional and fund-raising purposes. When Crimp was promoted to managing editor with issue 7 in the winter of 1978, he was given a permanent position with an annual salary of US\$8,000 and took over much of the editorial work, to which he made some substantial contributions. Soon the journal was no longer made at the Institute, but largely out of Crimp's apartment in downtown Manhattan, for private and professional reasons. For the Institute, its policies and practices, despite their reliance on theories of deconstruction and poststructuralism, were anything but versed in identity politics or discourses of sexuality and gender, and while the women among the Fellows and editorial staff were beginning to organize, analyzing and critiquing gender hierarchies and associated power structures, the identity models, gender constructs, and sexual orientations at the Institute were still largely based on traditional norms.

Compared to *Oppositions* and the Institute's other publications that were being developed at the time, *October* took a different editorial line, not only through its thematic focus but also in terms of the associated socio-political agenda. *October* 7 (winter 1978) was another special issue on "A Soviet Revolutionary Culture," edited by Annette Michelson, with one of her few written contributions. Ultimately, *October* remained primarily Krauss's project, as Michelson was mostly abroad at the time, which affected their working relationship and was a topic of conversation at the Institute when Krauss wrote to Eisenman in the spring of 1978 to complain that all the editorial work was falling to her. Eventually, Craig Owens joined *October* as associate editor. Owens, another of Krauss's students, had previously published contributions on performance and photography in the journal, had been an editor of *Skyline* in 1978, and had contributed exhibition reviews and other texts.⁷⁰⁶ From 1979 to 1981, Owens, who was personally interested in a theory of signs, oversaw the production of several issues and during this time published a two-part essay, "The Allegorical Impulse," in *October* 12 and 13. Based on a review of artworks by Robert Smithson, the essay lays the foundations for a theory of postmodernism in art.⁷⁰⁷ Ultimately, however, these structural and organizational changes in the *October* editorial team, which also affected its history and program, did not bring the hoped-for success, and the journal remained a loss-making business. Institutional documents show that in the fiscal years 1978–79 and 1979–80, *October* made heavy losses, with total liabilities exceeding US\$70,000. Despite the professional production through MIT Press and the institutional footing at the Institute, the journal continued to be a low-budget project, given

706 Craig Owens, "Einstein on the Beach. The Primacy of Metaphor," *October* 4 (Fall 1977), 21–32; "Photography en abyme," *October* 5, (Summer, 1978) 73–88

707 Craig Owens, "The Allegorical Impulse," *October* 12 (Spring, 1980), 7–86; "The Allegorical Impulse. Part 2," *October* 13 (Summer, 1980), 58–80, see also Anders Stephanson, "Interview with Craig Owens," *Social Text*, no. 27 (1990), 55–71.

a circulation of just 1,300 copies as well as the handling of editorial salaries and authors' fees. The editors pointed the finger at MIT Press since the university's publishing house had apparently neglected to advertise or market the journal ever since the contract was signed. By the end of 1979, no contract had been signed for distribution and sales at newsstands or bookstores, and *October* was not distributed in Europe at all. But even at the Institute, print products were not treated equally. Krauss now officially complained to Eisenman because, unlike *Oppositions*, *October* was fulfilling its contract with MIT Press and producing four issues a year. To emphasize her point, she explained how *October* received a grant from the New York State Council on the Arts because it was considered the best small magazine in the United States, but at the same time she called it the "best-kept publishing secret." For four consecutive years, the editors were awarded a grant from the NEA, even receiving the maximum amount of US\$15,000 in 1980; however, this could only reduce, not offset, the losses incurred in producing the journal.

Skyline

With the publication of *Skyline* in April 1978, the Institute entered new publishing territory. The monthly architecture newspaper, run by Andrew MacNair as editor from 1978 to 1980 and initially self-published with a circulation of five hundred copies, provided information about current cultural events, new buildings, and interesting people. Somewhat directly related to the Institute's expansion into a cultural institution, now competing not just with the programming at The Architecture League, but also exhibitions at MoMA, the new Architecture Room at P.S.1, and the commercial galleries specializing in architecture, *Skyline* was conceived as a more popular format to complement the two academic journals, *Oppositions* and *October*. *Skyline*, intended to be institutional rather than discursive, was initially designed as a letter-sized pamphlet that could contain double pages with event notices, further information, and a few illustrations based on a three-column grid; the League's postal newsletter may have served as a model. An initial mock-up model suggested that *Skyline* could have originally been typewritten, which promised time-efficient and cost-effective production in line with MacNair's DIY approach. Roles had yet to be assigned, and were approached in a playful rather than competitive manner: MacNair was initially listed as *Skyline*'s director, his assistant Mimi Shanley as managing editor, and Kenneth Frampton as editor in charge to ensure respectability and credibility.⁷⁰⁸ When the Institute was awarded a one-time US\$10,000 production grant from the New York Council on the Arts (NYSCA) for a calendar of events in the spring of 1978, the concept was quickly expanded, and *Skyline* was made into a tabloid format, again with Vignelli's help. In the newspaper,

708 In the first issue of *Skyline*, MacNair first gave himself the title "director," which was subsequently changed to "editor."

the calendar was now designed as a center fold with a double-page monthly overview of dates, initially exclusively in New York, which could be removed and hung up as a poster. Vignelli's approach and the established graphic identity, applied here to his preferred format, made the newspaper clearly identifiable to readers as printed matter from the Institute.⁷⁰⁹ *Skyline's* straightforward modernist layout, again based on a three-column grid, also meant that the newspaper could be set by hand by the editorial team themselves. In addition to the black title lettering, which was designed as a logotype in tightly set, boldly printed sans-serif black capital letters to recall the real Manhattan skyline, the black bar became the newspaper's most recognizable trademark. The horizontal bar, which originated from the paper's institutional identity, was designed as an eye-catcher, structuring not only all the information on the front page but also the calendar of events as an actual grid. On the single pages, too, the bar as a graphic element functioned both aesthetically and formally to organize the content: as a tab for all the texts and illustrations, large-scale photographs and architectural drawings, while also allowing for white spaces.

In view of the existing difficulties in producing *Oppositions* as well as *October* even four times a year, *Skyline* as a monthly tabloid was an extremely ambitious project at the Institute. The newspaper necessitated the development and testing of new publishing practices and organizational structures that allowed for much faster production, printing, distribution, and sales than had previously been the norm. Graphically, *Skyline* was laid out like a broadsheet tabloid with large, attention-grabbing headlines on the front page. The first issue had just eight pages and was built around a double-page calendar that listed cultural events in New York that were of interest to architects and designers, notably including Institute events. *Skyline* was a print publication produced to cross-promote events at the Institute—lecture series, “Open Plan” events, and exhibitions—in order to attract an ever-larger audience for the growing “Public Programs.” The editorial of the very first issue, which was not signed, set the agenda and provided information about the functions of the newspaper and the ambitions of its editors: “*Skyline* is both a central information file for upcoming exhibitions, lectures, symposia, and publications and a platform for critical opinion about the events of the recent past. Thus, it should become an index to the condition, spirit, and direction of architecture.”⁷¹⁰ While initially limited to New York, the newspaper was soon to expand geographically to cover the entire USA.

709 In our oral history interview, Vignelli highlighted that *Skyline* marked his return to the starting point of his career, newspaper design, in his view the supreme discipline in graphic design. For him, *Skyline*, was the most rewarding graphic job, compared to the other formats: the journal and the book.

710 Andrew MacNair, “Editorial,” *Skyline* 1, no. 1 (April 1978), 2.

As a tabloid newspaper available on newsstands and in selected stores, as well as by subscription at a price of US\$1, *Skyline* differed fundamentally from *Oppositions* in terms of aspirations and quality; the newspaper was in fact the diametric opposite of the journal in terms of form and content. For the *Skyline* editors, it was not about an international debate characterized by the juxtaposition of different positions. Instead, *Skyline* provided the Institute with a pluralism of listings, features, gossip, and hype, i.e., stories focusing on the human aspect. It was primarily a PR tool to report on people and events, with architecture coming only third place. “Today, there are more exhibitions with architectural themes than ever, and the teaching and study of architecture have been infused with new energy. The proliferation of the written word about architecture testifies to its popularity; new articles, magazines, books, and encyclopedias appear daily.”⁷¹¹ So while *Oppositions* stood for complex, intellectual topics and text-heaviness, *Skyline*, with its loud yet undogmatic approach, was the first architecture newspaper of its kind in the United States to advocate for a quickly written architecture journalism that was less serious in tone. “*Skyline* of course enters into this discursive mainstream. But it does so responsively and respondingly. Its hope is that, by channeling a mass of uncatalogued material through a central file, the significance of that material will become more apparent.”⁷¹² The *Skyline* editorial team, not least because of MacNair’s playful approach, flirting with a certain kind of punk attitude, worked with a mostly refreshing but not always reliable mixture of actionism and dilettantism. This suited the zeitgeist in New York, where the alternative art and architecture scene, which had been given a new location in 1976 with P.S.1 in Queens, was just experiencing a peak, paralleling the subversive youth and music culture, and especially punk. In its discursive, cultural, social, and institutional function, *Skyline*, as *The New York Architecture and Design Calendar* (the newspaper’s subheading), can—from an architecture history perspective—be read as a chronicle of the architecture and design culture of those years, at least as it was perceived from the perspective of the Institute (and also a chronicle of the Institute at that time), on the one hand, and on the other hand, as a specific mechanism for the constitution of a particular architecture and design scene.

As editor, financed by the NYSCA grant, with a small staff, and initially without many constraints and pressures, MacNair produced four pilot issues from April to August 1978, experimenting with the format and trying out various forms of editorial work. The editorial team included Craig Owens as second editor alongside MacNair for the first year, who contributed his expertise in the arts before joining *October* full-time in 1979, and Pilar Viladas, who served as *Skyline*’s managing editor for the first three issues and later went on to pursue

711 Ibid.

712 Ibid.

a career in journalism. In addition, two graphic designers from Vignelli's office, Lorraine Wild as an assistant and Jessica Helfant as an intern, helped design the issues; Vignelli then merely gave the go-ahead for printing. To build readership, the pilot issues were initially distributed free of charge throughout the New York metropolitan area. *Skyline* was printed just around the corner, within walking distance of the Institute, at Jae Kim Printing Company on 39th Street, which facilitated quick production. At first, William Eitner oversaw production; Brian Kay handled shipping and advertising. The format, distribution, and production met with success so in September 1978 *Skyline* began with a more or less regular production with up to ten issues per year, which had to compete on the market. In the first year, *Skyline* was largely financed by subscriptions. While MacNair and Owens contributed reviews and interviews, other articles—more news stories than academic writing—were written by Fellows and friends. MacNair produced primarily with staff from his circle of friends and acquaintances; as he repeatedly brought in new people during his time as editor-in-chief, personal continuity was thus only achieved for a few issues at a time. Professional distribution now made it possible for the architecture newspaper to be available for purchase in bookstores nationwide, drawing attention to the Institute and the local architecture and design scene. One of the merits of *Skyline* was that it featured emerging architects, thereby shaping what contemporary positions of architectural postmodernism were deemed relevant. However, the editors more than once had problems getting *Skyline* published on time at the beginning of the month, which had a negative impact on its function as a calendar of events and the Institute as host.

Since as a newspaper it displayed more creativity than intellectuality, with a focus on entertainment value rather than educational value, in addition to the novelty value of the calendar of events, *Skyline* mainly published smaller articles on topics relevant to architecture and design; in addition to exhibition and book reviews, these included, for example, articles on film sets and restaurant architecture, local cultural events in the arts, such as the New York Film and Theater Festival, or the latest postmodern trends in architecture. It was not until the editorial for the one-year anniversary appeared in April 1979 that the editors officially rejected the assumption that the title “Skyline” actually referred to Lewis Mumford's column in *The New Yorker* of the same name, published until 1963, in which the architecture critic discussed individual buildings or larger developments, and thus also to his criticism of architectural modernism; apparently they had been frequently asked about this and now felt compelled to issue a denial.⁷¹³ Nevertheless, from the outset, *Skyline* advocated for a broad notion of architecture

713 Donald Miller, *Lewis Mumford. A Life* (New York: Weidenfeld & Nicholson, 1989).

and encouraged a pluralistic view of contemporary architecture culture.⁷¹⁴ The “Skylights” section on the last page, for example, was initially a central column featuring short, sometimes polemical texts about events listed in the “Calendar” section or special cultural events and activities in Manhattan. While *Oppositions* increasingly involved professors of history and theory, rather than practicing architects, *Skyline*’s editorial policy was nowhere near as elitist or competitive in terms of the selection of authors and topics. However, just like the journal, the newspaper served a new economy of attention in architecture, popular and comprehensive, without regard to the already established positions. *Skyline* developed and distinguished itself mainly through two text formats: first, rather light interviews in the style of Warhol’s booming lifestyle magazine *Interview Magazine*, which was launched in 1969 and which aimed to offer insights into the scene through its frequently unedited interviews with glamorous figures of the New York art world, and second, comparatively serious book and exhibition reviews, for which, like the “Reviews, Letters, Forum” section in *Oppositions*, the prestigious literary magazine *The New York Review of Books* once again served as a model. *Skyline* was clearly designed for light reading, even though the newspaper’s readership was primarily a rather select circle, especially of local architects and designers, with a strong interest in the cultural life of the city.

Both Fellows and Visiting Fellows of the Institute, as well as experienced architecture critics, contributed to the first issues of *Skyline* with sometimes polemical, sometimes challenging texts. These also included the *Oppositions* editors, as well as the newspaper’s two editors MacNair and Owens. While MacNair wrote about architecture exhibitions, Owens was responsible for art exhibitions. Exhibition reviews were also published, some of them quite inflammatory, even of the Institute’s own events. For example, the exhibition “Projects, Sets, Arcadias,” curated by Archigram members Peter Cook and Ron Herron at the Institute in 1978, was reviewed in the August issue with two texts by Reyner Banham and Livio Dimitriu.⁷¹⁵ Frampton penned several exhibition reviews, while at the same time almost single-handedly managing the *Oppositions* editorial office, launching the catalogue series, and, on top of that, heading the editorial office of *Oppositions Books* together with Eisenman.⁷¹⁶ Eisenman contributed two short texts to the pilot issues of *Skyline* in 1978. Under the pseudonym Ernesto di Casarotta—an allusion to Ernesto Rogers, the former editor

714 Patrick Pinnell, “Editorial,” *Skyline* (April 1979), 2. On Lewis Mumford’s column in *The New Yorker*, see Robert Wojtowicz, ed., *Sidewalk Critic. Lewis Mumford’s Writings on New York* (New York: Princeton Architectural Press, 2000); see also Herbert Muschamp, “Sidewalk Critic. Lewis Mumford’s Writings on New York,” *Art Forum* (April 1999), 19–20.

715 Reyner Banham and Livio Dimitriu, “Peter Cook/Ron Herron: Arcadias/Insertions,” *Skyline* (August 1978), 3.

716 Kenneth Frampton, “Drawings by Le Corbusier at the MoMA,” *Skyline* (April 1978), 2; “Iceberg,” *Skyline* (September 1979), 5; “Stellar Material: Eileen Gray at the Modern,” *Skyline* (March 1980), 3.

(1953–1965) of the Italian *Casabella*—and mimicking the jargon of a sports reporter, he wrote about the relationship between the Institute and the IUAV on the one hand, and on the other hand, about the team of New York architects around Philip Johnson, to which he himself belonged.⁷¹⁷ As sociograms of the architecture field, described from the point of view of one of the protagonists (albeit under the protection of a pseudonym), these emotionalized texts demonstrate not only Eisenman's interest in gossip but also his strategic approach to acquiring and maintaining power, reordering the field without much ideological commitment, and inscribing himself without much affective involvement. The articles published in *Skyline* in general, and Eisenman's texts in particular, thus provide a good example and resource for a relational and network analysis of the dynamics of groups, organizations, and institutions. Even though *Skyline* clearly set itself apart from the Institute in its masthead, the Institute's interests and strategies were repeatedly reflected in its pages. For example, the May 1978 issue included a major interview with Philip Johnson, who was being systematically courted by Eisenman as an architect and as Institute director. With the publication of this interview, Johnson was given the opportunity to present and explain his design of the AT&T Building in detail at a time when the plans had just been made public. Then, when an exhibition of models and drawings of this postmodern skyscraper, the first to be built in New York after the financial and fiscal crisis, was presented at the Institute in the fall of 1978, *Skyline* issued several articles in advance and ensured that Johnson again became a topic of conversation. Finally, in the October 1978 issue, photographs of Johnson at the Institute were published. Using these tactics of familiarization, personalization, and scandalization, *Skyline* mixed information and entertainment, provided talking points, and advertised specific architecture firms.

Apart from that, *Skyline* also made a name for itself as a publishing platform for young authors; in the first year alone, almost sixty different authors contributed texts to the newspaper.⁷¹⁸ In addition to the editors, Livio Dimitriu, Lars Lerup, Herbert Muschamp, and Michael Sorkin published regularly in *Skyline*.⁷¹⁹ Moreover, *Skyline* provided young savages such as Rem Koolhaas or Bernard Tschumi, who had both spent a year at the Institute as Visiting Fellows in the mid-1970s, with another publishing opportunity after sporadic contributions to

717 Peter Eisenman [Ernesto di Casarotta, pseud.], "The Sound of Leather," *Skyline* (May 1978), 7; "Quarta Roma: Report from Rome," *Skyline* (August 1978), 6.

718 *Skyline*, (April 1979), 2.

719 Livio Dimitriu, "Report from Syracuse," *Skyline* (May 1978), 3; "Peter Cook/Ron Herron: Arcadias/Insertions," *Skyline* (August 1978), 3; "Swiss Transmissions and Exaggerations: An Interview with Mario Botta," *Skyline* (March 1980), 12–13; see Lars Lerup, "Gunnar Asplund," *Skyline* (September 1978), 4; "Report from San Francisco," *Skyline* (November 1978), 9; "Apropos Type: Patrick Henry Bruce and Aldo Rossi," *Skyline* (October 1979), 6; see Herbert Muschamp, "The Universal Style," *Skyline* (February 1980), 14–15; see Michael Sorkin, "Hollywood Matter," *Skyline* (September 1978), 9; "Cloning People," *Skyline* (November 1978), 11.

Oppositions. Koolhaas, for example, not only lobbied for the preservation of the landmarked hall in the Rockefeller Center in the “Skylights” section of the pilot issue in April 1978 under the title “The Birth of Radio City Hall,” but in doing so advertised his book *Delirious New York*.⁷²⁰ Tschumi, on the other hand, published the “Architectural Manifestos,” his most current projects, in *Skyline*, as well as the “Manhattan Transcripts,” and some of his Follies were also reported on there.⁷²¹ The two Italians Massimo Scolari and Giorgio Ciucci from the IUAV, who were guests at the Institute in the fall semester of 1978, also contributed their own drawings and texts to *Skyline*. Thus, *Skyline* could be read at any time as a reflection of the Institute’s network at that particular moment, profiting from the resulting social and cultural capital. The Institute’s transformation into a powerful cultural institution, its shift towards the establishment, and more than that, its transformation into a fashionable postmodern salon, expanding its sphere of influence with the “National Architecture Exchange” and variations on the “New Wave” series: all of these were accompanied by and accomplished through *Skyline*.

When the performance of *Skyline* was evaluated internally in early 1979, it was criticized for trying to come across as too intellectual and at the same time for not yet having found its own voice. Nevertheless, the publication of an architecture newspaper with its own calendar of events made the Institute less dependent on event announcements in *The New York Times* or the weekly neighborhood newspapers such as *The Village Voice* or *SoHo Weekly*. By publicizing its public events, lecture series, and exhibitions, the Institute succeeded in gaining a foothold in metropolitan urban culture through its media output and possibly reaching a larger audience. Soon the newspaper was available at one hundred and twenty-five outlets throughout the city, at newsstands and in bookstores, as well as in art galleries and selected shops, such as the flagship store of the trendy Milanese fashion label Fiorucci in Manhattan. In 1979, *Skyline* had a total circulation of 2,000 and nearly 1,200 subscribers. The newspaper, which was by now the central medium for topics related to architecture and design culture in New York, helped shape the Institute’s hip and trendy image throughout the country.⁷²² And while *Skyline*, unlike other “little magazines,” did not take up radical positions, as the arts and art criticism did, its main effect was to keep the Institute a topic of conversation in New York architecture circles and to attract public attention. Like the “Forum” section of *Oppositions*, *Skyline*

720 Rem Koolhaas, “The Birth of Radio City Music Hall,” *Skyline* (April 1978), 7.

721 Bernard Tschumi, “Bernard Tschumi’s Architectural Manifestos,” *Skyline* (May 1979), 8–9; “Architectural Manifestos,” *Skyline* (May/June 1980), 12.

722 Steven Holl, Alison Sky, Suzanne Stephens, “East Coast West Coast,” in Colomina and Buckley, 2010, 70–81. For some reason, Andrew MacNair, who created *Skyline*, was neither invited to the roundtable nor interviewed as part of the Clip, Stamp, Fold project. Suzanne Stephens, however, did mention him.

engaged in politics with the photographs it printed, for example when the party celebrating *Skyline's* first anniversary in April 1979 at the Rizzoli Gallery of the friendly commercial publisher and the coverage of it in the following issue were extensively documented with a photo spread of the party guests—including the funders and sponsors of the Institute, Fellows and friends, such as Gianfranco Monacelli, the publishing house's director—made it clear that the Institute was increasingly taking on the role of gatekeeper or taste-maker in the local architecture scene as well. In New York, the who's who of seeing and being seen ultimately defined who was part of the scene and who was not.

After one year, *Skyline's* concept was modified slightly for the first time with the anniversary issue of April 1979 and adapted to the needs of the Institute. The newspaper, whose editorial staff was expanded to include Patrick Pinnell, was given the new subheading *The Architecture and Design Review*, significantly softening its local connection to New York and emphasizing its national stature.⁷²³ In addition to an even greater focus on general interest interviews and reviews, the Calendar now included events across the East Coast of the USA—especially at the prestigious schools of architecture—which, in turn, allowed the Institute to manifest its close ties with them. Purely a city newspaper in its first year, in its second year *Skyline* became a review of the cultural life in architecture and design emanating from New York. The newspaper regularly announced or reviewed exhibitions in the major museums (The Museum of Modern Art, Solomon R. Guggenheim Museum), the commercial architecture galleries (Leo Castelli Gallery, Max Protetch Gallery), and the alternative self-managed art spaces (P.S.1 and Architecture Room). As part of its new alignment and new aspiration to become the leading medium for North American architecture culture, *Skyline's* editorial team included high-profile topics that appealed to the general public, primarily through a strategic selection of authors. The April 1979 issue, for example, printed excerpts from talks by Charles Jencks, architecture historian and theorist, and Paul Goldberger, architecture critic at *The New York Times*, on the role and responsibilities of architecture journalism at a symposium in San Francisco; both were well-known beyond the field of architecture and had made a name for themselves primarily as apologists of a postmodern architecture.⁷²⁴ Interestingly, in his editorial for the same issue, which consisted of introductory remarks to the feature on Jencks and Goldberger, Owens criticized their populist positions, since in his view they were presenting aesthetic arguments in their promotional and defensive pieces. Thus, *Skyline* was participating in the academic debate on postmodernism, albeit in a way that differed from that of *Oppositions* and *October*, by publishing popular and well-known authors while taking the liberty

723 Pinnell, who had previously taught in the Institute's "Undergraduate Program" as a tutor in the design studio during the fall 1978 semester and had a BA in literature, joined the editorial staff to ensure journalistic quality.

724 *Skyline* (April 1979).

of distancing itself from them, i.e., positioning itself as critical of the mainstream.

In its second year, *Skyline* repeatedly published reviews of books and exhibitions, some of them harsh polemics that were intended to shape public opinion. Once again, Frampton exemplified what he considered to be good journalism. For the April 1979 issue, he wrote no less than two texts on the recent MoMA exhibition “Transformations in Modern Architecture” (February 23 to April 24, 1979), curated by Arthur Drexler and the subject of much controversy at the Institute. “Transformations” proposed a particular interpretation of the heritage of architectural modernism, the global proliferation and corporatization of the International Style in the postwar period, and did not necessarily align with the architectural attitude held at the Institute—by historians and theorists as well as practitioners.⁷²⁵ Here, Drexler exclusively presented realized projects in the form of photographs; this, above all, disqualified some representatives of what was known as paper architecture, as propagated by the New York Five around Eisenman.⁷²⁶ While Frampton’s first text, “Blow Up,” was still a fairly objective review, his second piece, “Skylights: The Ins and Outs” was a revealing commentary in which he harshly criticized the exhibition’s emphasis on images and hence the criteria for exclusion embedded in the curatorial concept; moreover, he attacked Drexler personally, accusing him of being motivated solely by sensationalism and of having betrayed his ideals.⁷²⁷ *Skyline* then gave Drexler the opportunity to defend his exhibition against Frampton’s criticism in an interview with MacNair.⁷²⁸ In general, *Skyline* managed to publish regular reviews of current publications for a period of time. Pinnell wrote a review of Koolhaas’ *Delirious New York*, for which *Skyline* also ran extra ads, Alan Plattus introduced Paul Goldberger’s new architecture guide to Manhattan, and Peter Kaufman wrote a review of *The American City* coming out of the IUAV. These reviews were printed in *Skyline* rather than *Oppositions*, and it is particularly noticeable that many of the titles reviewed there were again penned by friends and authors associated with the Institute.⁷²⁹ Next to the “Reviews” section, “Interviews” in the second

725 Arthur Drexler, *Transformations in Modern Architecture* [Exhib. Cat.] (New York: The Museum of Modern Art, 1979).

726 Apparently, none of John Hejduk’s projects was shown in the exhibition, on the grounds that he did not fit into any category; see MoMA, “Transformations in Modern Architecture,” Master Checklist and Press Release no. 7, February 21, 1979, <https://www.moma.org/calendar/exhibitions/1773> (last accessed: May 31, 2023).

727 Kenneth Frampton, “Blow Up,” *Skyline* (April 1979), 6; “Skylights: The Ins and Outs,” *Skyline* (April 1979), 12. Frampton criticized Drexler for causing unnecessary turmoil with his curation and accused him of hysteria. This separation of information and opinion, by a single author, occurred only once.

728 Arthur Drexler (interview with Andrew MacNair), “Response. Arthur Drexler on Transformations,” *Skyline* (Summer 1979), 6.

729 Patrick Pinnell, “Remifications,” *Skyline* (March 1979), 5; Alan Plattus, “Manhattan Guides,” *Skyline* (October 1979), 8; Peter Kaufman, “Italian Views of the American City,” *Skyline* (May/June 1980), 17.

volume became the dominant format in *Skyline*.⁷³⁰ Much like Warhol's *Interview Magazine*, which for a decade had published interviews with celebrities, artists, and musicians, the Institute's tabloid newspaper now also regularly interviewed well-known figures, mostly established architects who were often members of the Institute's Architects' Circle, and thus rewarded them for the financial support by putting them in the spotlight; in addition to Philip Johnson, for example, Cesar Pelli, Ulrich Franzen, Arata Isozaki, Aldo Rossi, John Hejduk, and Charles Gwathmey also found their way onto the pages of *Skyline*. Most of MacNair's conversations coincided with current building projects by the respective architects; his own interests also allowed him to interview contemporary designers and artists, such as the German stage, costume, and lighting designer Manuel Lütgenhorst, who first came to New York in 1978 and immediately earned a certain reputation on the scene by renovating the hip Studio 54,⁷³¹ or with the furniture designers and interior decorators Dino Gavina and Joseph d'Urso, both of whom worked for Knoll International, one of the main sponsors of *Skyline*—another example of the commercialization of architecture culture. In addition, MacNair also asked Robert Venturi for an interview to discuss his design for Knoll International's Manhattan showroom, with the tone of the conversation fluctuating cheerfully between attack and approval.⁷³² Oddly enough, the interview was for the first time accompanied by a caricature drawn by architect and artist Michael Mostoller, which made the point that the brand names of design classics now dominated a thoroughly commercialized architecture world, while actual design had long since receded into the background.

All of the Institute's publications, not just *Skyline*, bore witness to postmodernism with all its ambiguities and paradoxes, even though their editorial policies differed: while *Oppositions* in the late 1970s stood less for a theorizing and increasingly for a historicizing approach, and yet still struggled to discuss contemporary architecture or current publications, *Skyline* was able to establish itself as a popular format for popular content conveyed through popular forms of presentation. Frank Gehry, for example, who had been a successful architect in Los

730 The following interviews were published in *Skyline*, unless otherwise noted by Andrew MacNair: Philip Johnson, interview with Martha Carroll and Craig Owens (May 1978); Rouben Ter-Arutunian (September 1978); Cesar Pelli (March 1979); Ulrich Franzen, interview with MacNair and Owens (April 1979); Arata Isozaki (May 1979); Arthur Drexler (Summer 1979); Aldo Rossi, interview with Diana Agrest (September 1979); Dino Gavina (October 1979); Joseph d'Urso, interview with Pilar Viladas (October 1979); John Hejduk, interview with Donald Wall and Nancy Ferrara (December 1979); Manuel Lütgenhorst (December 1979); Charles Gwathmey/Robert Siegel (February 1980); Robert Venturi (March 1980); Mario Botta, interview with Livio Dimitriu (March 1980); Coy Howard (March 1980).

731 Manuel Lütgenhorst (interview with Andrew MacNair), "Behind Studio 54," *Skyline* (November 1979), 17.

732 Robert Venturi (interview with Andrew MacNair), "Venturi and the Classic Modern Tradition," *Skyline* (March 1980), 4–5.

Angeles since the 1960s and was active in the vibrant art scene there, was discussed in an exhibition review in *Skyline*, but his architecture was not reviewed in *Oppositions*.⁷³³ At the time, Gehry had just completed his private house, which differed from the approaches advocated by the Fellows in that, in addition to the strategy of the ready-made, it emphasized the idea of the frame, placing fragments of a timber-frame building, pergolas, and scaffolding in front of an existing residential building, while incorporating historical quotations. In another example of the policies surrounding architecture culture, *Oppositions* editors Vidler and Forster placed reviews of the exhibition “Lauretta Vinciarelli: Projects 1973–1978” (1979, at the Institute) and “Diana Agrest and Mario Gandelsonas: Architecture between Memory and Amnesia” (1978–79, Architecture Room of P.S.1) in *Skyline*, but their architecture received no attention in *Oppositions*.⁷³⁴ In keeping with the tabloid format, *Skyline* could juxtapose different, at times opposing, positions. For example, in a two-part article, Pinnell discussed the architectural drawings and urban planning projects of the office Venturi and Rauch, and in doing so, featured Robert Venturi (but not Denise Scott Brown) in *Skyline*, while neither was discussed or published again in *Oppositions*.⁷³⁵ That *Skyline*’s tabloidization of architecture discourse also offered both quality and controversy was once again evident when Rosemary Bletter reviewed a symposium on “Architectural Form and the Problems of Historicity,” which engaged with the architecture of Michael Graves, along with critical commentary by Anthony Vidler and Alan Colquhoun.⁷³⁶

The issues of *Skyline* published in the fall of 1979, which announced and accompanied the coordinated exhibitions of Aldo Rossi’s drawings at the Institute and the Max Protetch Gallery, were indicative of a new cult of personality that the Institute was embracing with its educational offerings, cultural productions, and publication formats. The self-created media hype ranged from the cover of the September 1979 issue, which featured Rossi’s drawings for the San Cataldo Cemetery in Modena and its legendary Teatro del Mondo, to a pointed, if poorly edited, interview in which Rossi commented on architecture, politics, and film, and verbally applied his analogous approach to the American city; in the October 1979 issue, after the exhibitions closed, photographs of the vernissage party were published in the “Skylights” section, and the translation

733 A review of the inaugural exhibition at the Architecture Room of P.S.1 on Gehry, organized by Lindsay Stamm Shapiro, was published in *Skyline*; see Steven Harris, “202 Frank Gehry,” *Skyline* (November 1978), 2. At the Institute, Gehry played only a minor role.

734 Vidler, 1979; Kurt Forster, “Between Memory and Amnesia,” *Skyline* (January 1979), 4.

735 Patrick Pinnell, “On Venturi I: Drawing as Polemic,” *Skyline* (December 1978), 5; “On Venturi II: Allegory and Kitsch,” *Skyline*, (January 1979), 5. Scott Brown had been a partner in the firm since 1969, where she was responsible for urban design projects. This was not reflected in the name until 1989, when John Rauch resigned, and the office was renamed Venturi, Scott Brown and Associates.

736 Rosemarie Bletter, “About Graves,” *Skyline* (Summer 1979), 2–3.

of a text by Manfredo Tafuri, “Theater of Memory,” was reprinted in place of an exhibition review.⁷³⁷ *Skyline* thus continued the media strategy already pursued with *Oppositions* of generating not only social and cultural but also symbolic capital from the envy of those who were not present by portraying the select circle of invited guests. This superficial, largely quite subjective approach was punctured by one of Mostoller’s caricatures, whose sharply drawn commentary in this case illuminated the emerging phenomenon of celebrity culture in architecture embraced by Rossi. Mostoller depicted Rossi in multiple versions, as a copy of himself on the stage of architecture in the United States. At the Institute, it was precisely the interplay of pedagogical, cultural, and publishing practices that laid one of the cornerstones for the coming star cult, the excessive idolization, even glorification of a few, world-famous (mostly male) architects. This media culture that celebrated the genius of individual, often male, figures was a distinctive feature of architectural postmodernism, which was propelled by several major events in the 1980s: the first Biennale Architettura di Venezia (1980) headed by Paolo Portoghesi, the Internationale Bauausstellung IBA Berlin 84 under the dual direction of Josef Kleihues and Hardt-Waltherr Hämer (from 1980, culminating in 1984), and the “Deconstructivism” exhibition at MoMA curated by Philip Johnson and Mark Wigley (1987).⁷³⁸

Skyline was now in vogue and had become an important format for communicating and negotiating criteria for the perception and evaluation of contemporary architecture. The newspaper was subscribed to by libraries at leading universities and museums in New York, such as Columbia University and MoMA. It was also gaining recognition abroad; for example, Phyllis Lambert was an early subscriber to the newspaper for the Canadian Centre for Architecture in Montréal, which she founded in 1979. Most importantly, *Skyline*, by spreading gossip and generating media buzz, produced, reproduced, and represented the discursive and institutional networks that centered on the Institute, thus providing a good insight into its self-conception and self-image. Most importantly, the Institute increasingly used its monthly tabloid to advertise on its own behalf: it ran specially designed ads for its “Evening Program” and other print products, not just *Oppositions* and *October*. When the IAUS Exhibition Catalogues were introduced in late 1978, paralleling the professionalization of the “Exhibition Program,” *Skyline* provided the ideal complement. With interviews, reviews, and, above all, the calendar of

737 Manfredo Tafuri, “The Theater of Memory,” *Skyline* (October 1979), 7.

738 Szacka, 2016; While the Venice Biennale was only discussed at a “Forum” after Frampton had withdrawn his text contribution, Eisenman was the main contributor to the IBA Berlin 84 and “Deconstructivism” show from the circle of Fellows. With Eisenman and Frampton went to Berlin in 1984 as former Fellows at the invitation of the American Academy after the Institute, as it had existed for years, finally collapsed. See Senator für Bau- und Wohnungswesen, ed., *Idee Prozess Ergebnis. Die Reparatur und Rekonstruktion der Stadt* (Berlin: Frölich und Kaufmann, 1984); see also Philip Johnson and Mark Wigley, eds., *Deconstructivist Architecture* (New York: Museum of Modern Art, 1988).

events, *Skyline* guided a readership interested in architecture and design through New York's cultural life; the Institute portrayed itself as the main hub of architecture culture. The Institute's claim to national standing, expressed in "Open Plan," the "National Architecture Exchange," and the "New Wave" series was also demonstrated by the network of journalists that the *Skyline* editorial team maintained with other, new architecture newspapers such as *Archetype* from San Francisco, a network that also manifested itself in the placement of exchange ads.⁷³⁹ While the American publication landscape in architecture had previously consisted primarily of book series, architecture press, and university journals, by the late 1970s it had been augmented by many smaller productions.⁷⁴⁰ The summer 1979 issue of *Skyline* advertised university architecture journals, some of them new, such as *VIA*, *Perspecta*, and *The Harvard Architecture Review*.⁷⁴¹ The friendship between MacNair and Steven Holl, who had not only been a regular visitor to the Institute since moving to New York from the West Coast but also supported the production of *Skyline* and occasionally published pieces in the tabloid newspaper itself, helped establish a collegial relationship with the *Pamphlet Architecture* series that Holl was editing: small booklets featuring the designs of young architects.⁷⁴² One editorial strategy to extend the Institute's influence and reach beyond the East Coast was the introduction of the "Cross-Country" section with the October 1979 issue, which drew on a network of correspondents to report on buildings and cultural events from various North American cities.

Despite the editors' best efforts, the editorial work on *Skyline* proved to be difficult—and this was not only due to the inexperience of the editors and the strict publication schedule. After two years, newspaper-making at the Institute, working conditions, and decision-making processes were still precarious and marked

739 *Skyline* and *Archetype* ran exchange ads several times, e.g., in *Archetype* no. 1 through 4 and in *Skyline* (Summer 1979). The *Archetype* editorial staff included, among others, Andrew Batey, Demetra Bowles, and Henry Bowles; also Kurt Forster, who had newly joined *Oppositions* as editor, and Diane Ghirardo, who did translations for *Oppositions* and the *Oppositions* Books series, as well as Mark Mack, a friend of MacNair. In *Skyline*, *Archetype* was described as "the only non-New York architectural tabloid."

740 Colomina and Buckley, 2010.

741 Advertisements for *VIA IV*, *Perspecta*, no. 16, *The Harvard Architecture Review*, no. 1, *Skyline* (Summer 1979), 14.

742 Steven Holl, "USSR in the USA," *Skyline* (May 1979), 10; "Ungers at Columbia," *Skyline* (October 1979), 15. Holl launched *Pamphlet Architecture*, his own publication series, on December 30, 1977. Many of the architects featured were friends of MacNair's and part of *Skyline*'s extended circle. Among the first ten publications, in addition to Holl's projects, were designs by Mark Mack, Lars Lerup, Livio Dimitriu, Lebbeus Wood, Zaha Hadid, and Albert Sartoris. In the first *Pamphlet Architecture*, Holl wrote appreciatively of the Institute's influence not only on the New York architecture scene but on the American architecture world as a whole: "In New York, theorists rethought architecture education and founded the IAUS, analogous to London's Architectural Association. They first published *Oppositions*, edited by Peter Eisenman, Kenneth Frampton, and Mario Gandelsonas, to promote fresh creative ideas that were being ignored by the periodicals. New York thus became one of the most exciting architectural environments in the United States." See Steven Holl, ed., *Pamphlet Architecture*, no. 1 (New York: 1978).

by economic insecurity due to insufficient income and structural dependencies. The power imbalance became visible when MacNair complained several times to Eisenman, also in writing, that double standards were being applied to the Institute's publications. This was because, unlike *Oppositions*, *Skyline* editors were repeatedly told that the newspaper would have to be financially self-supporting and that it would have to pay forty percent of its revenue to IAUS Central as overhead. At this time, the newspaper format was considered a failure, at least economically. The problems with financing, management, and distribution remained unresolved, although several foundations provided funding in 1979, including NYSCA, the CBS Foundation, the J.M. Kaplan Fund, and The Gilman Paper Foundation, the private foundation of the largest paper manufacturer in the United States at the time. In the meantime, *Skyline* editors were able to report successes as private sponsors were secured and nationwide distribution was professionalized. But by early 1980 *Skyline* had accumulated debts totaling US\$10,000, and salaries could no longer be paid. In the spring of 1980, MacNair sought professional outside advice from people willing to invest in the paper, working with Henry Hecker and Horace Havemeyer III to come up with a new business plan and various scenarios, such as launching a fully funded, fixed circulation publication or redesigning *Skyline* as a glossy magazine with a higher circulation and thus more financially strong advertisers. He even offered to acquire the copyright himself. But these efforts remained unsuccessful. Eisenman rejected all of MacNair's proposals on the grounds that they were in line with neither the Institute's goals nor its resources. While the production of *Oppositions* and *October* was largely covered by MIT Press by the end of the decade, Institute director Eisenman ultimately did not lobby hard enough for *Skyline* to find a publisher to include the architecture newspaper in their program; talks with Monacelli at Rizzoli International also ultimately failed to produce results. All this was to change.

Despite all the background difficulties, the production of *Skyline* continued and gave rise to discussion. One incident that was representative of the conflict potential in architecture culture was a "Letter to the Editor" written by Peter Fend and printed in the February 1980 issue.⁷⁴³ Here, Fend reported on the groundbreaking "Real Estate Show," a politically charged exhibition that had been organized out of the emerging art scene in a vacant building on the Lower East Side and through which an artists' collective criticized real estate policies in the East Village and the role of the artist in the gentrification process: a topic that was not a concern at the Institute.⁷⁴⁴ Fend, who had

743 Peter Fend, "Letter to the Editor," *Skyline* (February 1980), 2.

744 Alan Moore and Marc Miller, eds., "The Real Estate Show," in *ABC No Rio Dinero: The Story of a Lower East Side Art Gallery* (New York: ABC No Rio, 1985), 52–71; Kim Förster, "ABC No Rio: Architecture of Opposition," in *Cinematographies: Fictional Strategies and Visual Discourses in 1990s New York City*, eds. Günter H. Lenz, Dorothea Löffermann, and Karl-Heinz Magister (Heidelberg: Universitätsverlag C. Winter, 2006), 97–120.

previously worked as an assistant to the late Gordon Matta-Clark and was one of the exhibition's organizers, made a sweeping accusation against all architects that they had so far only presented East Village residents "from above," with utopian designs for large-scale structures, an allusion to Paul Rudolph's design. By printing the letter, rather than commissioning a review, *Skyline* nevertheless supported Fend's call for ideas to contribute to a socially engaged architecture. Meanwhile, MacNair had begun to develop his own events outside the Institute, such as the exhibition "The Edge of Architecture 1980: Between Buildings and Bodies," which he organized at the Max Protetch Gallery in the spring of 1980 and advertised in *Skyline*.⁷⁴⁵ By this time, his relationship with the Institute had come under lasting strain. Another incident that triggered this falling out and highlighted the power imbalance was a review of a symposium at the New York Institute for the Humanities that focused on the architecture of mental health facilities in light of the transformation of the hospital system in the United States, which was announced but never published. In his review "The Architecture of Confinement," commissioned by MacNair, NYU historian Thomas Bender also discussed Richard Meier's Bronx Development Center, which he criticized as being outdated due to changes in psychiatric practice shortly after its completion.⁷⁴⁶ However, the text was withdrawn at the last minute, apparently at Meier's intervention, and not printed, which Bender interpreted as an act of censorship.⁷⁴⁷ In the subsequent correspondence with a trustee, he condemned the economically driven decisions at the Institute but explicitly accepted those of MacNair as editor. Instead, he identified Meier as the main culprit, blaming him for the non-publication of his review. This incident, which went down in the Institute's archive as "The Bender Affair" and might thus serve as evidence of another, less celebratory history of the Institute, was to occupy Institute director Eisenman for more than a year and finally culminated in a rift between the Institute and the *Skyline* editor. The tense situation did not improve when a comic strip, the first of its kind, was published in the April 1980 issue under the newly introduced "Funny Pages" section.⁷⁴⁸ In a sequence of twelve cartoons, it parodied the appearance of an architect who bore a strong resemblance to Eisenman in both appearance and demeanor, so that MacNair's clash was now being aired publicly.

In the course of these disputes, MacNair had already threatened to resign several times and finally did so in a letter to Peter Eisenman at the end of April

745 Muschamp, 1980.

746 Thomas Bender, "The Architecture of Confinement" (announced in *Skyline*, February 1980, unpublished). Thomas Bender's article was already set, see folder "The Thomas Bender Affair." Source: CCA Montréal, IAUS fonds: A.5-6.

747 Thomas Bender, letter to Armand Bartos, March 25, 1980, Source: CCA Montréal, IAUS fonds: A.5-6.

748 "R K Tecto-Comix," *Skyline* (April 1980), 18.

1980.⁷⁴⁹ He also resigned from all the other posts he held at the Institute after six years as a Fellow, a major break in his career and a bitter loss for the Institute. Eisenman had previously offered him the post of director of public programs to keep him at the Institute. But MacNair cited various reasons, including institutional, financial, structural, and personal ones, and said he felt exploited and inadequately supported. The May/June 1980 issue of *Skyline*, for which Havemeyer III served as business consultant, James Saslow and Peter Lemos as associate editors, Margot Jacqz as managing editor, and Katherine Norment as editorial assistant, would be the last for the time being. The publication was suspended, at least temporarily, since Eisenman not only immediately sent a letter to all subscribers informing them of the suspension to avoid complaints and dissatisfaction, but he also immediately set out to find a new editor-in-chief and planned a relaunch with a professional editorial team, a commercial publisher, and secure financing. The format was too important a publicity tool for increasing the Institute's visibility to be abandoned. After the event, MacNair was engaged in the launch of two follow-up publications. First, he was involved in the creation of *Metropolis*, where he was slated to be editor-in-chief.⁷⁵⁰ And when he was forced out here as well, abandoning the project before its first publication, he finally self-published *Express*, another architecture newspaper, in December 1980.

IAUS Exhibition Catalogues

With the expansion and professionalization of the Institute's "Exhibition Program" that began in 1978, the IAUS Exhibition Catalogues were introduced as another publication format. At Eisenman's initiative, Frampton was summarily appointed editor of the newly conceived publication series in his absence. Frampton was joined by Silvia Kolbowski as managing editor, who had initially worked at the Institute's reception desk and later assisted with the "Exhibitions Program" and the "New Wave" series. The publication not only promised to draw more attention to the Institute as a gallery space but also opened up the possibility of acquiring additional grants or donations through the catalogues to cross-fund operations.⁷⁵¹ Thus, beginning in the summer of 1978, Frampton and Kolbowski started collaborating on a new catalogue series with a supposedly simple concept. The publication even took on a historiographical function, as

749 Andrew MacNair, letter to Peter Eisenman, April 29, 1980. Source: CCA Montréal, IAUS fonds: A.5-6. Although MacNair had signed the letter, in our oral history interview MacNair did not confirm whether he drafted it himself or not.

750 *Skyline* can thus be seen as an indirect precursor to *Metropolis*, which first appeared in newspaper format in July 1981 and still exists.

751 By his own account, MacNair, having set up the exhibitions at the Institute since 1975 and having initially directed the program, had only produced self-made catalogues for some of the exhibitions by quickly photocopying materials from the shows and simply stapling them together. A first catalogue was already being planned for the 1976 "Idea as Model" exhibition, yet was not published until 1981.

the format was tasked with documenting the exhibitions running at the Institute for both professionals and posterity: a tangible product in contrast to the ephemeral nature of the “Exhibition Program.” The catalogues were first advertised in 1978 on the poster for the “National Architecture Exchange,” one of the offerings under the newly created outreach and publicity platform. They were thus another purchasable teaching and learning product produced at the Institute and distributed nationwide, along with the lecture tours, traveling exhibitions, and slide series. Advertised alongside the names of the architects exhibited were the names of the authors slated to provide introductions, in many cases Fellows or Visiting Fellows, who were listed as a mark of quality. Eight catalogues in total were offered for exhibitions that had been held in the previous three years: *The Architecture of O.M. Ungers* (with an introduction by Rem Koolhaas), *Idea as Model* (Richard Pommer), *Gwathmey/Siegel: Ten Years and Twenty-Four Houses* (Kenneth Frampton and Ulrich Franzen), *Robert Krier: Projects about Space* (Andrew MacNair), *Aldo Rossi in America, 1976, 1977, 1978* (Mario Gandelsonas), *Ivan Leonidov: Russian Constructivist, 1902–1959* (Gerrit Oorthuys), *The Princeton Beaux Arts. From Labatut to the Program of Geddes* (Anthony Vidler), and *Massimo Scolari: Architecture Between Memory and Hope* (Mario Gandelsonas).

It is noteworthy that this offer was made at a time when the catalogues had neither been issued nor published and was therefore a first step to drum up publicity and test demand, and buyers would thus have paid for them in advance. Despite their documentary nature, the IAUS Exhibition Catalogues, as a series, were clearly intended to establish a format that was distinct from *Oppositions*, with its own author base and budget plan; for the first time, the acronym “IAUS,” which already graced the promotional and fundraising brochure, was now also used as a brand for one of the publications. As catalogues for past and present exhibitions of contemporary and, to a lesser degree, modernist architecture they promised to advance positions and projects of postmodernism. They also had an institutional function, as the exhibitions and the catalogue series not only depended on each other in terms of content but also built on each other for financial reasons. The concept was that each catalogue would print extensive visual materials (drawings, plans, and photographs) previously seen in the exhibition, and an introduction and further essays were planned for each: “critical and theoretical pieces that set the context for viewing architecture and express the didactic aims of the display.”⁷⁵² Despite the educational goal, some catalogues ultimately took years to realize; and of the authors initially planned and already advertised, only a fraction ultimately wrote one of the planned introductions.

The catalogue series was launched before the end of 1978 with the exhibition and lecture series “A New Wave of Japanese Architecture,” which was on

752 Frederieke Taylor, grant application to the NEH for a Challenge Grant, November 30, 1979 (CD-1444-81). Source: CCA Montréal, IAUS fonds: A.2-10.

view at the Institute before touring North America.⁷⁵³ In formal terms, Catalogue 10, as it was officially numbered, was closely modeled on *Oppositions* in terms of format, graphics, and page layout. The catalogue series, also designed by Vignelli, once more corresponded to the Institute's graphic identity and yet, due to its cover design, could have been identified as an independent print product. Vignelli's cover design for the catalogue series, based on a three-column grid, was less obtrusive and eye-catching than that of the journal, with its fine black line drawings and a red serif font for the text against a creamy white background. In terms of content, the catalogue of the "Japanese New Wave" was a comprehensive document on contemporary architecture in Japan, consisting mainly of short programmatic texts and selected projects by eleven architects: Takefumi Aida, Tadao Ando, Hiromi Fujii, Hiroshi Hara, Osazmu Ishiyama, Arata Isozaki, Toyo Ito, Fumihiko Maki, Monta Mozuna, Minoru Takeyama, and Atelier Zo (in alphabetical order). Frampton introduced and classified the architects and their projects, and further formulated a definition of how the "Japanese New Wave" should be understood.⁷⁵⁴ As editor, he not only positioned himself in terms of the architecture presented there in comparison to those contemporary attitudes familiar to American readers; he also wrote for the first time as an expert on Japanese architecture.⁷⁵⁵ Frampton was clearly seeking to present the group exhibition promoted by the Institute across the country with the traveling exhibition and lecture series and shown at the Institute itself as the only true contemporary architectural avant-garde. He consistently wrote of "the New Wave" as if there was no other. For him, the young generation of Japanese architects differed fundamentally from the American generation that had dominated the early 1970s and had made architectural postmodernism acceptable in the United States—despite their dichotomous juxtaposition and media politics. The last page of Catalogue 10 once again publicized the Institute's new venture. Readers found a list announcing the publication of ten exhibition catalogues, documenting the Institute's exhibitions of 1976, 1977, and 1978.⁷⁵⁶ While it took years to accomplish, this first exhibition catalogue—self-published and distributed by the Institute—was nonetheless a complete success. Within two months, over four hundred copies had already been sold in the USA.

753 IAUS, ed., *A New Wave of Japanese Architecture*, Catalogue 10 (New York: The Institute for Architecture and Urban Studies, 1978).

754 Kenneth Frampton, "The Japanese New Wave," in IAUS, 1978, 1–13.

755 Frampton later continued to push Japanese architecture in *Skyline* as well as in *Oppositions*. See Kenneth Frampton, "Modernism's Diffusion. Japan Diary, Summer 81, Part 1," *Skyline* (April 1982), 26–29; "Part 2," *Skyline* (May 1982), 26–29; "Part 3" *Skyline* (June 1982), 22–25. Frampton shared an interest with Eisenman in Arata Isozaki, who was a Visiting Fellow at the Institute.

756 Curiously, the numbering of the advertised IAUS Exhibition Catalogues corresponded to the chronology of the exhibition dates, but in the end did not coincide with the actual order of publication.

The Institute also negotiated with MIT Press to publish the IAUS Exhibition Catalogues in 1979. It was Taylor who, as director of development responsible for the acquisition of funds and public relations, now communicated with Reinke at the university's publishing house after the promising start of the catalogue series, which was no longer within the scope of Institute director Eisenman, and who in correspondence with Reinke praised the new series as a logical development of the already established "Exhibition Program."⁷⁵⁷ Taylor indicated that, by January 1979, two other catalogues of past exhibitions were already being planned or in production: *Philip Johnson: Processes* and *Gwathmey/Siegel Architects: Twenty-four Residences*. Apart from the chronology of the exhibitions, these two publications were a top priority for the Institute, since Charles Gwathmey had been a trustee and President of the Institute since 1978, and Philip Johnson was a patron of the Institute. Additionally, Johnson, while having made few if any official appearances until the previous year, was about to pull the strings. More importantly, both architecture firms had already contributed to the production costs of their respective catalogues. Taylor highlighted the sales figures and pre-orders of the only title available to date to underscore the interest in the Institute's catalogues in the architecture books market. In addition, she sent a review of "A New Wave of Japanese Architecture" by Huxtable, one of the still rare interactions between the renowned architecture critic with the Institute, in which she specifically praised the care with which the editors had prepared the catalogue.⁷⁵⁸

Catalogue 9, *Philip Johnson: Processes*, published in the spring of 1979, then became the Institute's second catalogue, documenting the exhibition on Johnson's AT&T Building at the Institute in the fall of 1978.⁷⁵⁹ It perpetuated the hype, the very mechanism of an attention economy that Johnson had cultivated throughout his life and that the Institute was now embracing as well. Even more than the exhibition, the catalogue recalled the controversial design for New York's first postmodern skyscraper shortly after it was commissioned, by paying tribute to the documentary role of architectural drawings and their capacity to provide insights into the design process. Much of the production budget of US\$17,000 (of which Kolbowski as managing editor received US\$3,000 and Frampton as editor received US\$1,300) had been contributed by Johnson, signaling some degree of dependence on the part of the Institute. The catalogue, with a critical "preface" by Craig Owens, an "introduction" by Massimo Scolari, and several texts by Frampton, became an in-house test of character, especially since Frampton, in his text on the *Glass House*, did not pass up on the opportunity to criticize Johnson and his past fascist leanings, obviously not unknown at the Institute at the time, if only between the lines, whereas prior to that, *Oppositions* 10 had promoted

757 Frederieke Taylor, letter to Ann Reinke (MIT Press), January 30, 1979. Source: CCA Montréal, IAUS fonds: A.5-3 / ARCH401644.

758 Huxtable, 1979, D27.

759 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).

Johnson almost uncritically and unquestioningly.⁷⁶⁰ For Johnson, as was commonly known back then, apparently not only accompanied the invasion of Poland in the suite of German armed forces in September 1939 at the invitation of Joseph Goebbels' Ministry of Propaganda but also provided for the dissemination of Nazi propaganda in his articles and speeches. Frampton's article explicitly criticized Johnson's interior design for the utility core of his country house, which to him was reminiscent not only of ruins but of the Polish villages destroyed at the beginning of World War II.⁷⁶¹ Eisenman, on the other hand, took no responsibility as Institute director and did not cover for his editors, and when Johnson complained, pointed out that each of the Institute's programs was independent, as was the work of the program directors themselves.⁷⁶² He himself confined himself to vague allusions to Johnson's past in his preface to *Philip Johnson: Writings*.⁷⁶³

In 1979, the Institute managed to secure MIT Press for the IAUS Exhibition Catalogues. The decisive criterion for the further development of the series was now to select historically relevant or well-known contemporary architects with a broad appeal in order to attract public funding such as from NYSCA, the NEA, etc. to finance individual exhibitions and catalogues, as well as the operation of the Institute itself. In the spring of 1979, work was underway on the fourth title in the series, a catalogue on Ivan Leonidov, with Gerrit Oorthuys and Rem Koolhaas as potential authors. But initially, the editorial team faced financial difficulties and had to borrow money internally from other programs at the Institute, the "Exhibition Program" and the "National Architecture Exchange." Over the course of the year, Eisenman himself planned which new publications were conceivable and feasible for the Institute, including future catalogue titles (and thus, to some extent, new exhibitions). The crucial question in this regard was what financing might even be considered for possible productions; the handwritten list again testified to the patterns of thought that infused Eisenman's curation and his directing practice.⁷⁶⁴ At the top of the list, in

760 Craig Owens, "Philip Johnson: History, Genealogy, Historicism," in IAUS, 1979, 1–11.

761 Kenneth Frampton, "The Glass House Revisited," in IAUS, 1979, 39–59, here 51.

762 Johnson's fascist past again became an issue at the Institute when, in September 1979, a staff member of MIT Press offered Johnson's early writings for publication. Source: CCA Montréal, IAUS fonds: A.5-7. However, *Oppositions* editors were obviously not interested in exposing this in their journalism.

763 Peter Eisenman, "Introduction," in *Philip Johnson: Writings*, eds. Peter Eisenman and Robert Stern (New York, Oxford University Press, 1979), 10–25. Instead, Eisenman used this sensitive information as leverage against Johnson, for instance when he conducted interviews with him in the early 1980s in which he, among other things, addressed this blind spot in Johnson's biography, threatening to make it public. Apparently, Eisenman was bought out, see Schulze, 1994, 372–376. Despite the overwhelming evidence, it is remarkable that it is only the subsequent generation of architecture historians who has studied Johnson's dissemination of fascist ideas and strategies of dealing with this past; see Varnelis, 1995.

764 Peter Eisenman, notes on IAUS Publications, 1979, Source: CCA Montréal, IAUS fonds: A.5-8 / ARCH401754.

alphabetical order, he placed a catalogue on the New York-based Austrian architect Raimund Abraham—who like himself taught at Cooper Union but had no other connection to the Institute—followed by catalogues on New York architects, notably Charles Gwathmey and John Hejduk, both longtime companions and erstwhile members of the New York Five, for which funding had already been secured. In a somewhat smaller type, Eisenman included catalogues on Rossi and Scolari, both of whom were given a second solo exhibition after 1976. The great promise associated with the series, in addition to symbolic gains for everyone: the architects, the Institute, and MIT Press, was further income from sales. In addition, Eisenman projected an exhibition and catalogue on Terragni; this was apparently one of the exhibitions he naturally considered particularly worthwhile. He also hoped to finance a retrospective including catalogue production on the glorious Texas Rangers, i.e., the group of educators around Bernard Hoesli, Colin Rowe, Robert Slutzky, and John Hejduk, who once taught at the University of Texas in the 1950s and, due to their influence, were now widely idolized, not only in New York architecture circles but internationally.⁷⁶⁵

The second part of Eisenman's list included exhibitions and catalogues as part of the "New Wave" series, first and foremost a "Swiss New Wave," for which he expected income from Pro-Helvetia, Swiss Air, and Swiss banks. Furthermore, young architects from Austria, France, Spain, and Argentina were to be featured by the Institute. The contract with MIT Press, similar to *Oppositions*, called for the production of four exhibition catalogues per year. When the Institute applied to the NEH in 1979 for funding to continue its public lecture series, Taylor also advertised these plans for further IAUS Exhibition Catalogues. Subsequently, the Institute organized, toured, and staged an "Austrian New Wave" in the spring of 1980, which was the first to be awarded grant money, including for a catalogue. The NEA, the Austrian Ministry for Education and the Arts and Ministry for Foreign Affairs, and the Zentralsparkasse and the Kommerzbank Wien all contributed. Over the next few years, there was an abundance of ideas for exhibitions and catalogues, but funding remained a problem. After all, the Institute was counting on revenues of over US\$100,000 for the 1979–80 fiscal year from the catalogue series alone. In 1979, the editors then invested in the production of another promising catalogue, this time on Rossi, which included the unique drawings on the analogous city he made during his stay in New York in 1976, along with an introduction by Eisenman and an exclusive text by Rossi himself.⁷⁶⁶ The catalogue, which launched the collaboration on a coordinated exhibition at the Max Protetch Gallery in the fall of 1979, was to become a bestseller.⁷⁶⁷ Another catalogue was to be produced for the Wallace Harrison retrospective at the Institute, planned for winter 1979–80, for which Rem Koolhaas was originally to be responsible

765 Caragone, 1995.

766 IAUS, ed., *Aldo Rossi in America, 1976–1979*. Catalogue 2 (New York: MIT Press, 1979).

767 Kauffman, 2018, 236, 264. Not only the exhibitions but also the publications were instrumental in the expansion of the art market.

as external curator and editor. By the end of 1979, however, the Institute had only produced a total of three catalogues: in addition to *A New Wave of Japanese Architecture* and *Philip Johnson: Processes*, also Catalogue 2, *Rossi in America, 1976–1979*, the next big hype, now published for the first time by MIT Press, but not until after the exhibitions themselves. In general, the latest print products, actually conceived as catalogues for the exhibitions, were only rarely ready for the opening; in most cases, there were still texts missing. But when they were realized, they showcased the powerful interplay between culture and politics, between architecture, knowledge, and power that characterized all of the Institute's publications.

Oppositions Books

From 1978, the Institute's publication portfolio was set to be complemented by Oppositions Books as its own book series, with the English translation of Aldo Rossi's *The Architecture of the City* for the North American market as its first publication. In doing so, the translation of foreign-language books—particularly by authors from Europe—into English was intended to raise the culture of translation, which had previously been established and practiced with *Oppositions*, to a new level and turn it into the basis for an even more globalized debate on architecture. For the launch of Oppositions Books in 1978, the young architect Diane Ghirardo, who had been working intermittently as a translator of Italian texts for *Oppositions*, was commissioned to produce a new translation of Rossi's bestseller. The Italian architect, whose first monograph had already been translated into several languages, embarked on an updated introduction for a North American readership, as he had already done for other translations. A volume of essays by British architect, theorist, and historian Alan Colquhoun was also planned as the second contribution to the book series. Colquhoun, who in addition to his firm also taught at the Polytechnic of Central London and had repeatedly held visiting professorships in the United States since 1969, had two essays published in *Oppositions* 12 in 1978, both of which were indebted to his historical materialism: an architecture critique of the projects of Michael Graves and a theoretical essay on the modernist style, the relationship between form and function, and the legacy of the figurative tradition, thus revisiting the ideological discussion on “neo-realism” and “neo-rationalism” that had previously been conducted in the journal as contemporary positions.⁷⁶⁸ By referencing the opposition between modern means of production and postmodern forms of expression, Colquhoun emphasized that “modern architecture was polemically committed to the transformation of the ‘real’ world.”⁷⁶⁹ Architecture, he diagnosed, had detached itself

768 Alan Colquhoun, “From Bricolage to Myth: or How to Put the Humpty Dumpty Together Again,” *Oppositions* 12 (Spring 1978), 1–19. For a discussion of Colquhoun's politics, see also *Oase* 87 (2012): “Alan Colquhoun: Architect, Historian, Critic,” especially in Owen Hatherley, “Two Notes on Alan Colquhoun,” *Oase* 87 (2012), 87–98.

769 Alan Colquhoun, “Form and Figure,” *Oppositions* 12 (Spring 1978), 28–37, here 37.

from its social role, becoming one of the arts—a role in which “‘possible’ and ‘virtual’ worlds are created.” As far as the publication of his book of essays was concerned, however, Colquhoun was also negotiating with Conover at the same time, which made the matter more urgent for both parties, the Institute and MIT Press.

However, there was no budget for the Oppositions Books and only limited capacity on the part of the Fellows. When the Institute published its promotional and fundraising brochure at the end of 1978, with chapters on all the Fellows’ fields of work, the Oppositions Books obviously had to be included, even though they did not de facto exist; in the brochure, they were nevertheless presented as a *fait accompli*.⁷⁷⁰ The new book series was already announced in the introductory text about the history of the Institute, without a fixed publication date or a contract in place, let alone a definitive solution to financing the editorial work or the book production, including typesetting, printing, and distribution. In the search for funding and donations, the Institute’s leadership simply declared the publication of the book series as a foregone conclusion that was certain to materialize in the future, without any planning certainty. It was not until 1979 that a more decisive approach was taken to the conception and planning of Oppositions Books. After Taylor attempted to obtain NEH funding for the translation of essays and books in the spring of 1979, without any notable success, Eisenman first presented a comprehensive concept for the further planning of *Oppositions Books* in July 1979.⁷⁷¹ He used the capital generated by *Oppositions* as his main argument and outlined the book series as a logical continuation, engaging with the same topics and implementing the same strategies and aims, only in a different format: “*Oppositions* began to have an effect not only in America but in Europe, beyond our most hopeful expectations.” To him, the reasons were obvious: “Students and architects around the country began to talk about ideas. Other journals began carrying criticism. Theory courses began to appear in schools where previously there had been none. The *Oppositions* ‘Forum,’ public discussions of the journal began to be copied in other institutions along similar lines.” He also emphasized the openness of the Institute: “The *Oppositions* ‘Little Magazine Conference’ After Modern Architecture spawned an entire historicizing tendency, post-modernism, which has become a keyword for journalists and architects alike.” Finally, he derived the new aspiration for a book series at the Institute from the success of the journal: “In short, *Oppositions* has become a catalyst for a set of ideas and for discussion of architecture previously unseen in this country. It has also become an introduction to a present-day form of contemporary theory of architecture.

770 IAUS brochure, 1978. Source: CCA Montréal, IAUS fonds: C.3-2 & C.3-3. In CCA’s IAUS fonds, there is no indication as to whether a contract between the Institute and MIT Press for the publication of the Oppositions Books already existed at that time.

771 Peter Eisenman, draft and concept of Oppositions Books, July 9, 1979. Source: CCA Montréal, IAUS fonds: A.5-8 / ARCH401742 & ARCH401744.

[...] But as such *Oppositions* has pointed the way for such a next step and has at the same time created its own audience for such a continuation: Oppositions Books.” Following this line of reasoning, the book series was inevitable.

What was striking about Eisenman’s conceptual planning was that he saw the book series as being quite similar to *Oppositions*’ original purpose, although the journal had long since taken a different path. Accordingly, Oppositions Books would comprise four categories of texts: first, translations of “seminal texts unpublished in English,” second, collections of “seminal texts never collected in one volume,” third, previously “new texts or essays which have never been published before,” and fourth, “commissioned texts which begin to explore the potentials of architecture theory and criticism.” The concept paper subsequently illustrated that Eisenman’s interest and motivation were the same as when *Oppositions* was founded in 1974, namely to pursue a linguistic or semiotic approach to architecture, which he viewed as a “humanistic discipline.” A historiography of architectural modernism, as pursued with *Oppositions* by Frampton as well as Vidler, was not mentioned here, or at least not explicitly. In the concept, Eisenman also stated for the first time that a “critical” introduction was to be written for each title, the task of which was “to place the work into a critical matrix by locating the particular work or works in a context both of the author’s other writing, to the time and place when it was written—a relationship to other significant texts. But also in relationship to the developing American context.” This framing made it clear that Oppositions Books, according to the rhetoric of the concept paper, addressed a specific readership in the English-language book market, while Eisenman tried to convince potential partners, be they publishers or foundations, arguing that the Institute had already built up its target group with *Oppositions*.

Although *Oppositions* and Oppositions Books were two independent publications with separate budgets and different goals, there was some overlap in textual and editorial practice, as well as publishing. Eisenman and Frampton were responsible for the conceptualization of the book series, collaboration with MIT Press, and acquisition of funding, with Eisenman taking a more strategic approach and Frampton a more academic one. When Eisenman sat down to plan the IAUS Exhibition Catalogues in 1979, he was simultaneously outlining possible Oppositions Books titles.⁷⁷² The focus was not so much on the financial argument as on the names, i.e., the intellectual capital, of authors who had already been solicited or considered. Aldo Rossi was at the top of the list with two monographs, followed by Alan Colquhoun, Moisei Ginzburg, Soviet architect of the *Narkomfin* house and author, Colin Rowe, and Manfredo Tafuri. After Eisenman had secured the publication rights for Rossi’s second publication, *A Scientific Autobiography*, for the Institute in early 1979, Rossi was fully absorbed that year and elevated to the status of key author at

772 Peter Eisenman, notes on IAUS Publications, 1979, Source: CCA Montréal, IAUS fonds: A.5-8 / ARCH401754.

Oppositions Books.⁷⁷³ Eisenman's rather hurriedly scribbled list indicated that the conception of the book series focused less on the contributions to the architecture debate than on the names of the authors. He noted that he would share the work of writing the introductions and thus the responsibility for editing each title with Frampton. While Frampton subsequently—even before his own monograph *Modern Architecture. A Critical History* came out in 1980—oversaw the translations of modernist classics, Eisenman—neither of whose book-length publications *House X* nor *Giuseppe Terragni* had been published—was again, both in the book series and concurrently with the journals, primarily concerned with publishing contemporary Italian authors.⁷⁷⁴ As instruments of branding and power politics, Oppositions Books did not differ significantly from the other publications issued at the Institute. However, the large format made it possible to focus attention on certain authors; there were to be monographs and essay collections by Fellows and friends that sought to inform the architecture debate and by extension architecture education. Frampton and Vidler, among others, were to receive their own publications.

MIT Press was ultimately won as a publishing partner for Oppositions Books, like *Oppositions*, *October*, and the IAUS Exhibition Catalogues before it. In 1979, they signed an initial agreement, providing for the publication of four titles per year. For Conover, who had been promoted to executive director at the university publishing house in 1978, this was a very attractive deal, since he still had to contract a certain number of titles each year, and the Institute provided a well-rehearsed editorial team with Eisenman and Frampton; in return, the Institute retained control over large parts of the production process. Unlike other monographs, MIT Press left the graphics, layout, and typesetting in the hands of the Institute. Vignelli was once again commissioned with the design of the book series to ensure that Oppositions Books was clearly recognizable as an Institute publication, even at first glance. This way, MIT Press could expand its focus on architecture books and significantly raise its profile in the New York architecture scene as well as the Institute's European network. In return, the university publisher agreed to pay at least part of the editorial staff's salary and production costs. Eisenman and Frampton, as editors-in-chief, each received a one-time fee of US\$2,000 per title, as a bonus. In addition, MIT Press paid half the annual salary of a managing editor.

773 As early as 1973, Rossi had taken notes on both the drawings of the analogous city and the preparation of an autobiography of his projects. See Aldo Rossi, *I Quaderni azzurri* (Los Angeles: Getty Research Institute, 2000). Lobsinger, in her reading of *A Scientific Autobiography*, has pointed out that Rossi had already produced a first manuscript in 1975. See Lobsinger, 2002. Accordingly, Eisenman did not commission Rossi, but rather revisited an idea or drew on a manuscript.

774 Eisenman's first monograph, *Giuseppe Terragni. Transformations, Decompositions, Critiques*, with a foreword by Manfredo Tafuri, was already announced in the MIT Press catalogue in the fall of 1979.

At the Institute, on the other hand, the question of how it would pay for its share of the salary and production costs remained unresolved. The lack of funds was ultimately one of the reasons why the publication of the first of the *Oppositions Books* series was delayed for two more years. In 1979, Eisenman hired architect Lindsay Stamm Shapiro, who had previously curated exhibitions, as managing editor, without discussing this with Frampton beforehand. The plan was for Stamm Shapiro to be the only full-time employee, coordinating the translation, copy editing, and production of each title and communicating with the authors, publisher, and translators. When Ghirardo's first translation of *The Architecture of the City* was available in the summer of 1979, Stamm Shapiro worked with Rossi on selecting the illustrations. At the time, she was working with Frampton on Colquhoun's collection of essays, the second publication in the series, creating footnotes and a bibliography, and researching illustrations at Columbia University's Avery Library. She also requested quotes for typesetting and printing *Oppositions Books*, even though neither the conceptual design of the book series nor the planning of additional titles had progressed. The editorial team was now working with a list of fourteen titles in all, the bulk of which, in addition to two translations—e.g., two commissioned works or first publications—was made up of ten essay collections, including one by Manfredo Tafuri.⁷⁷⁵ Each title was already assigned an author who would write the introductions, with Eisenman himself taking on this responsibility for the two Rossi books. According to this list, Frampton was also slated to contribute a monograph to the series entitled *Architecture and Industrialized City*, which never materialized. But Eisenman's Terragni book no longer appeared in this context. The biggest problem was that the chronic underfunding of *Oppositions Books* almost forced the editors to adopt an amateurish approach. Stamm Shapiro was assigned only a small budget to acquire publication rights for targeted titles, let alone commission professional translations; for the most part, she worked with academics and especially students, who were cheaper but could not necessarily meet deadlines due to other commitments. She also earned comparatively less than her colleagues at *Oppositions* or the IAUS Exhibition Catalogues, which did not really speak in favor of the Institute as an employer.

With the conception of the book series, Eisenman and Frampton, who not only selected the authors to be celebrated but also lent legitimacy to the individual titles by either writing the introductions themselves or commissioning capable and favorably disposed authors to do so, ultimately assumed interpretative authority over approaches that were, methodologically and conceptually, more postmodern than poststructuralist (especially with the two Rossis), which they thus placed on a pedestal. Although they were responsible for the editorial and textual work on *Oppositions Books*, the contract with MIT Press asserted that

775 *Oppositions Books*, list of titles. Source: CCA Montréal, IAUS fonds: A.5-8.

final editorial control of the content and linguistic quality of all titles, including and especially the translations, ultimately fell to the publisher. Thus, by entering into the master agreement, MIT Press had not yet given the Institute general approval to print; the individual titles first had to be accepted by its editorial board. In the course of 1979, the editorial team worked hard to prepare concepts for the first batch of Oppositions Books: to request the first test translations of Ginzburg's monograph *Stil' i epokha* (1924) by Anatole Senkevitch Jr. and of the two collections of essays by Adolf Loos, *Ins Leere Gesprochen* (1897–1900) and *Trotzdem* (1900–1930) by Ernst Brandel, and then to obtain opinions from external experts.⁷⁷⁶ Kurt Forster served as the Institute's external reviewer. Conover supervised this editorial procedure intensively, and Stamm Shapiro spoke with him on the phone almost every day. When the first four titles were presented to the editorial board in November 1979—the review of Rossi's *A Scientific Autobiography* was submitted later—all but the translations of the two Loos books were approved.⁷⁷⁷ The university publishing house gave the Institute the go-ahead and awarded US\$24,000 each to fund the production of the titles by Rossi, Colquhoun, and Ginzburg.⁷⁷⁸ Conover had made a strong case for the Institute, even though Oppositions Books was a book series that did not necessarily promise commercial success. After all, it was he who, as head of the architecture division, had to guarantee that the book series would recoup MIT Press' expenses. In the end, only five titles were published; in addition to the two Rossi books, which were Eisenman's project, Frampton was in charge of the anthology of Colquhoun's texts, the translation of Ginzburg and eventually an anthology as a “best of” Loos were published, and while some books had already been previously accepted, or at least earmarked for publication, but were ultimately left to the Institute, the collaboration with MIT Press represented a new departure.

776 Individual texts by Moisei Ginzburg in a translation by Anatole Senkevitch Jr. and Adolf Loos in a translation by Ernst Brandel had already been planned for publication in *Oppositions* in 1975. The collaboration with Senkevitch was a guest editorial. He prepared a comprehensive concept for the translation of *Stil' i epokha*. He was also contractually assured that he would write the introduction to Oppositions Books.

777 Following the preliminary rejection of the two collections of essays by Adolf Loos by the editorial board of the MIT Press, the Institute, following Forster's recommendation, commissioned two Columbia University students, Jane Newman and John Smith, to translate it.

778 Alan Colquhoun, *Essays in Architectural Criticism* (Cambridge: MIT Press, 1981); Aldo Rossi, *A Scientific Autobiography*, trans. Lawrence Venuti (Cambridge: MIT Press, 1981); Aldo Rossi, *The Architecture of the City*, trans. Diane Ghirardo and Joan Ockman (Cambridge: MIT Press, 1982); Moisei Ginzburg, *Style and Epoch*, trans. Anatole Senkevitch. (Cambridge: MIT Press, 1983). Oppositions Books editors set the budget to produce a single title at US\$ 30,000. This meant that they had to rely on an additional US\$ 6,000 of the Institute's own capital per book.

4.3 Facing Increasing Bureaucratization

At the beginning of the new decade, work in the individual editorial offices of *Oppositions*, *Oppositions Books*, and the IAUS Exhibition Catalogues intensified. Additionally, the possible continuation of *Skyline*, which had been discontinued after Andrew MacNair's resignation, and the greater institutional involvement of *October*, which continued to be produced out of Douglas Crimp's home, required a complex publishing apparatus, subject to institutional, discursive, structural, and financial constraints. Publications were revalorized with the 1980–81 fiscal year, as the Institute faced yet another reinvention, which had been on the horizon for some time, when the NEH discontinued public funding for "Open Plan." For the first time in years, the Institute no longer had an "Evening Program," and the only series of public events was the "Exhibition Program." They financed operations primarily through revenue from architecture education, the commercially successful "Undergraduate Program," "Internship Program," and "Advanced Design Workshop." A Challenge Grant from the NEH was another source of revenue that influenced all activities, including the "Publication Program." This was a three-year grant, but it was conditional on the grant amount being matched on a one-to-three basis by private donations and other public funding. To this end, Institute director Eisenman devoted more time than in previous years to expanding its Architects' Circle and also made a compelling case for reaching out to the more financially powerful architecture establishment as well as the construction and real estate industries. Philip Johnson and Gerald Hines, who were appointed as new trustees on February 1, 1980, played an important role as intermediaries. Moreover, decisions about the future of the Institute were increasingly being made at the Century Association, a long-established society club not far away on 43rd Street that had over the years become a meeting place and power center for the New York architecture and construction world, a fact that was already being criticized in the architecture press at the time.⁷⁷⁹

Specifically, this reinvention led firstly to a structural transformation in the composition of the Board of Trustees and the hiring of new staff; in addition to Johnson and Hines, Douglas Banker, Eli Jacobs, Gerald McCue, Robert Meltzer, and John White were appointed trustees, as was Frederieke Taylor, who had resigned from her post as director of development in late 1979 to serve as executive director at the Lower Manhattan Cultural Council, and also retired from the Fellowship in the summer of 1980. She was replaced by Lynn Holstein. In addition, an associate director, Hamid Nouri, was hired in the fall of 1980 to handle financial operations and to serve as secretary and treasurer of the board. Secondly, the restructuring brought about a change in the Institute's collective

⁷⁷⁹ Plunz and Kaplan, 1984.

work, in terms of content, program, organization, and thus cultural policy. This meant not only a further professionalization of the Fellows' academic, journalistic, and publishing practice and an increasing bureaucratization of the editorial work but also an economization of each of the publications.⁷⁸⁰ The focus of the Institute in 1980–81 was clearly on publications, as the main field of activity of both old and new Fellows, who were brought in for intellectually demanding and technically skilled textual and editorial work. The publishing houses involved played an important role in the production and distribution of the publications, and thus the redefinition of the culture and debate, the discipline and pedagogy of architecture. In addition to the Institute's longstanding collaboration with MIT Press, Rizzoli International now became the publisher of *Skyline*; a commercial enterprise that had previously attracted more readers with architecture monographs than with academic publications. After all, with the formalization of relations between editors, authors, translators, and publishers at the Institute, the instituted once and for all gained the upper hand over the instituting, and the formerly small productions now became professional commodities. Large parts of the Institute's activities were devoted to the acquisition of third-party funding and to major grant applications for selected exhibition and catalogue productions. With the relaunch of *Skyline* in 1981 it became clear that, next to its news, hype, and gossip function as a tabloid, the newspaper now had to assume an institutional function as a tool for acquisition. Institute director Eisenman's main focus, however, remained on *Oppositions* and Oppositions Books, because the impact and prestige of the two formats were particularly high, and because MIT Press now insisted on fulfillment of all contracts.

Fulfilling the Contracts

Since signing the contract with MIT Press in 1976, *Oppositions* editors had never really stuck to the agreed four issues per year. The practice of misdating issues could no longer hide this fact. The Institute, the editors, and the authors had benefitted from the fact that the journal was produced at the expense of the university publisher. For MIT Press, on the other hand, *Oppositions* continued to be a prestigious but increasingly costly investment. In order to restore some regularity to *Oppositions* and to reduce the debt accumulated by the delays at MIT Press, six issues were planned simultaneously in the spring of 1980. This immense undertaking was not helped by the fact that Eisenman also founded his own office with Jaquelin Robertson as a partner that year, as did Mario Gandelsonas and Diana Agrest. Nevertheless, *Oppositions* 15 to 20 were to appear within a year. Frampton

780 Ockman blamed the Institute's post-1980 development, which she summarized as "its bureaucratization, its cultivation as a fashionable salon and power base in New York, and its solicitation of mainstream patronage," for the decline of *Oppositions*, see Ockman, 1988, 199. There were indeed "internal and external transformations in the cultural climate," but the first indication became apparent, if not obvious, as early as the mid-1970s.

in particular, who had finally published *Modern Architecture. A Critical History* in 1980 after ten years of work, again assumed a central role with the conceptual design of two double issues, *Oppositions* 15/16 and 19/20 on Le Corbusier.⁷⁸¹ In these two issues, each of which was the size of a book, Frampton published the results of his many years of research, in order to, on the one hand, rehabilitate the French-Swiss master architect as a historical figure and one of the protagonists of European modernism and, on the other hand, formulate a critique of historicism and postmodernism by historicizing modernist construction. However, Frampton's own two essays "Le Corbusier and L'Esprit Nouveau" and "The Rise and Fall of the Radiant City" could be read not necessarily as a continuation of the polemic that characterized the architecture culture in the 1970s, but as a critical examination of the legacy of white architecture by addressing Le Corbusier's urban designs, intentions, influences, and conditions, and placing them in the larger contexts of the time.⁷⁸² Frampton's essays were printed along with contributions by other Fellows, including Eisenman on the *Maison Domino* and Forster on *Maison La Roche* and *Maison Jeanneret*.⁷⁸³ The two double issues also provided opportunities for young scholars to publish recent research on Le Corbusier's life and work; e.g., Mary McLeod, who received her PhD on Le Corbusier from Princeton.⁷⁸⁴ Featuring a list of authors, *Oppositions* heralded a new phase of Le Corbusier reception in the English-speaking architecture world, one that was topical and comprehensive and, simultaneously, responded to several monographic publications that had appeared since his death in 1965.⁷⁸⁵ In addition, *Oppositions* 15/16 and *Oppositions* 19/20 published a range of documents, a text by Le Corbusier on the Weissenhofsiedlung in Stuttgart, a bibliography, and a review (the translations were by Joan Ockman and Christian Hubert).

Meanwhile, *Oppositions* 17, originally conceived by Gandelsonas as a special issue on "Architecture and Language," was more concerned with the Frankfurt School's critique of functionalism, and the social and economic conditions of modern architecture, art, and music. In his editorial "After Historicism," Vidler reflected on contemporary historiographical approaches. Gandelsonas, in "From Structure to Subject," one of his rare textual contributions to the journal,

781 Ockman referred to Frampton as the *Oppositions* "work horse;" see Ockman, 1988, 185.

782 Kenneth Frampton, "Le Corbusier and L'Esprit Nouveau," *Oppositions* 15/16 (Winter/Spring 1979), 13–58; "The Rise and Fall of the Radiant City," *Oppositions* 19/20 (Winter/Spring 1980), 2–25.

783 Peter Eisenman, "Maison Dom-ino," *Oppositions* 15/16 (Winter/Spring 1979), 119–128; see Kurt Forster, "Antiquity and Modernity in the La Roche-Jeanneret House of 1923," *Oppositions* 15/16 (Winter/Spring 1979), 131–153.

784 Mary McLeod, "Le Corbusier and Algiers," *Oppositions* 19/20 (Winter/Spring 1980), 53–85.

785 Maurice Besset, *Qui était Le Corbusier?* (Geneva: Skira, 1968); Stanislaus von Moos, *Le Corbusier – Elements of a Synthesis* (Rotterdam: nai010 publisher, [1968] 2009); Charles Jencks, *Le Corbusier and the Tragic View of Architecture* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1974).

addressed Eisenman's designs for *House VI* and *House X*, and expressed a critique of formalism derived from his analysis of precisely these structuralist approaches.⁷⁸⁶ The "Theory" section was comprehensive, with an English translation of Theodor W. Adorno's seminal lecture "Functionalism Today" delivered at the Berlin Academy of the Arts on the occasion of the Werkbund Day of 1965, a postscript by Roberto Masiero, and a reprint of a discussion with Adorno from *Werk und Zeit*, the Werkbund's publication, as well as a historical text by Ernst Bloch on "Formative Education, Engineering Form and Ornament;" the "History" section included Tafuri's essay "The Historical Project" and a text by Oriol Bohigas on "Satoris. The First Classical of the Avant-Garde," which underscored historiographical tendencies. *Oppositions* 18 was a regular issue with no real thematic focus, with texts by William Ellis on "Type and Context in Urbanism. Colin Rowe's Contextualism," Christian Norberg-Schulz on "Kahn, Heidegger and the Language of Architecture," Elaine Hochman on "Confrontation: 1933; Mies van der Rohe and the Third Reich," and documents by Rudolph Schindler (introduced by Stephans Polyzoides) and Le Corbusier (Ivan Žaknić). Eisenman himself was responsible for the conceptual design of *Oppositions* 21, which again had a strong Italian focus with contributions by Giorgio Grassi and Massimo Cacciari of IUAV, and a text by Daniel Libeskind on Aldo Rossi's *Teatro del Mondo*.⁷⁸⁷ Working on several issues at the same time posed logistical problems for the entire editorial team and for Bloomfield in particular; she was assigned two assistant managing editors, Jill Silverman and Kate Norment, to help her handle this extra workload. The race to catch up with the publishing backlog became tense when the production of the two double issues on Le Corbusier progressed further than that of *Oppositions* 17 and 18. In the end, this difficult undertaking, the schedule that had originally been agreed with MIT Press for all publications, was not entirely successful. The historiographical turn consequently resulted from the availability and commitment of *Oppositions* editors.

In 1980, Frampton increasingly began working with Silvia Kolbowski on the IAUS Exhibition Catalogues, which were to prove the Institute's most commercially successful print product. Again, the main concern was to meet the agreed four catalogues per year. Catalogue 7 on Gwathmey/Siegel Architects, honoring Charles Gwathmey's new role on the Board of Trustees, was the first to appear in 1980 and was partly financed by the architecture firm itself.⁷⁸⁸

786 Gandelsonas's essay was actually first published in *Architecture + Urbanism*; see Gandelsonas, 1979.

787 Frampton edited the essays by Thomas Hines on Richard Neutra and Stanford Anderson on Peter Behrens for *Oppositions* 21 in the spring of 1980. Later, they also planned a contribution by Vittorio Magnago Lampugnani, "Die eigenwillige Muse," but this had to be considerably revised and was subsequently not included at all.

788 IAUS, ed., *Five Houses. Gwathmey/Siegel Architects. Catalogue 7* (New York: MIT Press, 1980).

Catalogue 1 on Massimo Scolari, also published in collaboration with the Max Protetch Gallery, for the first time explicitly indicated on the cover that the series was distributed by MIT Press.⁷⁸⁹ In May 1980, Catalogue 13 on *A New Wave of Austrian Architecture* was published, comparatively close in time to the exhibition that was shown at the Institute in the spring of 1980 and was still touring the United States at the time of publication.⁷⁹⁰ The exhibition and catalogue presented six Vienna-based architects and artists (Missing Link, Hermann Czech, Heinz Frank, Appelt-Kneissel-Prochazka, Heinz Tesar, and Rob Krier) each with several projects, texts, and biographies, introduced with essays by Friedrich Achleitner and Rudolf Kohoutek. Unlike other productions, with the exception of design and printing, all editing and text production had been carried out in Austria, with the Institute acting as a publishing house. Strikingly, it was the first catalogue in the series to feature a new cover design: the fine serif typeface of the titles had been replaced by large, bold letters in partly loud, partly pastel tones, giving the series a distinctly postmodern aesthetic. In addition, the fine line drawings inside which had previously characterized the series had now been replaced by color illustrations, drawings, and photographs. The new graphics also revealed a new strategy on the part of the Institute, and Vignelli was now more intent on putting his own recognizable stamp on each of the productions. A letter-size flyer was being produced to advertise a total of eight IAUS Exhibition Catalogues, but there were repeated delays. For example, Catalogue 11 on Wallace Harrison was postponed until further notice due to a lack of funds. After more than a year, Frampton and Kolbowski were still struggling with structural problems, but also with individual capacity, as very different priorities were set. With Catalogue 12 on John Hejduk, another catalogue had not been ready for the exhibition because Eisenman had not managed to deliver his introduction on time. Again, Kolbowski complained to Eisenman as author and Institute director about the resulting delay. The Institute's "Publication Program," with five different formats that required coordination of different schedules and diverse contributions from Fellows and external authors, was in danger of failing because of the discrepancy between aspirations and reality.

In 1980, after three years of planning and preparation, Eisenman and Frampton ultimately took the final steps towards launching *Oppositions Books* with Rossi's *The Architecture of the City*, the translation of which was largely completed, as a top priority; by now, MIT Press had invested a great deal of time and money in this book project. At the same time, the contract for *A Scientific Autobiography* had been signed in March 1980 and Lawrence Venuti of the Translation Center at Columbia University, who had done a test translation, had

789 IAUS, ed., *Massimo Scolari. Architecture. Between Memory and Hope*. Catalogue 1 (New York: MIT Press, 1980).

790 IAUS, ed., *Austrian New Wave*. Catalogue 13 (New York: The Institute for Architecture and Urban Studies, 1980).

already been commissioned to translate it. According to the contract, Rossi left the English-language publication rights to the two partners and also undertook to write an introduction to the planned Loos book. In a concept paper, Institute director Eisenman projected that during the 1980–81 fiscal year, work would be carried out on five Oppositions Books titles simultaneously.⁷⁹¹ At the same time, the editors pressed ahead with the conceptual work for other titles: for example, they commissioned the translation of the *Selected Writings of Arata Isozaki* and acquired the publication rights for texts by Theo van Doesburg. Another key book of the Oppositions Books series was Tafuri's *The Sphere and the Labyrinth*, a test translation for which was being prepared by Robert Connolly and Pellegrino D'Arcierno. Stamm Shapiro also sought and acquired the translation rights to this book, which contained texts on the modern avant-garde and its contemporary epigones, published in Italian by Einaudi, for the lump sum of US\$900.

Then, in the fall of 1980, Tafuri's essay "The Historical Project" appeared in *Oppositions* 17.⁷⁹² In this text, which was actually the English translation of his introduction to *The Sphere and the Labyrinth*, presented here in the "History" section, Tafuri introduced a metatheoretical analysis of architecture discourse and institutions and, starting from a semiotic-linguistic interpretation of "architecture, language, techniques, institutions, historical space" committed to deconstruction, reflected at length on the question of "labor" in relation to "architectural writing."⁷⁹³ "The historian is a worker 'in the plural,' like the subjects on which he labors."⁷⁹⁴ He contrasted "operative criticism" that places itself in the service of the profession, as practiced at the Institute, with his own approach to critical historiography, with which, following poststructuralist theories, he focused primarily on an analysis of power.⁷⁹⁵ Written as an introductory text, Tafuri called for the expansion of the "critical field," with architecture criticism now being called upon to start at another level of scale "from the analysis of the architectural object to the criticism of the global contexts that condition its configuration." The essay thus concluded Tafuri's own historiographical project of the 1970s, which had consisted of writing a history of "intellectual labor" of the professions of architecture and urban studies.⁷⁹⁶ On the one hand, he was concerned with processes underlying the concrete material object and on the other, with the reception

791 IAUS, projected titles of Oppositions Books for 1980/81, n.d. Source: CCA Montréal, IAUS fonds: A.1-4.

792 Manfredo Tafuri, "The Historical Project," trans. Diane Ghirardo and Stephen Sartarelli, *Oppositions* 17, (Summer 1979), 55–75.

793 Ibid., 56.

794 Ibid., 66.

795 Ibid., 69.

796 Ibid., 71.

of buildings as final products. Reflecting on the contemporary practice of historians and theorists, this essay also represented the endpoint of Tafuri's engagement with Eisenman and the Institute that by now claimed a huge part of his publications in English. In addition to Tafuri, it was also thanks to Eisenman's still-intense Italian connections, especially to the IUAV, that two more monographs, by Massimo Cacciari and Giorgio Grassi, were being discussed for Oppositions Books in 1980, alongside their contributions in *Oppositions*, which had already been firmly scheduled.⁷⁹⁷ Eisenman had contacted Francesco Dal Co to assist him in selecting the texts and as a potential author of the introductions. The idea was for Italian authors, more than from any other intellectual and cultural context, to become a figurehead of this book series; for them, the offer of a fully funded, high-quality English translation through the Institute and publication by a prestigious American university publisher must have been extremely attractive. However, Stamm Shapiro was often left almost entirely to her own devices. It was timely, therefore, that Joan Ockman graduated from Cooper Union in the summer of 1980 and not only rejoined the *Oppositions* editorial team but also took on a lot of work on Oppositions Books, initially handling the difficult translation of the Rossi book before becoming even more involved in the entire production in 1981.

Relaunch

While driving the Institute's publishing offensive forward with wholehearted personal enthusiasm in 1980, Institute director Eisenman also made *Skyline*'s relaunch a top priority. Only a short time after publication had been temporarily suspended following MacNair's resignation, he sought to continue the newspaper with a new, professional editorial staff, with Rizzoli as commercial publisher, and, above all, with secured financing. In June, in a memorandum to the trustees, he called *Skyline* "potentially" the Institute's "most important publication."⁷⁹⁸ Obviously, Eisenman needed their support for a relaunch. He even linked the question of whether the publication should be continued to the very purpose of the Institute since "to give it up without exploring all options would seem to me to defeat the reason for the existence of the Institute." At a time when the Institute was facing profound institutional, financial, personnel, and programmatic transformations and needed not only to raise private funds but also to moderate a generational shift, Eisenman personally championed a

797 Cacciari had proposed his two books, *Metropolis* (1973) and *Oikos* (1975), for an English translation. In late 1980, Oppositions Books editors discussed using essays from *Oikos* and *Dallo Steinhof* and an article on Wittgenstein. A translation of *Metropolis* was published under the title *Architecture and Nihilism. On the Philosophy of Modern Architecture* by Yale University Press in 1996. A long version of the essay "Avantgarde and Continuity" by Grassi was initially under discussion. Later it was proposed to acquire the publication rights to *The Logical Construction of Architecture* (1967), but MIT Press was more interested in Grassi's more recent books.

798 Peter Eisenman, memo to the trustees regarding *Skyline*, June 9, 1980. Source: CCA Montréal, IAUS fonds: A.5-6.

relaunch of *Skyline*. The publication of *Skyline* was to be financed by donations from larger architecture firms, some of which already had philanthropic ties to the Institute through the Architects' Circle, as well as successful contractors, who in return were to be featured in interviews in addition to being named in the masthead. Eisenman was aware that the Institute would not initially make a profit on *Skyline*. He was, however, determined not to let the 1980–81 NEA grant lapse. Once again, Eisenman received support from Philip Johnson, who provided many contacts to sponsors, as well as his own name and financial resources, for a relaunch.

In his search for a new editor-in-chief, Eisenman turned to Suzanne Stephens on the recommendation of Robert Stern. Compared to other candidates, Stephens stood out because she had worked as an editor in the 1970s, first for *Architectural Forum* and then for *Progressive Architecture*. Importantly, she also had a keen insight into national and local building, cultural, and media politics, while maintaining a critical distance from New York architecture circles, including the Institute. When she agreed to take on the role of editor-in-chief in August 1980 after brief but very focused negotiations, she tied this to a number of conditions, including the hiring of an executive director.⁷⁹⁹ In addition, Stephens secured the suspension of payment of the 40% overhead to IAUS Central for *Skyline* until further notice, as this was the only way for her to achieve financial independence for the newspaper. In making these demands, she demonstrated not only a strong sense of the Institute's politics but also negotiating skills, demanding, for example, a fixed annual salary for herself for a two-year period, as well as salaries for a managing editor, an assistant editor, and a copy editor, ultimately earning more than she had in her previous job. For the architecture newspaper to achieve a professional standard, she believed that this should be expressed in content and form, as well as in circulation, reach, and scope. Margot Jacqz, who remained managing editor, then took care of communications with subscribers and advertisers; after all, there were still almost 1,500 subscriptions to *Skyline*, including more than one hundred abroad. Even before she signed her contract, Stephens was already working on a budget plan and a new concept for the newspaper. At the time, Eisenman repeatedly emphasized *Skyline*'s function and its importance for the Institute in his concept papers.⁸⁰⁰ For example, the Institute's publications had aroused interest in a new kind of architecture journalism, as *Skyline* had successfully communicated to a broader public. Eisenman displayed even more of an economic mindset as a publicist than before, in terms of attention and monetization. *Skyline* was an ideal means for him to market architectural knowledge

799 Suzanne Stephens, letter to Peter Eisenman, August 26, 1980. Source: CCA Montréal, IAUS fonds: A.5-2.

800 Peter Eisenman, "Why the Institute?" & "Why Skyline?," n.d. Source: CCA Montréal, IAUS fonds: A.5-6.

and power, to present “a specifically New York view” of architecture culture. He also imagined how distressed New York architects would be if they were not included in *Skyline* and thus not the center of public interest. To Stephens, he made it clear that envy was a central mechanism that was to govern the editorial policy of the architecture newspaper in the future.⁸⁰¹ For fiscal year 1980–81, the Institute projected a budget of US\$125,000 for *Skyline* alone, which included sales revenues and grants from private and public foundations.⁸⁰²

Renegotiations

At the same time, beginning in the fall of 1980, the Institute’s new associate director Hamid Nouri entered into negotiations with MIT Press for Rizzoli to publish *Oppositions*; the university publisher responded calmly and agreed to let its commercial competitor handle distribution. However, working relations between MIT Press and the Institute were subsequently so badly damaged that the publisher made its first financial demands on the Institute in October 1980. Over the course of the winter, a long correspondence ensued. In a letter personally addressed to Eisenman, Frank Urbanowski, the head of MIT Press, revealed that they had invested more in the Institute in the past than in any other publication project.⁸⁰³ “In total,” he recounted, “there is approximately US\$125,000 of MIT Press money currently advanced to support a combination of IAUS projects, including *Oppositions*, the catalogues, and the book series.” The university publisher insisted on repayment of at least half of the debt. In addition, MIT Press pressed for fulfillment of the existing contract for another volume of *Oppositions* 21 through 24, especially since continued subscriptions provided a lucrative source of funds to cover the expenses already incurred.⁸⁰⁴ Ultimately, MIT Press was pulling the plug on the project with these demands and declared *Oppositions* over after only six volumes.

Meanwhile, production of *Oppositions* Books continued to be slow; still, no books had been published in collaboration with MIT Press. At an editorial meeting in the fall of 1980, it became obvious that the editorial staff was simply overworked. After all, no one at the Institute except Frampton had experience in book production. The first translation of *The Architecture of the City* proved problematic and continued to be extremely time-consuming; there was also no money available for a new translation. An attempt was therefore made to publish the Colquhoun book first in the series. As the Institute continued its efforts to raise funds for *Oppositions* Books, Eisenman noted that Stamm Shapiro’s salary

801 In our oral history interview, Stephens spoke about being tasked by Eisenman to produce envy.

802 IAUS, financial requirements of individual programs for fiscal year 1980/81, n.d. Source: CCA Montréal, IAUS fonds: A.2-11.

803 Frank Urbanowski, letter to Peter Eisenman, November 25, 1980. Source: CCA Montréal, IAUS fonds: A.5-7.

804 Ann Reinke, letter to Gianfranco Monacelli, December 12, 1980. Source: CCA Montréal, IAUS fonds: A.5-7.

was lower than that of the other managing editors, and so her annual salary was raised to US\$18,000. To make matters worse, in the late fall of 1980 MIT Press refused to pay any more advances before the first title in the book series was published. Rossi's *A Scientific Autobiography* was still awaiting approval from the MIT Press' editorial board. Finally, a path opened up for Oppositions Books when the Institute submitted the book series to the Graham Foundation in Chicago on December 15, 1980.⁸⁰⁵ Stamm Shapiro had compiled a comprehensive document for a grant application with texts by Eisenman and Frampton, which included a concept, a new list of now eleven titles, the current status of each title's editing, a timetable, a budget, summaries of four publications (Colquhoun, Rossi, Ginzburg, Loos), and detailed CVs of the two editors as qualifications. Here, Rossi's *The Architecture of the City* continued to be listed first, with the publication of an English translation fifteen years after the original described as long overdue. Attached to the book series proposal was a first draft cover for the Rossi book, prepared by Vignelli, which showed the Graham Foundation that they would be named exclusively in the imprimatur as a sponsor. MIT Press, on the other hand, was not mentioned as a publishing partner at this point; there had been negotiations with other publishers despite the existing contract.

With rhetoric that was both ambitious and lofty, the Institute sought to underscore the book series' eligibility for funding. The proposal stated that "Oppositions Books will function as a Great Books course, library, syllabus, and bibliography for the professional and the student."⁸⁰⁶ Oppositions Books editors confidently claimed that they would produce future classics that would form a new compulsory canon of theory and history books, a task that in the United States had previously been undertaken primarily by the George Braziller publishing company, albeit with a different approach and focus; for example, with volumes on art history by Meyer Shapiro, on the architecture of modern masters such as Alvar Aalto, on contemporary positions such as Richard Buckminster Fuller or Oscar Niemeyer, on urban planning in specific periods or regions, or on the national architectural production of each decade. The editors specifically highlighted two titles, "the meditative autobiography and canonic study on the relationship of architecture and the city of Aldo Rossi, the rigorous and severe historical etudes of Manfredo Tafuri."⁸⁰⁷ At the same time, they again argued that with this series, as with *Oppositions*, the Institute would provide teaching content for the newly created master's degree and doctoral programs at North American universities and that the central question of the target group was thus as good as resolved. "At the same time when burgeoning architecture history and theory

805 Peter Eisenman and Kenneth Frampton, "A Proposal for the Support of Oppositions Books," submitted to the Graham Foundation, December 15, 1980. Source: CCA Montréal, IAUS fonds: A.5-8.

806 Ibid., 4.

807 Ibid., 3.

courses throughout the nation require essential primary texts concerned with the theory and cultural history of architecture, this series has a ready-made and developing audience.”⁸⁰⁸ With its grant application to the Graham Foundation in the early 1980s, the Institute grandiosely portrayed itself as a discourse leader in the English-speaking, if not Western world, and also justified this move by citing university teaching aimed at the classics, especially at the University of Chicago and Columbia University. In his personally signed letter to Carter Manny, the director of the Graham Foundation, Eisenman used the example of Rossi’s *A Scientific Autobiography* to emphasize the eligibility of commissioned publications and first publications and held out the future prospect of commissioning not only positions from Europe but increasingly exclusive publications by American architects. As examples, he listed Philip Johnson, Robert Venturi, Robert Stern, John Hejduk, and Michael Graves; all of them well-known and popular postmodernists whose publications should also be promising.⁸⁰⁹ In his letter, Eisenman literally ingratiated himself to Manny by expounding on the great historical significance the book series would one day have: “Fifty years from now all historians will, I think, certainly appreciate your generosity and recognize this very natural partnership.” When the Institute received a full grant just a month later, in mid-January 1981, Manny’s response was equally rhetorical in emphasizing that *Oppositions Books* would become an extremely important project for architecture education.⁸¹⁰

Publishing at the Institute took on a different status, despite the contract negotiations. With his lists of authors and titles, Eisenman knew how to harness and orchestrate the diverse capital of the networks attached to the Institute. The opportunities for editors, Fellows, and Visiting Fellows, as well as outside authors to publish books or journal articles resulted in a complex system of merits and awards for maintaining and creating commitments and connections. Thanks to his charisma, Eisenman also maintained the Institute’s network of publishers and foundations. When Frampton was appointed director of publications in late 1980—a post created especially for him—Eisenman was rewarding him for his faith in the Institute and his loyalty.⁸¹¹ Frampton was recompensed for his immense contribution to almost all of the Institute’s publications, *Oppositions*, the IAUS Exhibition Catalogues, and the *Oppositions Books*; the

808 Ibid., 3.

809 Peter Eisenman, letter to Carter Manny, December 15, 1980. Source: CCA Montréal, IAUS fonds: A.5-8.

810 Carter Manny, letter to Peter Eisenman, January 16, 1981. Source: CCA Montréal, IAUS fonds: A.3-19. The Graham Foundation disbursed the seed capital in two installments, at the beginning of 1981 and of 1982.

811 Peter Eisenman, letter to Kenneth Frampton, December 1, 1980. Source: CCA Montréal, IAUS fonds: A.2-10.

expansion of the publication apparatus in the preceding years would have been impossible without him. Hence, it was more than justified that this position brought him an additional salary of US\$12,500 annually from January 1981 as compensation. At the same time, however, the new position obliged Frampton to live up to the trust placed in him in the future. One advantage was certainly that his authority as a person and as an editor was recognized by all the managing editors active at the Institute.

Yet, despite the engagement and support of female staff, work at the Institute was still dominated by a hierarchical if not patriarchal structure that not only reflected North American society in the 1970s and 1980s but also represented gender roles in the field of architecture and in particular the male-dominated building world.⁸¹² As the Institute's publication apparatus expanded, many women were now working on the editorial teams as managing editors and thus permanent staff, including Bloomfield at *Oppositions*, Jacqz at *Skyline*, Kolbowski at IAUS Exhibition Catalogues, and Stamm Shapiro and Ockman at *Oppositions Books*.⁸¹³ As an act of recognition, female editorial staff were gradually appointed to the rank of Fellows beginning in the 1980–81 fiscal year. However, in addition to Stephens as now editor-in-chief of *Skyline*, only two other women, Krauss and Michelson, had served on *October's* editorial board from the beginning. As a result, few women at the Institute were given the chance to take on a truly senior position, and it was very difficult for the junior staff to rise in the Institute's power hierarchy. The women did provide quality editing and writing, but the ideas, concepts, and contacts came mostly from the male editors. Without the commitment of the female managing editors, however, the Institute would not have lived up to its former reputation as a think tank and current role in architecture discourse, and the tangible legacy in the form of publications would have been far less.

From the perspective of a cultural critique of the Institute's publishing activities and a sociology of architecture culture, its textual and editorial practices, which attest to the transformation of the culture industry in the field of architecture, especially the publishing market in North America, all formats produced at the Institute were transformed into commodities under Institute director Eisenman. As with the Institute's work on research and architectural projects, teaching, and cultural production in the broader sense, the long-practiced pragmatism was also apparent in the publications of the early 1980s. For the success of a publication was measured by the Institute's leadership not so much in terms of its reception and impact on architecture debate and education, but ultimately in terms of

812 Several women at the Institute initially worked for Richard Meier's firm before moving to the Institute, Julia Bloomfield at the front desk and Joan Ockman as an intern after graduation.

813 In an oral history interview, Eisenman boasts that there were numerous women working at the Institute.

the financial viability of its production and whether it yielded economic profits, whether each format could sustain itself in the expanding and yet competitive North American book and journal market. The situation worsened when Michael Leonard, MIT Press' deputy general manager, communicated to Eisenman in early 1981 that the university publisher was no longer willing to act as the Institute's bank for the publication of *Oppositions*. A repayment of the losses, as contractually agreed, was finally arranged through the Institute's lawyers. The debt, which now totaled over US\$80,000, was to be repaid in two installments in 1982 and 1983. The somewhat one-sided collaboration, which had given the Institute enormous freedom, was thus terminated by MIT Press for economic reasons. The Institute now had to atone for years of mismanagement and budget deficits.

4.4 Embracing Commercial Benefits

The Institute had been trying for some time to move all its publications to Rizzoli International, which escalated matters. Eisenman expressed dissatisfaction towards the academic publisher about the low circulation of *Oppositions*—MIT Press had printed only 2,900 copies, half of which were for subscribers—and the unsolved distribution problems, as the journal was only irregularly marketed in Europe via de Boer, although there were separate agreements for England, France, Italy, and Japan. He had been friends with Rizzoli's director Gianfranco Monacelli for some time. The art book publisher, an American offshoot of the renowned traditional Italian publishing house from Milan, founded in 1927, which had maintained a second office in New York since 1964, had until then built its share with architecture monographs rather than academic journals. Nevertheless, the international distribution of *Oppositions* was of interest to the commercial publisher, so in September 1980 Monacelli made the Institute an offer to buy a print run of 6,000 copies of the journal per issue at a fixed price of US\$25,000. This would have meant regular income. Eisenman also negotiated with Rizzoli about the Institute's other publications. Over the summer of 1981, he also negotiated with Monacelli about *Skyline* and finally managed to get Rizzoli to make an offer for the architecture newspaper too, according to which they would finance half of the production and, in addition, advertising and distribution.⁸¹⁴ The extent to which Eisenman once again combined his personal interests with those of the Institute was evident from the fact that, parallel to the institutional negotiations, he also succeeded in placing his own books with Rizzoli: first a publication on *House X* in 1982, and then his book on *Giuseppe Terragni*, albeit not until 2003.⁸¹⁵

814 Gianfranco Monacelli, letter to Peter Eisenman, September 30, 1980. Source: CCA Montréal, IAUS fonds: A.5-6.

815 Peter Eisenman, *House X* (New York: Rizzoli International, 1982); *Giuseppe Terragni. Transformations, Decompositions, Critiques* (New York: Monacelli Press, 2003).

Although Eisenman threatened the existence of *Oppositions*, the Institute was now in a better position to renegotiate with MIT Press, since it had in Rizzoli a potential, financially strong partner as back-up. In the process, the conflicted and dispersed capital that took both embodied, objectified, and institutionalized forms at the Institute was reproduced in this dispute with MIT Press, and legitimized precarious cultural production for years. As a result, the Institute had to stay with MIT Press for *Oppositions* and Oppositions Books for the time being, at least until the contracts were fulfilled and its debts were paid.

In 1981, however, Rizzoli International initially took over the distribution of the IAUS Exhibition Catalogues and was eventually selected as the new publisher for the relaunch of *Skyline* that same year. The contract for the catalogues, which came into effect on January 1, 1981, covered the production of six catalogues per year, three in the spring and three in the fall, with a production cost of US\$5,000 and an editorial salary of US\$9,000 for each catalogue. Although this made the production of the catalogues a regular source of income, the Institute took a large risk by tying the catalogue series to the “Exhibition Program.” The concept remained the same, namely that the catalogues would document historical, contemporary, and—new to the program—projected exhibitions in an increased print run of 3,000 to 4,000 copies. The first publication to be published by Rizzoli was Catalogue 14 on “Le Corbusier’s Firminy Church,” which accompanied the double exhibition curated by José Oubrierie at the Institute and Cooper Union in April 1981. The exhibition and the catalogue supported a kind of architectural fundraising at the Institute, as French architect Oubrierie was responsible for the completion of the extraordinary building in Firminy, France. *Oppositions* 19/20, Frampton’s lavish double issue on Le Corbusier, was also published to coincide with the opening of the exhibition. With a total of seven issues in the 1980–81 fiscal year, *Oppositions* largely succeeded in fulfilling their contractual obligations to MIT Press and, for the first time, even made a small profit on the journal. The editors were optimistic and planned more individual editorials and contributions of their own for the next issues. In addition, the editorial team was rejuvenated when, after the departure of William Ellis, Alan Plattus took over the “Reviews, Letters, Forum” section, with book reviews again playing a larger role in the future.⁸¹⁶ With regular reviews of magazines and journals from Europe (*A.M.C.*, *Lotus*, *Rassegna*), *Oppositions* was to take on a somewhat different focus, position itself proactively, and assert itself as a central print medium. In addition, there were also more and more reviews of magazines and journals that had been produced at American universities in the meantime, such as *Harvard Architecture Review*, *Modulus*, *Perspecta*, and *VIA*. The production of *Oppositions* Books also took off in the spring of 1981. After the bold new layout

816 IAUS, book reviews in production, March 1981. Source: CCA Montréal, IAUS fonds: A.5-7.

for the catalogue series, Vignelli was now working on the graphic design for the book series, which, with its square format and gridded layout, borrowed heavily from *Oppositions* and the catalogues. The graphics had to be submitted to the publisher, although the contract actually stipulated that MIT Press would hand over the design completely to the Institute and only assume the costs and responsibility for printing. Significantly, Eisenman ended up fighting with Conover over the imprimatur, and the Institute once again overrode its partner by defining the collaboration as a hierarchical relationship and demoting the university publisher to a “publishing service.”⁸¹⁷ But the new contract situation with Rizzoli soon proved as problematic as the one with MIT Press before it. As early as the spring of 1981, the new publisher refused to pay the agreed advances for the catalogues until Eisenman had delivered the artwork for his monograph.

One important publication for both the Institute and Eisenman was, however, Catalogue 3, “Idea as Model. 22 Architects 1976/80,” which was published by Rizzoli in the summer of 1981, almost five years after the exhibition.⁸¹⁸ Eisenman had personally championed the publication. Unlike many others in the series, Catalogue 3 was ultimately more than an exhibition catalogue and featured photographs of not only the models and sculptures shown at the Institute in the winter of 1976–77 but also of newer ones, some of which had been made especially for the publication in 1980 by the architects involved at the time. However, the development of architectural thinking and design exhibited here is not the only reason why Catalogue 3 was less of a documentation and more of a document of both a history of ideas and the Institute. With an introduction by Christian Hubert, a young Fellow who was involved with the editorial team of the catalogue series, about the tasks performed by the architectural model in general and two texts by art critic Richard Pommer, an early review, written immediately after the exhibition, discussing the actual contributions, even rivaling conceptions of art and architecture vis-à-vis social responsibility, and an essay debating the profound changes in the art market with regard to the commercial uses of architectural models rather than their design purposes, the catalogue also described the reception history of “Idea as Model” over the five-year period and thus its cultural significance.⁸¹⁹ One striking aspect is that Eisenman’s conceptually reasoned approach toward an autonomous architecture now took on a central role in the publication, in contrast to the exhibition, in which all models had been displayed side by side on an equal footing. Eisenman claimed authorship for the exhibition idea in the preface, which was ostensibly about the competition of ideas through models. In addition, the catalogue now also featured an interview

817 Peter Eisenman, letter to Roger Conover, April 21, 1981. Source: CCA Montréal, IAUS fonds: A.5-8.

818 IAUS, ed., *Idea as Model: 22 Architects 1976/1980*, Catalogue 3 (New York: Rizzoli International, 1981).

819 Pommer, 1981; see also Christian Hubert, “The Ruins of Representation,” in IAUS, 1981, 17–27.

with him about his ideas on the function of architectural models, questions of representation, scale, and the relationship between models and reality.⁸²⁰

In 1981, in response to the new publishing regime, which called for the expansion of both the book series and the catalogue series, the editorial staff at the Institute was also restructured. Stamm Shapiro, who until then had worked exclusively as managing editor of Oppositions Books, was now also responsible for catalogue production, having taken over the management of the “Exhibition Program” that summer from Laurie Hawkinson, who had left the Institute. At the same time, Ockman was rising through the ranks to become executive editor of Oppositions Books as well as serving as an editorial consultant to the IAUS Exhibition Catalogues. Stamm Shapiro, meanwhile, had commissioned the typesetting for Alan Colquhoun’s collection of essays and had already worked with Eisenman on the layout of Rossi’s *A Scientific Autobiography*. Ockman revised the translation of *The Architecture of the City* and took over the editing of both the Loos and Ginzburg books. Moreover, on the initiative of Hamid Nouri, the editors were joined by two new assistant editors, Christopher Sweet and Thomas Mellins, whose salaries were again paid by Philip Johnson. However, production of the books and catalogues continued to progress slowly.

Skyline, Reissued

Skyline assumed more institutional importance than the other formats and its relaunch absorbed capacities at the Institute. To help counterbalance this, Eisenman wrote to seventeen architecture firms and contractors, in his words “leading members of the professional community”—mostly in Philip Johnson’s name, sometimes in John Burgee’s—in April 1981.⁸²¹ In the letter, which Eisenman rewrote several times and eventually cut and pasted together, he asked for donations of US\$10,000 per year for a total of three years to build up a stock of capital for the relaunch. According to him, the hallmark of the new *Skyline* was to be that its editorial staff would be accountable to both the Institute and its sponsors but would ultimately operate independently. The campaign got off to a rather slow start, however, and by June, only four commitments had been made for this form of cultural sponsorship. Edward Saxe who, on Johnson’s recommendation, had been advising the Institute’s leadership on financial matters since early 1981, proposed that well-known American architects such as John Burgee, I.M. Pei, Cesar Pelli, and Kevin Roche, as well as a number of prominent and financially strong developers be added to the Board of Trustees in order to forge even stronger and more enduring links between

820 Eisenman had conducted the conversation with Lindsay Stamm Shapiro and her husband, the poet David Shapiro; see Peter Eisenman, “A Poetics of the Model: Eisenman’s Doubt,” (March 8, 1981) In IAUS, 1981, 121–125.

821 Peter Eisenman, draft letter to sponsors, n.d. Source: CCA Montréal, IAUS fonds: A.5-2 / ARCH401625.

the Institute and the establishment of the architecture and building world.⁸²² Johnson himself stepped forward as a trustee and patron when the Institute hosted a dinner in his name at the Century Association on July 20, 1981, to celebrate *Skyline*. Other dinners, such as those in the name of Gerald Hines, or in honor of *The New York Times* architecture critic Ada Louise Huxtable, were to follow. By promising patrons admission to this illustrious circle, the Institute ultimately built up a new philanthropic network, next to the Architects' Circle, that would become strategically important for *Skyline* and for the Institute itself. Contemporaries criticized this development and characterized the architecture newspaper as "the single most important media resource for the Inner Club."⁸²³ Indeed, *Skyline* became a PR instrument for New York architects who rallied around Johnson in the Century Association.⁸²⁴ The fact that the Institute was not averse to building bridges between architecture and the building industry—on the contrary—and its attempts to attract further sponsoring were also reflected in a conference on the subject of "Architecture, Development and the New Investment Pattern: Can They Co-exist?" which had been planned for some time and was finally scheduled for September 1981, that is at the same time as the relaunch of *Skyline*, under the direction of Gerald Hines and based on a concept by Jonathan Barnett.⁸²⁵ Even if this conference ultimately did not take place, the planning alone highlights the economic promise of a construction and real estate industry that had gradually recovered by the early 1980s and its hoped-for impact on the architecture world.

Like Oppositions Books, the rebirth of *Skyline* was ultimately made possible by Philip Johnson, who once again paid the editor's salary, in this case, that of Suzanne Stephens, thus financing a key position in the Institute's publishing operations. During the preliminary negotiations, Stephens had her attorney draw up a contract that guaranteed her an income of US\$30,000 per year—making her the Institute's top earner—and wide-reaching powers. Not only was she paid more than any other editor, but even more than Eisenman as Institute

822 Edward Saxe, memo to Bruce Brackenridge, April 15, 1981. Source: CCA Montréal, IAUS fonds: A.1-6. Saxe, who was previously deputy director and general manager at MoMA, initially advised the Institute without an official mandate.

823 Plunz and Kaplan, 1984.

824 *Skyline* was ultimately funded by a list of architecture firms: Daniel, Mann, Johnson & Mendenhall; Ulrich Franzen & Associates; Philip Johnson and John Burgee Architects; Paul Kennon / Caudill Rowlett Scott, Inc; Murphy/Jahn Architects/Engineers; I.M. Pei and Partners; Cesar Pelli Associates; Kevin Roche, John Dinkeloo & Associates; Paul Rudolph, Architect; The Skidmore, Owings & Merrill Foundation; Swanke, Hayden & Conell; see *Skyline* (October 1981); see also IAUS, list of sponsors. Source: CCA Montréal, IAUS fonds: A.5-6.

825 As designer for the CPC and head of the UDC, Barnett used to collaborate with the Institute; see Jonathan Barnett, proposal and revision of concept for conference on investment patterns, October 20, 1980, November 10, 1980, November 11, 1980, April 6, 1981 & April 10, 1981. Source: CCA Montréal, IAUS fonds: A. 5-11.

director; she was also given full editorial control over *Skyline*'s content while bearing no financial responsibility. Her two-year employment contract also covered her if the status of the architecture newspaper changed, such as in the event of discontinuation, merger, change of publisher, or change of name. She was also contractually assured that four full-time editorial positions would be available. This meant that *Skyline* had the only professional editorial staff at the Institute, and Stephens had full decision-making authority over all personnel: in addition to Margot Jacqz as managing editor, regular staff included Margot Norton, who worked freelance as a copy editor, and Heather Cogswell, who was initially editorial assistant; the fact that the editorial team was composed exclusively of women was a first in the Institute's history. As part of the professionalization, Stephens, who was provided with a fully equipped office at the Institute, was also able to ensure that—for the first time—authors were paid a fee of ten cents per written word. To ensure that the interests of all partners were safeguarded, an editorial board was set up at the Institute. This was composed of one representative each from *Skyline* (Suzanne Stephens), the Institute (Anthony Vidler), the sponsors (Henry Cobb), and the publisher (Gianfranco Monacelli), and served as a controlling body. Eisenman appointed Vidler, head of the editorial board, to act as an intermediary to ensure that the professional work and journalistic quality justified commercial distribution and financial support. Vignelli eventually also became a member of the editorial board. Over the summer, he also created the new graphic design of *Skyline* along with Michael Bierut, who worked as a junior designer at Vignelli Associates, further developing the old graphic design. As design director, Vignelli was responsible for the redesign of *Skyline*, ensuring that it was visually consistent with the Institute's identity—at least its brand identity if not its corporate identity—even as this evolved from a modernist approach to a postmodern look that subsequently built on the new *Skyline*. The relaunch was carried out professionally, not least because the conclusion of a contract with Rizzoli had ensured financial stability. On the publisher's side, David Morton was now responsible for the Institute's publications. Morton, as a former editor of *Progressive Architecture*, was well acquainted with Stephens and accordingly took personal responsibility for the newspaper, which now had a circulation of 5,000 copies and was distributed at an increased, but still affordable price of US\$2.50. On September 29, 1981, the relaunch of *Skyline* was marked by a big release party at the Institute.

Running an Editorial Floor

Publishing at the Institute felt different then. In the summer of 1981, the *October* editorial staff, where Craig Owens had by then been replaced by Joan Copjec, moved back into the Institute's penthouse. At the beginning of the 1981–82 academic year, the Institute's upper floor was thus virtually a single editorial floor. Almost all publications now had their offices there and were connected by the bridge that ideally would have facilitated exchange between editorial

offices. *Oppositions* alone was still edited on the 20th floor, although the journal had long since lost its key status. Finally, the restructuring of the Institute's publishing operations was accompanied by further personnel changes, as Silvia Kolbowski (September 1980), Joan Ockman (May 1981) and Rosalind Krauss (July 1981) were appointed Fellows. This meant that the editors, executive editors, and managing editors of IAUS Exhibition Catalogues, *Oppositions* Books, and *October* now had direct representation in the Fellowship, which underscored or reinforced their status and their voice in the Institute.⁸²⁶ In early October 1981, the Institute's executive and operational structure was revised—it was divided into separate subdivisions for the first time—and the Fellows held four programmatic Institute meetings, each dealing with one of the four major areas of work, "Publication Programs," "Education Programs," "Public Programs," and "Development Programs," to set new strategies and goals for the next five years. In this context, Frampton, as director of publications, provided a status report on each of the Institute's publications, himself being responsible for *Oppositions*, the IAUS Exhibition Catalogues, and the *Oppositions* Books.⁸²⁷ One point that was raised in this context was that *Oppositions* editors continued to be dissatisfied with the work of MIT Press, especially with its distribution abroad. Of particular concern was that the Institute was currently investing almost exclusively in the production of the journal but continued to see no significant revenue from academic publishing. In an effort to reduce the Institute's dependence on publishers, there was renewed talk of establishing its own publishing house as part of the search for new spaces. At the meeting, Frampton made a specific proposal to combine all steps of production under a single roof in the future to save costs through synergy effects. "Specifically the question was raised," the meeting minutes later state, "whether the Institute might do better, in the long term, to handle all aspects of publication, including in-house typesetting, graphics, and distribution."⁸²⁸ For the current fiscal year, however, all five publications were contractually bound to the publishers, and Nouri pointed out that MIT Press and Rizzoli still had a better "selling name" than the Institute. The economic logic displayed by Nouri as controller became the measure of all things at the Institute, including publications in all respects. While contracts were supposed to guarantee maximization of profits, Nouri, in a departure from the previous model of self-exploitation practiced by the editorial offices, enforced that all managing editors would in the future receive an adequate salary to motivate them to continue doing good

826 Krauss as editor of *October* became more involved in meetings of the Fellows in the early 1980s, followed by other editorial staff in the following year: Joan Copjec, Douglas Crimp, and Annette Michelson were made Fellows in May 1982.

827 Kenneth Frampton, "Provisional Report on Publications," October 18, 1981; unofficial minutes, October 1, 1981 [sic!]; Marguerite McGoldrick, "Minutes of Fellows Meeting," October 8, 1981. Source: CCA Montréal, IAUS fonds: A.2-9.

828 Ibid.

work, and that they would also be provided with enough assistants to make their workloads manageable.

At these meetings, it was noted that the IAUS Exhibition Catalogues were quite commercially successful. In October 1981, Catalogue 8 on the Russian Constructivist Ivan Leonidov was published.⁸²⁹ The Institute had thus published a total of ten catalogues, fulfilling the first half of the contract with Rizzoli. On the other hand, it was clear by now that the series would not be completed, as Catalogue 4, “The Princeton Beaux-Arts,” had been canceled and Catalogue 11, “Wallace Harrison: Fifty Years of Architecture” had been postponed until further notice. At this point, four more productions on O.M. Ungers, Raymond Hood, Robert Krier, and William Lescaze were in the planning stages, and catalogues on the Office for Metropolitan Architecture and on Raimund Abraham were to follow. Oddly enough, more catalogues were produced than exhibitions. The Fellows consequently discussed a new relationship between exhibitions and catalogues to ensure the quantity and quality of the series, and the internal coordination of the “Public Program.” Some criticized the series’ historic focus and suggested it should document more contemporary projects. For the first time, there was a discussion about whether it was the Institute’s goal to produce monographic exhibitions and catalogues. Group exhibitions such as “Idea as Model” or the “New Wave” series and the accompanying catalogues continued to be the Institute’s flagships, but even they could not hide the fact that the “Exhibitions Program” focused more on the figure of the architect as artist than on pressing contemporary issues.

Even before these meetings, the *Oppositions* editorial team had again drawn up a very ambitious schedule and work plan in February 1981. According to this schedule, a total of nine issues were to be published in the coming months through May 1982, in order for the Institute to fulfill its contractual obligations and to make up for the journal’s self-induced backlog. They outlined the dates and content of *Oppositions* 22 through *Oppositions* 30, the former quite detailed, the latter less so.⁸³⁰ Essays by Vittorio Lampugnani and Werner Oechslin, by Massimo Cacciari, Giorgio Ciucci, Francesco Dal Co, and Giorgio Grassi, by Maurice Culot and Leon Krier, by Rafael Moneo and Ignasi de Solà-Morales, and by Alberto Perez Gomez and George Teyssot were discussed. The special issues planned by the editors at that time were: Forster working on an issue on “Monument,” Frampton and Vidler on an issue on “Institutions, Power, and Architecture,” and Eisenman on an issue on “Postmodernism.” Vidler was also slated for special issues on “History and Practice” and “Nietzsche and Architecture;” Gandelsonas was no longer involved

829 IAUS, ed., *Ivan Leonidov. Russian Constructivist, 1902–1959*. Catalogue 8 (New York: Rizzoli International, 1981).

830 IAUS, editorial meeting agenda, content of *Oppositions* 22 to 30 including an “Updated List of Articles and Actions” February 24, 1981, Source: CCA Montréal, IAUS fonds: A.5-8 / ARCH 401765.

at all at this point. *Oppositions* 26/27, a double issue on housing, was scheduled for publication in March 1982. This issue grew out of the conference “Social Housing in Europe Between the Two World Wars” and was to be guest edited by Teyssot, a former *Oppositions* author and young academic who taught at the IUAV and espoused a type of historiography inspired by Foucault. The goal was for the journal to appear regularly for the first time in its history, starting with the August 1982 issue of *Oppositions* 29. Only then would the contractual requirements be fulfilled, and the Institute would finally have been able to part with its former publisher, the out-of-favor MIT Press, a plan that ultimately could not be sustained for a variety of reasons. For the sixth volume, *Oppositions* 21, 22, 23, and 24, which then appeared in 1981–82, reviews and essays by outside historians and theorists, some of whom had explicitly been earmarked as authors for *Oppositions* Books, were included, and with them the Institute’s connections, to generate content.⁸³¹ Stanford Anderson repeatedly contributed texts: after an excerpt from his dissertation on the German architect Peter Behrens had been published in *Oppositions* 11 in 1978, further passages from the chapter on “Modern Architecture and Industry” appeared in *Oppositions* 21 and 23, edited by Frampton.⁸³² Frampton was also the only editor to contribute his own writings to *Oppositions* during this period, namely the essay “Louis Kahn and the French Connection.”⁸³³ Eisenman’s Italian network led to the publication of a number of historiographical, theoretical, and critical texts in the “Theory,” “History,” “Documents,” and “Reviews” sections, texts by Massimo Cacciari, Giorgio Ciucci, Francesco Dal Co, and Giorgio Grassi, authors associated with the IUAV, all translated by Stephen Sartarelli, some of which had to be heavily edited.⁸³⁴ After the 1976 “Italian issue,” the journal again took on a strong Italian focus, after architectural postmodernism gained a foothold in the global cultural world with the 1980 Venice Architecture Biennale. Finally, *Oppositions* 24 entered architecture history primarily through the juxtaposition of two articles, on the one hand, Leon Krier’s essay on Albert Speer’s architecture,

831 IAUS, minutes of editorial meeting for *Oppositions*, March 6, 1981. Source: CCA Montréal, IAUS fonds: A.1-4 / ARCH 401041.

832 Stanford Anderson, “Modern Architecture and Industry: Peter Behrens and the Cultural Policy of Historical Determinism,” *Oppositions* 11 (Winter 1977), 52–71; “Modern Architecture and Industry: Peter Behrens, the AEG, and Industrial Design,” *Oppositions* 21 (Summer 1980), 70–97; “Modern Architecture and Industry: Peter Behrens, and the AEG Factories,” *Oppositions* 23 (Winter 1981), 53–83.

833 Kenneth Frampton, “Louis Kahn and the French Connection,” *Oppositions* 22 (Fall 1980), 21–53; Frampton also published a review of *Hermann Muthesius. The English House, “The Castellated Home,” Oppositions* 22 (Fall 1980), 106–113.

834 Giorgio Grassi, “Avant-Garde and Continuity,” *Oppositions* 21 (Summer 1980), 25–33; Massimo Cacciari, “Eupalinos or Architecture,” *Oppositions* 21 (Summer 1980) 106–115; Francesco Dal Co, “The Remoteness of die Moderne,” *Oppositions* 22 (Fall 1980), 75–95 and “Notes Concerning the Phenomenology of the Limit in Architecture,” *Oppositions* 23; (Winter 1981), 37–51; and Giorgio Ciucci, “The Invention of the Modern Movement,” *Oppositions* 24 (Spring 1981), 69–91 (all translations: Stephen Sartarelli).

“Vorwärts, Kameraden, Wir Müssen Zurück,” and on the other, Joan Ockman’s response, “The Most Interesting Form of a Lie,” a harsh critique of an appearance made by Krier at the Institute and of the architect’s theory of a classical urbanism. With this contribution, Ockman, who had long worked only as an editor, finally made her debut as a promising young author.⁸³⁵ But the plans were too ambitious, and *Oppositions* once again fell far short of its self-imposed goals due to other commitments, missing the opportunity to leave a lasting stamp on architecture debate, especially with a special issue on institutional critique in architecture.

To announce the forthcoming *Oppositions Books*—the first three had already been announced in the fall 1981 MIT Press catalogue—a poster was printed with six titles, in addition to those in production, including a collection of essays by Frampton titled *Labor, Work and Architecture*, in place of Tafuri.⁸³⁶ After revising the schedule several times, Frampton was finally able to announce at the October 1981 Institute meeting that Colquhoun’s collection of essays and Rossi’s *The Architecture of the City* would appear in 1981. A major book launch and celebration with the two authors and invited guests was already scheduled for December 30, 1981. In the meantime, the Institute was deliberating who would be the best choice to review the books. At this point the editors were working on books planned for 1982; in addition to the translations of Loos and Ginzburg and the collections of essays by Frampton and Tafuri, these were currently the books by Massimo Cacciari and Giorgio Grassi, a translation of Theo van Doesburg, and a collection of essays by Arata Isozaki for 1983.⁸³⁷ Eisenman and Frampton also sought to publish another book by Tafuri, a monograph with the title *Discordant Harmony*, as well as a new monograph by Colin Rowe titled *The Architecture of Good Intentions*. In addition, proposals had already been formulated for two more books by Francesco Dal Co and Vidler, but these were not yet in manuscript form and therefore not scheduled for a specific publication date, although Vidler stipulated that his book be published next year.⁸³⁸ Authors from Switzerland (Werner Oechslin), France (Jean-Louis Cohen), and Japan (Koji Taki, Hiromi Fuji) were also discussed. In a

835 Krier, 1981; see also Joan Ockman, “The Most Interesting Form of Lie,” *Oppositions* 24 (Spring 1981), 38–47.

836 In the fall of 1980, Tafuri had initially intended to publish a book titled *Toward an Ideology of Architecture*. Frampton suggested that his collection of essays *Labor, Work and Architecture* should include essays from *Oppositions* 1, 3, from *Architect’s Yearbook* 12, from *Architectural Design* 38, 39, and from *L’Architecture d’Aujourd’hui*.

837 Joan Ockman, communication with Hamid Nouri, October 5, 1981. Source: CCA Montréal, IAUS fonds: A.5-8.

838 *Oppositions Books* editors had requested a publication by Vidler on the form of institutions and central themes of the late Enlightenment, titled *The Architecture of the Lodges or Institution & Utopia: Lodge*. Shortly thereafter, *Oppositions* 27 was planned as a special issue on “Institutions, Power, and Architecture.”

guideline announced at an editorial meeting, Eisenman specified that of the four Oppositions Books per year, only one should be historiographical and another a translation of a classic; two books in the series, however, were to be monographs commissioned from contemporary authors, and he explicitly called for architects from the United States to be published as well.

But before Oppositions Books was actually launched on the market, Conover again called for urgent improvements in communications between the Institute and MIT Press, and for the academic publisher to be more involved in all decisions. Not surprisingly, MIT Press was still suspicious: despite years of delays in printing Rossi's *The Architecture of the City*, Eisenman still had not written his preface and introduction when the monograph was finally assigned to the typesetter in November 1981. Publication was eventually postponed yet again. Not only could the two Rossi books no longer appear simultaneously, as the author had requested, but they were eventually published in chronologically reversed order. In the meantime, Nouri had commissioned a feasibility study for the publication of Oppositions Books, which indicated that *The Architecture of the City* should now be printed third, after Colquhoun's collection of essays and Rossi's *A Scientific Autobiography*.

New Priorities in Publishing

The first issue of *Skyline* under Suzanne Stephens's direction in October 1981 was thirty-six pages long and displayed characteristics of a new, postmodern aesthetic. But there were changes in content as well. The bold graphic design of the cover, simply stating the names of the featured authors, interviewers, or interviewees, using oversized letters in 72pt font size, all set in the same size, headlines only, transformed the architecture newspaper into an advertising billboard on the newsstands. As the new editor-in-chief, Stephens reinterpreted the tabloid format created by MacNair, but retained the two central sections, reviews, and interviews, which continued to set the tone: on the one hand, through full-page or even longer book reviews, some of them fairly caustic, e.g., Vidler on Jencks' *Post-modern Classicism* or Stern on Frampton's *Modern Architecture. A Critical History*,⁸³⁹ and, on the other hand, through exclusive, controversial interviews such as Eisenman speaking with the American writer Tom Wolfe, then known as the author of *From Bauhaus to Our House*, which had just been published in 1981.⁸⁴⁰ In her programmatic editorial, Stephens wrote that she wanted *Skyline* to treat architecture as a cultural phenomenon, which was consistent with the Institute's policy as formulated in 1977.⁸⁴¹ With

839 Anthony Vidler, "Cooking up the Classics," *Skyline* (October 1981), 18–21; Robert Stern, "Giedion's Ghost," *Skyline* (October 1981), 22–25.

840 Peter Eisenman, "Interview. Tom Wolfe and Peter Eisenman. Part I," *Skyline* (October 1981), 12–14; "Part II," *Skyline* (November 1981), 3–4

841 Suzanne Stephens, "Skyline Rises Again," *Skyline* (October 1981), 2.

her experience and professionalism, Stephens succeeded in reviving *Skyline*, financed by the architecture establishment, as an established brand while still providing it with an independent voice within the Institute. She immediately set new standards by staging individual contributions as debates, juxtaposing pros and cons, and revisiting old conflict lines between Whites and Grays, true to the polemics cultivated at the Institute and especially with *Oppositions*. The intention was to keep readers engaged across issues by extending and continuing both reviews and interviews as a follow-up story, setting up cliffhangers, and printing a rebuttal or sequel in the following issue. Aside from these strategies, perhaps the biggest conceptual change was that Stephens replaced the double-page calendar with a luxuriously illustrated centerfold article. Longer essays of at least two pages, written either by Stephens herself, by Vidler, or by other notable authors on a topic of general interest, could be placed prominently here under an oversized headline. On the other hand, the monthly announcements of architecture, art, and cultural events that had made the *Architecture and Design Review* indispensable to receptive, culture-savvy architects and architecture lovers alike were now listed as events under the new *Dateline* column on the penultimate page. In general, the new graphic design of *Skyline* was now no longer elegant and restrained, but excessive and pompous. Building on Bierut's first design, Vignelli reinterpreted the newspaper and added characteristic features of a post-modern tabloid, especially with regard to the relation between text and image. The new layout was still based on a clear grid, but Vignelli now took a much more playful approach to the typographic elements, the choice of fonts and type sizes, and the function and arrangement of illustrations. While the old *Skyline* had featured the distinctive black bar, this was now also used as background for inverted headlines, for example, so that more black space was printed. Century Schoolbook was now replaced by Bodoni, a classicist typeface favored in postmodernist graphics and characterized by a greater contrast between base and hairlines. In addition, Vignelli now liked to use oversized type, especially for the headline of the centerfold. Content and form needed to work for the new *Skyline* to prevail against the new competition, as it now had to assert itself more strongly on the growing market and generate revenue through advertisement sales; three architecture newspapers were now published in New York alone, the other two being *Express* and *Metropolis*.⁸⁴²

From the outset, and despite its dependence on the Institute for contracts and funding, the far more professionalized editorial team managed to find its own voice. Stephens was able to draw on her own network of experienced architecture critics, such as Eleni Constantine and Martin Filler, both of whom were writing for *Progressive Architecture* at the time; ambitious young writers such as the young art historians Barry Bergdoll and Hal Foster also found a platform

842 Jane Kay Holtz, "Tabloid Trio. New Voices Speak up on Built Environment," *The Christian Science Monitor* (March 19, 1982), 15.

here.⁸⁴³ The declared goal of reaching the broadest possible readership with an interest in architecture and the city was pursued with the introduction of additional columns. In the “City Reports,” which aspired to a certain degree of investigative journalism, Stephens alternated with Jacqz in reporting on local building activity and current issues such as building restrictions and historic preservation, but also on architecture and urban policy debates of general interest; thanks to quality journalism with topical relevance and a clear stance, *Skyline* gained significance and, in contrast to *Oppositions*, was the only publication of the Institute to comment directly on issues of urban development and urban renewal in New York.⁸⁴⁴ Another new feature was the “Obituaries” column, with articles on recently deceased architects; because of the generational shift in architecture, this read like a farewell to classic architectural modernism and its protagonists.⁸⁴⁵ In addition, so-called “Insider’s Guides” to architecture firms or schools of architecture on the East Coast were published: often anonymously written texts with apparently well-informed glimpses behind the scenes that nonchalantly revealed the networks of architecture education and practice, thus catering to *Skyline*’s target groups of young architects and architecture students as potential readers.⁸⁴⁶ Stephens ultimately interpreted her new assignment creatively. *Skyline* now offered even more entertainment and human-interest stories: for example, when a list of the year’s new publications—including, of course, those of the Institute—was presented as tips for Christmas gifts, or when fashion tips were offered with pointers to Johnson’s optician or Eisenman’s shoemaker. Eisenman himself encouraged Stephens to report on the lives of architects to provide readers with human interest. Gossip, i.e., informal, indirect communication about third parties, their character and social qualities, achievements, failures, and interpersonal relationships, played a key role in New York’s architecture scene, which was governed by the laws of celebrity culture. Gossip could create or sustain celebrity; consistent disregard, on the

843 *Skyline* at that time published texts by Michael Kimmelman, later architecture critic for *The New York Times*, and Sylvia Lavin, architecture historian, who both wrote reviews as freelancers in March and April 1983.

844 Suzanne Stephens, “City Report: New York,” published in *Skyline* from October to December 1981, see also Margot Jacqz, “City Report: New York,” published in *Skyline* in October, and December 1981.

845 *Skyline* published obituaries of Robert Moses (October 1981), John Dinkeloo (October 1981), Alfred Barr (October 1981), Peter Collins (October 1981), Marcel Breuer (October 1981), Albert Speer (December 1981), Albert Mayer (December 1981), Wallace K. Harrison (January 1982), Richard Llewelyn Davis (January 1982), John Barrington Bayley (February 1982), Fazlur Kahn (May 1982), Bruce Goff (October 1982), O’Neil Ford (October 1982), Giovanni Muzio (November 1982).

846 *Skyline* published “Insider’s Guides” to offices and schools: “Insider’s Guide to Architectural Offices: Gwathmey and Siegel Architects,” *Skyline* (October 1981); “Insider’s Guide to Architectural Offices: Hardy Holzman Pfeiffer,” *Skyline*, (November 1981); “Insider’s Guide to Architecture Schools: Cornell,” *Skyline* (December 1981), 27; “Insider’s Guide to Architecture Schools: Columbia,” *Skyline* (January 1982), 24; “Insider’s Guide to Architecture Schools: Yale,” *Skyline* (May 1982), 25; “Insider’s Guide to Architecture Schools: Harvard,” *Skyline* (June 1982), 15.

other hand, could destroy it. And although Stephens and her editorial team were criticized for this strategy, borrowed from the yellow press, the architecture newspaper's representation and reproduction of social relationships, pushed by Eisenman and endorsed by *Skyline's* editorial board, was a central mechanism through which the Institute, as the "fame maker," influenced architecture education and practice, the cultural sector, and the art and architecture market.

Nevertheless, the new *Skyline* offered its readers a compelling read due to the enormous variety of topics, varied text formats, and writing styles appropriate to an entire range of target groups. At the beginning of 1982, it became clear why the new *Skyline* was an independent publication that not only offered shallow entertainment but also aspired to be a scholarly publication. The occasion was two milestone anniversaries: first, Columbia University was celebrating its 100th anniversary with the exhibition "The Making of an Architect, 1881–1981" and second, MoMA was celebrating the fiftieth anniversary of the groundbreaking 1932 exhibition "The International Style." In both cases, *Skyline* joined the celebrations with special issues.⁸⁴⁷ In the January 1982 issue, Thomas Bender, as one of the two co-founders of the New York Institute for the Humanities, contributed again after "The Bender Affair" with an article entitled "Between Civic Culture and the Academy," in which he reviewed universities as sites for the production and consumption of discourse, arguing that throughout history, there has been a need for so-called "cultivators" to carry the results of research and teaching into the public sphere, without claiming that the New York Institute for the Humanities could be such a cultivator.⁸⁴⁸ In the February 1982 issue, which also featured an Eisenman interview with Philip Johnson illustrated with a series of the latter's postmodern high-rise designs that underscored the architectural metamorphosis, Stephens recalled the scope of the exhibition once curated by Henry-Russell Hitchcock and Philip Johnson himself in her editorial "Looking back at 'Modern Architecture,'" focusing in particular on curatorial and editorial positions, including differences in content and ideology. Stephens not only highlighted the role that American architecture played in the exhibition, compared with the publication accompanying it, but she also referenced the housing featured in the exhibition and the "social concern" that was evident here. In this way, *Skyline* congratulated not one but two established institutions in New York on their anniversaries, the university and the museum, with which the Institute had had a relationship throughout its existence, whether directly or indirectly, as an offshoot or provider, competitor or pioneer.

Eisenman's contribution to the new *Skyline* was regular interviews. He apparently chose his interviewees based on considerations of usefulness and current events: the two-part interview with Wolfe was followed by interviews

847 Suzanne Stephens, "Columbia Architecture at 100!" *Skyline* (January 1982), 16; "Looking Back at 'Modern Architecture.' The International Style Turns 50," *Skyline* (February 1982), 16–27.

848 Thomas Bender, "Culture of Cities: Between Civic Culture and the Academy: New York and Columbia in the 19th Century," *Skyline* (January 1982), 14–15.

with Robert Hughes, Paul Goldberger, Philip Johnson, Cesar Pelli, Henry Cobb, Robert Venturi, Gerald Hines, John Portman, Leon Krier, Robert Maxwell, and Richard Serra; i.e., he spoke mostly to people who were of general interest—not only to the public at the time but also the Institute.⁸⁴⁹ In the introduction to the Johnson interview, which appeared in the MoMA issue of *Skyline*, Eisenman introduced an additional concept to the interview series by dividing his interviewees into four groups, according to which he sought to conduct a total of twelve interviews, with three “critics,” “developers,” “teachers,” and “architects.” In the end, he did not adhere to this concept either, which was not detrimental to the economy of attention; practicing architects were overrepresented, while university teachers were underrepresented. Moreover, it was noticeable that there was not a single woman among his interviewees. Instead, the interviews represented a text format that brought Eisenman as much attention as the people he interviewed. In this series of interviews, he repeatedly turned the spotlight on direct collaborators, both trustees of the Institute (in the case of Johnson and Hines), and sponsors of *Skyline* (Pelli, Cobb). At a time when Eisenman was working more and more as an architect with his own firm, for example on a housing project for the IBA Berlin 84, and at the same time withdrawing more and more from the Institute’s operations, he used this platform to stage himself as a public figure before a larger audience, a kind of Andy Warhol of the architecture and construction world. Like the pop icon in the art and creative world before him, he carried a recording device with him everywhere he went. As part of the manifestation of his will and intellect, Dorothy Alexander, the Institute’s in-house photographer since the mid-1970s, was commissioned to take not only portraits of the interviewees but also shots of significant, sometimes confrontational conversational situations, which were then used to illustrate the interviews. Eisenman, who obviously always had to be the center of attention, thus took his self-stylization as the mastermind of the Institute and the architecture scene to extreme heights. But it was above all Eisenman’s selected interviews with the declared proponents and protagonists of postmodernism, e.g., Tom Wolfe, Robert Venturi, and Leon Krier, that were also received internationally and reprinted in other publications, sometimes in translation, which thus secured international attention for both *Skyline* and the Institute.

Vidler, on the other hand, not only contributed to *Skyline* with his writings on contemporary (James Stirling, Richard Meier, Rem Koolhaas/OMA), modernist (Adolf Loos), or classicist architects (John Soane), but also used his academic contacts to bring in scholars from other disciplines, such as the cultural

849 For *Skyline* Eisenman interviewed Tom Wolfe (October 1981) & (November 1981), Robert Hughes (December 1981), Paul Goldberger (January 1982), Philip Johnson (February 1982), Cesar Pelli (May 1982), Henry Cobb (June 1982), Robert Venturi (July 1982), Gerald D. Hines (October 1982), John Portman (January 1983), Leon Krier (February 1983), Robert Maxwell (March 1983), Richard Serra (April 1983).

historian Carl Schorske, or professor of comparative literature Peter Brooks, both of whom came from his immediate environment at Princeton University, as authors for the middle section. The new *Skyline* thus also bore his signature.⁸⁵⁰ Vidler scored a particular coup when, on his initiative, the thematic focus of the March 1982 issue was devoted to Michel Foucault, thus introducing one of the most influential French philosophers of his time to the North American architecture debate in a high-profile and broad format.⁸⁵¹ This was indeed an impressive issue, first introducing Foucault's ideas and describing his engagement with certain building types and urban planning in the two-page article "Spatialization of Power" by Gwendolyn Wright and Paul Rabinow.⁸⁵² Wright and Rabinow outlined why Foucault-influenced poststructuralist philosophy was less interested in architecture than in urban space, and they themselves analyzed individual buildings and the built environment as a whole as technologies of power. The centerfold article of this issue, however, was an exclusive interview conducted by Rabinow with Foucault in Paris.⁸⁵³ The interview, which was printed under the sweeping heading "Space, Knowledge, and Power," was one of the political philosopher's few concrete statements on the role of architecture in relation to issues of space and power. Here, contrary to the usual historiography of modernity, Foucault argued that while architects had understood and deployed their projects as a technique of government since the eighteenth century, with industrialization, they had increasingly lost control over built space to engineers, who played a greater role in the urbanization of territory. Foucault thus placed the role of architects in society into perspective but did not deny architecture its importance; on the contrary, he instead argued for the continued relevance of the profession in planning and housing.

In terms of a history of ideas (and possibly also the history of institutions), it is interesting that in the course of the conversation, Rabinow attempted to elicit from Foucault a direct statement on core issues of the architecture debate

850 Anthony Vidler, "Cooking up the Classics," *Skyline* (October 1981), 18–21; "Restructuring Modernism. The Architecture of James Stirling," *Skyline* (November 1981), 16–19; "Institutional Style. Deconstructing Modernism: Meier's Hartford Seminary," *Skyline* (March 1982), 21–23; "The Office for Metropolitan Architecture. The Irony of the Metropolis: Notes on the Work of OMA," *Skyline* (May 1982), 18–21; "The Big Greek Column Will be Built: Adolf Loos and the Sign of Classicism," *Skyline* (October 1982), 16–17; "Progress and Primitivism: The Roots of John Soane's Style," *Skyline* (November 1982), 32–33.

851 In New York, Foucault had previously been received in art and theory circles, but only rarely in architecture circles, e.g., in the context of the conference "Schizo-Culture" at Columbia University from November 13 to 16, 1975, organized by the journal *Semiotext(e)*; see Sylvère Lotringer and David Morris, eds., *Schizo-Culture. The Event/The Book* (Cambridge: MIT Press, 2014); see also Cusset, 2008. At the Institute, the French philosopher had previously been featured in *October* (but not in *Oppositions*) and had at most been cited or referenced.

852 Gwendolyn Wright and Paul Rabinow, "Spatialization of Power. A Discussion of the Work of Michel Foucault," *Skyline* (March 1982), 14–15.

853 Foucault, 1982.

of the time, such as the delineation of postmodernism in architecture and philosophy or the polarization of historicism and rationalism. Foucault, however, did not fall for the rhetorical trap of stylistic preferences that concealed bourgeois utopias and replied, entirely in line with deconstructivist, poststructuralist thinking, that he saw the task of philosophy as questioning any form of rationality, whereby he was fundamentally opposed to anything that claimed to be a return, be it historicism or playing with any kind of historical references. At the end of the highly readable conversation, translated by Christian Hubert, Foucault outlined his approach to historiography and epistemology, using the example of the fireplace as an architecture element to show how much the history of ideas, society, and technology are directly interrelated. Essentially, he stated that architecture interested him not in terms of its formal properties, but because it provided insights into social and political contexts. The reverse conclusion, that architecture represents a one-to-one reproduction of power hierarchies, was only valid in a few cases. Despite, or perhaps because of, the provocative heading—the word “power” was virtually shouted in large letters spanning the entire page—Foucault’s statement is all the more remarkable; especially at a time when architecture was primarily about who would tell and publish the better story, and in an intellectual and institutional environment in which a battle was being waged over the correct historiography with *Oppositions*, and *Skyline* was suddenly producing theory.

Compared to Eisenman and Vidler, the other *Oppositions* editors contributed little to *Skyline*. Aside from the review of *Modern Architecture. A Critical History*, which was staged as a controversy between Frampton and Stern—the teaser and individual quotations from the articles in 36pt type testified to the fact that the two had been antagonistic, even outright shouting at each other—Frampton published only his three-part “Japan Diary” documenting his trip to the Far East in the summer of 1981 under the title “Modernist Diffusion” in the April, May, and June 1982 issues, again portraying himself as an admirer of and expert on Japanese architecture, a contemporary movement that he had previously presented as the only true alternative to American postmodernism.⁸⁵⁴ Forster published a review of Frampton’s *Modern Architecture, 1851–1919* in the July 1982 issue, which was strikingly more sympathetic than Stern’s previous review of the monography had been.⁸⁵⁵ Apart from this, *Skyline* provided a high-profile platform for Fellows, including support for their current architectural projects. When Gandelsonas and Agrest suffered a resounding defeat at the very beginning of their professional career in New York, as a postmodern

854 Frampton, 1981.

855 Kenneth Frampton, *Modern Architecture 1851–1919*, GA Document. Special Issue 2 (Tokyo: A.D.A. Edita, 1981); see also Kurt Forster, “Re modernism. Kurt W. Forster Reviews Kenneth Frampton’s Latest,” *Skyline* (July 1982), 27.

tower project for the historic district on the Upper East Side, a high-rise that was to be built over a landmarked house, failed to materialize due to historic preservation regulations, individual opposition, and a targeted media campaign, Stephens personally advocated for them; she presented the project in her “City Report” entitled “Tradition of the New” in the December 1981 issue, after it had been rejected by the Landmarks Preservation Commission. She described the planning process, the architecture of the three-tower project, and the controversy that it had sparked in detail.⁸⁵⁶ In addition, *Skyline* took a stand in the controversy with another commentary by Aldo Rossi featured in the April 1982 issue, in which the Italian architect, as a friend and colleague, spoke out in favor of what he considered to be an excellent tower project, “a tower whose main virtue is that it interprets the history of the city.”⁸⁵⁷ *Skyline* thus used its media power, on the one hand, to explicitly take sides on behalf of Fellows and friends of the Institute, but on the other hand, also took a stand in a debate that was being conducted in the national daily and trade press.⁸⁵⁸ The architecture reviews published in *Skyline* were another noteworthy feature—especially since Stephens herself taught a seminar on “American Architectural Criticism in Magazines and Newspapers, 1850 to The Present Day” at Barnard College starting in 1982—and reported with great regularity on new buildings that were planned or completed, for example, new museum buildings and repeatedly high-rise buildings.

International Circulation of Ideas

When the first two Oppositions Books, Alan Colquhoun’s *Essays in Architectural Criticism. Modern Architecture and Historical Change* and Aldo Rossi’s *A Scientific Autobiography* appeared in mid-January 1982, the Institute finally launched its own book series after five years in the making.⁸⁵⁹ The discursive, educational, and institutional function of individual titles, and ultimately the historical significance of the overall book series are difficult to assess, and could be determined from reviews and references, reading lists and PhD dissertations, sales figures and reprints, etc.; it would be impossible to imagine the full extent, had it been implemented as originally planned. For the production of Oppositions Books was immediately interrupted by developments

856 Suzanne Stephens, “City Report: New York. Tradition of the New,” *Skyline* (December 1981), 4–5.

857 Aldo Rossi, “On 22 East 71st Street,” *Skyline* (April 1982), 2.

858 Paul Goldberger, “Debate Over Proposed 71st Street Tower,” *The New York Times* (November 10, 1981); Pilar Viladas, “Right Building, Wrong Block,” *Progressive Architecture* (January 1982), 33–34; George Lewis, “Chapter Active on Upper East Side District,” *Oculus*, no. 8 (May 1982), 5; see also Diana Agrest and Mario Ganelsonas, “Manhattan Additions I,” *Architectural Design*, no. 52 (May/June 1982), 44–48. This contained excerpts from letters of support sent to Landmarks Preservation Committee by Samuel Brody, John Hejduk, and Jaquelin Robertson, and Anthony Vidler.

859 Colquhoun, 1981; Rossi, 1981.

and events at the Institute in 1982, caused by Peter Eisenman's resignation as Institute director in June 1982, the subsequent break-up of the Fellowship and discontinuation of the editorial work, and further restructuring, that brought all publication activities to a halt. Finally, under Eisenman and Frampton's editorship, only five Oppositions Books that had already been started were ultimately published: Rossi's *The Architecture of the City*, finally, in April 1982, and in the fall of 1982, the English translation of Moisei Ginzburg's *Style and Epoch* and the collection of essays by Adolf Loos, compiled from two volumes, under the title *Spoken into the Void*. The editors' introductory comments, whether printed as "Forewords," "Prefaces," or "Introductions," influenced the reception and interpretation of each title, distinguished the authors, and played an important role in the international circulation of ideas—in all five cases these were books by European authors for the English-speaking world.⁸⁶⁰ This sociology of introductions, however, did not refer solely to the intellectual transfer of knowledge or appropriation of cultural, symbolic, or even economic capital, as is quite common in book series, but also to discursive properties and interpersonal relations in the form of controversies, polemics, disputes, etc., and thus complex network effects between the Institute as publisher, the authors of the introductions, and the actual authors of the individual Oppositions Books.⁸⁶¹

The battle for attention in publishing was evident in the prefaces to the English translation of *L'Architettura della Città*. The book was finally introduced with two texts by Eisenman, an "Editor's Preface" and an "Editor's Introduction," as well as one by Rossi himself, an "Introduction to the First American [sic!] Edition," which he had already written in 1978, a good three years before publication. Eisenman, who had been promoting the Italian architect for years, once again slipped into the role of expert on Rossi to achieve fame for himself. Rossi, on the other hand, when he wrote his introduction in 1978, as he did with every new edition, explicitly wanted the updated translation to be understood as another chapter on the American city, even if he only alluded to

860 In an essay on the sociology of culture, Bourdieu called for a sociology of prefaces and introductions; regarding the republication of texts in translation and the selection of the authors for introductions, see Pierre Bourdieu, "The Social Conditions of the International Circulation of Ideas," in *Bourdieu: A Critical Reader*, ed. Richard Shusterman (Oxford: Blackwell Publishers, 1999), 220–228.

861 For example, in the case of Ginzburg, Anatole Senkevitch, as guest editor (and translator), was enabled to write the introduction himself. In addition, in the case of Rossi's *A Scientific Autobiography*, Vincent Scully was requested as an external author, but Rossi expressly did not want an introduction, so that the already commissioned text was summarily turned into an afterword. Rossi perhaps profited most from the attention, after all; in the end two out of five Oppositions Books were authored by him, and he wrote the introduction to the Loos book. See Adolf Loos, *Spoken Into the Void: Collected Essays 1897–1900*, trans. Jane O. Newman and John H. Smith (Cambridge: MIT Press, 1982).

this in most of his remarks.⁸⁶² After repeatedly visiting New York, he was enthusiastic about primarily the architecture and atmosphere of Manhattan: “Perhaps no urban construct in the world equals that of a city like New York. New York is a city of monuments, such as I did not believe could exist.”⁸⁶³ He later added in *A Scientific Autobiography* that for him New York represented the confirmation of his theses from *L’Architettura della Città*, again without elaborating further.⁸⁶⁴ Although he flattered his North American readers, especially in the second half of this unique text, he did not go into more detail about New York or any other American metropolis.⁸⁶⁵

Rossi, however, had evidently lost sight of his urban geographic perspective during the 1970s and had since abandoned a critique of the socio-economic conditions of urban landscapes. As late as 1966, when he first published *L’Architettura della Città*, he had diagnosed the “blighted zones” as a typical problem of the modern capitalist city.⁸⁶⁶ When the two *Oppositions Books* were published a good fifteen years later, however, his attention was focused almost exclusively on the primary elements of architecture; as a practicing architect, he had apparently lost interest in analyzing the city from a Marxist perspective.⁸⁶⁷ Beginning in the spring of 1976, Rossi shuttled back and forth between Milan and New York with increasing frequency; since then, his drawings exhibited American motifs and were now characterized not only by transhistorical but also by transcultural references.⁸⁶⁸ His depictions of the analogous city were followed by architectures of Broadway and Wall Street, the Twin Towers of the World Trade Center; above all, his fictional skyline was now defined by the wooden water reservoirs above the rooftops of Manhattan. After excursions to Maine, typical New England lighthouses also appeared again and again as a central motif. In his writings as much as in his drawings, Rossi indicated how much the visual impressions of his stays in the United States served him as a source of inspiration. Even though he repeatedly referenced New York in *A Scientific Autobiography*, Rossi only explicitly referred to

862 Aldo Rossi, “Introduction to the First American Edition,” in *The Architecture of the City* (Cambridge: MIT Press, 1982), 13–19.

863 *Ibid.*, 15.

864 Rossi, 1981, 76.

865 Rossi admits that up to this point he had not written about the American city and architecture. In a few passages, he discusses the atmospheric qualities of the lighthouses in Massachusetts and Maine, Broadway in New York, the widows’ walkways in New England, and the piers on Manhattan’s Westside; see Rossi, 1981, 52, 58, 64, 65, 75f.

866 Rossi, 1982, 50.

867 In Rossi’s biography, the publication dates of his two monographs, 1966 and 1981, are considered cornerstones of a work phase. After his time at the ETH Zurich (1972–1975), his stays in New York from 1976 onward represent an incisive experience; see Angelika Schnell, “Von Jörn Janssen zu Rossi—Eine hochschulpolitische Affäre an der ETH Zürich,” *Arch+*, no. 215 (2014), 16–23.

868 IAUS, 1979.

the complex reality of cities experienced in everyday life in a single passage: “The line of the karst plateau corresponds to the skyline of New York, a city which is something like a mountain with stratifications where the built structures represent, more than anywhere else, the social, ethnic, and economic tangle of the city.”⁸⁶⁹ With this equation of natural conditions and urban geography, however, which was more of a poem than an analysis, Rossi naturalized any intersectional discrimination; his interest in the American city was clearly superficial. Instead, Rossi had discovered the American art market for his drawings, at least since the 1979 exhibitions at the Institute and the Max Protetch Gallery, and now the publishing market for his books, and in his autobiographical writing he even briefly addressed his biographical project at the time, the boosting of his career in the USA: “If I were to speak now of my American work or ‘formation,’ I would be digressing too far from the scientific autobiography of my projects and would be entering into a personal memoir, or a geography of my experience. I will say only that in this country, analogies, allusions, or call them observations, have produced in me a great creative desire and also, once again, a strong interest in architecture.”⁸⁷⁰

Obviously, Rossi’s work was marketed and sold by the Institute, and all the resulting hype, the cult of personality, contributed to the success of the cultural production and publishing there for several years, just as Rossi profited from his new fame in the USA. It was clearly in Rossi’s interest to publish his two *Oppositions Books* as special editions; he was involved in the selection of images and even reissued some of his drawings. Nevertheless, Rossi failed to mention the Institute—and Eisenman in particular—in his autobiography. Vidler was the only Fellow mentioned by name.⁸⁷¹ In the end, Rossi tried to distance himself from the Institute’s idiosyncratic reading of his drawings and writings and to resist outright appropriation, indicating that he felt he had been misinterpreted. Eisenman, on the other hand, in his creative misreading of *The Architecture of the City*, referred to the North American version as an “analogous artifact,” borrowing directly from Rossi. The analogous character of *The Architecture of the City*, which incorporates diverse references and plays with different cross-references, is obvious: first, because it contains various prefaces and updates, and second because Eisenman added his own “Editor’s Introduction,” which he gave the witty title “The Houses of Memory: The Texts of Analogue.”⁸⁷² Here, he purported to historicize Rossi’s monograph: “The task of this preface then is to locate this book for an American audience not only in its own tradition, in the

869 Rossi, 1981, 64.

870 However, Rossi ultimately did not say what significance his numerous stays in New York, his teaching at Cooper Union, and the two exhibitions at the Institute and Max Protetch Gallery actually had for him, see *ibid.*, 64.

871 *Ibid.*, 68. Apparently, Vidler had given Rossi a book as a reference to his *Teatro del Mondo*.

872 Eisenman, 1982.

context of Italian theoretical writings by architects, but also in the more contemporary context of Italy of the 1960s and 1970s [sic!].⁸⁷³ His remarks, however, made it clear that Eisenman—and herein lies the misinterpretation—preferred his own reading and had no further interest in introducing readers to Rossi’s theory.⁸⁷⁴ In light of this, his introduction should not be understood as a classification or contextualization, despite the fact that in the grant application to the Graham Foundation he had claimed that this was the task of every introduction. Moreover, Eisenman did not really situate the book within current American debates either.⁸⁷⁵ Instead, in his own introduction, he offered a glimpse into his own thought processes: “My own introduction [...] is in certain ways not only about this book but also about the Rossi that this book anticipates.” Ultimately, he was less concerned with *The Architecture of the City* as theory, or with Rossi as architect and author, and more with his own creative, rather than critical writing: “My own introduction attempts to enter into this memory and in this sense serves as a kind of analogy of an analogy, a creation of yet another artifact with its own history and memory.” This rhetoric served Eisenman for the acquisition of power rather than knowledge. He appropriated not only Rossi’s notion of the ‘analogous,’ but also that of the ‘collective,’ and used it, emptied of its original meaning, in his introduction when he compared this publication with the previous Italian edition: “[T]his book is similarly, and even to a greater degree, a ‘collective’ artifact.” Remarkably, Eisenman even put the word “collective” in quotation marks to emphasize the quote.⁸⁷⁶ Accordingly, a socio-political or even critical concept of the collective apparently did not exist in his vocabulary, since *Oppositions Books* could be regarded both as being the cultural product of a labor process and the result of a production of knowledge.⁸⁷⁷ What mattered was that by americanizing the ideas formulated in *The Architecture of the City*, that is, by producing an “American Rossi,” so to speak, Eisenman could adopt or even ignore them without presenting a theory of his own.

Eisenman’s introduction to *The Architecture of the City* made *Oppositions Books* polemical rather than pedagogical. Unlike Rossi, he had never really been

873 Ibid., n.p.

874 Lobsinger’s reading of *The Architecture of the City* contextualized the publication in architecture and urbanist debates; see Lobsinger, 2006; see also Pier Vittorio Aureli, “Rossi. The Concept of Locus as a Political Category of the City,” in *The Project of Autonomy. Politics and Architecture Within and Against Capitalism* (New York: Princeton Architectural Press, 2008), 53–69.

875 In the late 1970s and early 1980s, Eisenman had used the Institute’s various publications, especially *Oppositions* and the IAUS Exhibition Catalogues, to publish texts on notable contemporary architects (Philip Johnson, Michael Graves, Aldo Rossi, John Hejduk) in which he formulated text blocks of his own theory.

876 Peter Eisenman, “Editor’s Preface,” In Rossi, 1982, n.p.

877 The introduction failed to mention some of the people who worked on the book’s production; see *ibid.* Importantly, the imprimatur stated that Eisenman and Rossi both revised *The Architecture of the City* for publication by MIT Press.

interested in the city, as his contributions to the Institute's early research and building projects show, nor in the cultural memories or the political concerns of its inhabitants, which for Rossi were configured as a collective and expressed in monuments.⁸⁷⁸ More importantly, Eisenman's prefaces placed him on the grand stage of the international architecture world as a creative and intellectual. By adorning his introduction with quotes from Jacques Derrida and Sigmund Freud, he implied that he was well-read in two of the hottest theories of the day: deconstruction and psychoanalysis. Strictly speaking, however, he offered neither a deconstructionist nor a psychoanalytic interpretation of *The Architecture of the City*. Instead, he made biased judgments about how Rossi interpreted his role, accusing him of "disillusionment and anger" about the proper way to deal with the legacy of modernism.⁸⁷⁹ "For Rossi's generation, it was no longer possible to be a hero, no longer possible to be an idealist; the potentials for such memories and fantasies had been taken forever." Eisenman discredited Rossi's writings, which were simultaneously historiographical and biographical, academic and poetic, and characterized him pejoratively as "unheroic and autonomous." In his view, Rossi was still in a process of self-discovery when he wrote *The Architecture of the City*: "Rossi's psychological subject—the autonomous researcher—still continues to seek his own home in the collective house of the city."⁸⁸⁰ And further: "The shadow of the humanist poet hovers continuously behind the figure of the autonomous researcher."⁸⁸¹ Eisenman had solved this dilemma, which arose from "modern architecture's failure," for himself after he set himself apart from the corporate architecture of the International Style by placing the design process at the center of his work and negating the socio-political moments of utopia. Building on his 1977 theoretical construct "Post-Functionalism," Eisenman's introduction to *The Architecture of the City* also postulated an autonomy of architecture, both from the subject as agent and from the concrete object, yet his approach was equally devoid of history and place, and thus diametrically opposed to Rossi's.

Taken together, these two introductions to *The Architecture of the City* by Eisenman and Rossi testify to an increasing depoliticization that is representative of the globalized architecture culture and debate. As a paradigm of a post-modern discursive formation, they celebrate what Derrida may have meant by "*différance*," the arbitrary, even unconsidered juxtaposition of supposed pairs of opposites (in this case Rossi/Eisenman) on the one hand, and on the other

878 Martin points out that neither of the two concepts of the city developed by Rossi and Eisenman in their dialogue were in keeping with the times, Martin, 2010, 7–9. Earlier, Tafuri had criticized Eisenman's concern with the urban renewal project of the 1967 exhibition "The New City," as well as the Institute's housing project, as being merely about forms and not about urban problems or a political agenda; see Tafuri, 1976, 49.

879 Eisenman, 1982, 4.

880 *Ibid.*, 10.

881 *Ibid.*, 11.

a permanent displacement or emptying out of what might ultimately have been meant by architecture and the city, the architect and practice, at the time of writing.⁸⁸² Eisenman's argument took up Rossi's concept of typology, which he had originally adopted from Marxist literary theory in order to bring together form and content.⁸⁸³ However, for his own purposes, he reinterpreted the concept as subjectless: "Rossi, however, discovers in typology the possibility of invention precisely because type is now both process and object." According to this conservative, reduced understanding of typology, the architectural object would have had to analyze and reinvent itself. Ultimately, Eisenman was not interested in fundamentally questioning the architect as an authorial subject. Thus, his understanding of architecture became entangled in contradictions, for example when he reversed the relationship between process and product and affirmed Rossi's view that an architectural drawing, "and not its built representation, becomes architecture."⁸⁸⁴ As a building theorist, Eisenman thus provided arguments for a conceptual reassessment of the tools of design when these had long been established on the art market; as a conceptual architect, meanwhile, he began to serve the architecture market. The two *Oppositions Books* published by Rossi at MIT Press can thus be understood not only as the culmination and beacon of the Eisenman-driven hype surrounding Rossi in the United States but also as part of his systematic and deliberate self-promotion through the Institute's publications.⁸⁸⁵

Following its successful departmentalization, 1982 was a pivotal year for the Institute in publishing, with the individual publications taking up a great deal of resources. While the contract with MIT Press for *Oppositions* was terminated in the spring, effective October after issue 24, to the regret of the academic publisher's management, Eisenman proudly announced to the April annual meeting of the Board of Trustees that a contract had been successfully concluded with Rizzoli International, which was expected to bring the Institute US\$105,000 per year for *Oppositions* alone.⁸⁸⁶ *October*, which in its first five years had

882 Jacques Derrida, "Die différance," in *Postmoderne und Dekonstruktion. Texte französischer Philosophen der Gegenwart*, ed. Peter Engelmann (Ditzingen: Reclam, 2004), 76–113.

883 Lobsinger, in her reading of *A Scientific Autobiography*, points out that Rossi's notion of typology referred not to Quatremere de Quincy, but to Georg Lukács; see Lobsinger, 2002, 47ff.

884 Eisenman, 1982, 10–11.

885 McLeod already referred to the specific context in which Rossi's urbanist theory emerged and its emphasis on the collective and public space in an early review of *The Architecture of the City* published in 1984; see Mary McLeod, "The Architecture of the City," *Design Book Review*, 3 (Winter 1984), 50. Later reviews did not make the connection between the Rossi hype at the Institute and the subsequent commodification of his architectural drawings and writings; see Botond Bogner, "Rossi's Ultimate Dilemma?" *Journal of Architectural Education* 41, no. 2 (Winter 1988), 56–59. For *A Scientific Autobiography*, MIT Press was the point of contact for international publishers for German, French, and Spanish translations.

886 Peter Eisenman, "Director's Report," April 12, 1982. Source: CCA Montréal, IAUS fonds: A.1-13.

been distinguished by contemporary theoretical approaches, in particular an institutional critique directed against art institutions (the artist studio, gallery, museum, patronage, etc.) and their role in the market economy, especially real estate development in SoHo, and a blend of deconstructivism, psychoanalysis, and feminism, was by now more fully integrated into the Institute, with Joan Copjec, Douglas Crimp, and Annette Michelson also being elected Fellows in May 1982.⁸⁸⁷ *Skyline*, the publication with the Institute's largest budget in fiscal year 1981–82, had received a grant from the J.M. Kaplan Fund, on the basis of which Peter Freiberg had been hired as editor for the new "City Report" section and continued to report critically and in detail on current building activity in New York, especially around Times Square.⁸⁸⁸ Gradually, however, individual sponsors began to cut off their support, and so by the summer of 1982 the architecture newspaper was facing major financial difficulties; with debts amounting to US\$23,500, it could no longer afford to pay the salaries of its editorial staff. Stephens offered to suspend work on the July 1982 issue until a solution could be found, but Eisenman declined, and *Skyline* continued to be produced.

Throughout 1982, production of IAUS Exhibition Catalogues was moving ahead at full speed, although there was no budget for additional salaries and internal coordination was inadequate. In addition to the *October* editors, Stamm Shapiro and Hubert were also elected Fellows in May 1982. Furthermore, the editorial staff, which now included Deborah Berke, who had previously taught in the Institute's "High School Program," continued to work simultaneously on catalogues for long-completed exhibitions as well as for current ones. 1982, for example, saw the publication of Catalogue 6 for the exhibition on the German architect O.M. Ungers, which had been shown at the Institute five years earlier (May 1977), after he had completed his professorship at Cornell University, and of Catalogue 5 for the exhibition of the Vienna-based Luxembourg architect Robert Krier (April to May 1977) who, together with his brother Leon, was one of the best-known proponents of the European city and European postmodernism. Catalogue 15 on the American architect Raymond Hood (1981), on the other hand, which resulted from a larger historical exhibition and publication project directed by Robert Stern and was prepared in collaboration with Thomas Catalano, was a novelty, since it was published without an exhibition at the Institute.⁸⁸⁹ Catalogue 16 was published to accompany another historical exhibition, this time on the

887 Annette Michelson, Rosalind Krauss, Douglas Crimp, Joan Copjec, "Introduction," in *October: The First Decade, 1976–1986* (Cambridge: MIT Press, 1986), IX–XII.

888 Peter Freiberg, "City Report: New York. 42nd Street Redevelopment," *Skyline* (May 1982), 3; "City Report: New York. Theaters," *Skyline* (November 1982), 28; see also Susana Torre, "Times Square. At the Crossroads," *Skyline* (December 1982), 18–22.

889 Stern had originally planned an exhibition on Raymond M. Hood at the Institute for 1981, but this was eventually displayed at a branch of the Whitney Museum in midtown Manhattan; see Carol Willis, "Review of Raymond Hood," *Skyline* (July 1982), 10–11.

Swiss-American architect William Lescaze (April to June 1982), who had once been involved in the *Modern Architecture* exhibition at MoMA and had realized modernist office and residential buildings in the USA in the 1930s. This was published to coincide with the exhibition.⁸⁹⁰ Finally, 1982 also saw the publication of Catalogue 17 for the traveling exhibition on Japanese architect Kazuo Shinohara (December 1981 to January 1982) from UQAM in Montréal, and Catalogue 18 for the group exhibition *New West Coast Architecture. California Counterpoint* (1982), which marked the first time that the Institute was to display positions from the West Coast on a larger scale. The catalogues for the double exhibition of the Office for Metropolitan Architecture at the Institute and the Rizzoli Gallery (March to May 1982) and the exhibition on the Argentine architect Clorindo Testa (November to December 1981), on the other hand, were not produced.⁸⁹¹ No serious attempt was made to develop other, previously considered exhibition and catalogue projects on Hans Hollein, Raimund Abraham, Kevin Roche, John Dinkeloo and Associates, or Gregorio Grassi. Although the editorial team could not quite keep up with the new Rizzoli contract, and the publication could barely finance itself, the series made it to a total of sixteen volumes, including some outstanding titles. They are the most tangible document and lasting legacy of the “Exhibition Program” at the Institute, in effect, an institutional archive of some of the most widely recognized postmodern positions of the 1970s and 1980s and some of the most forgotten protagonists of architectural modernism from the United States.

Oppositions 25, a special issue on the theme “Monument/Memory,” the first to be edited by Kurt Forster, appeared in the fall of 1982 as the first issue of the eighth volume at Rizzoli. It was slightly different in appearance, with a high gloss cover. Forster had built the issue around the English translation of a 1903 essay “The Modern Cult of Monuments. Its Character and Origin” by Austrian art historian and monument conservator Alois Riegl. This applied less to creative works, be they artistic or literary, but rather to monuments that had been officially designated landmark sites, once erected and now preserved.⁸⁹² In this mediation on works of art and historical value, *Oppositions 25* represented a very different view of history than the one held by Frampton and Vidler as editors, namely that of a European style of modernism that discussed both models and precursors of a modernist movement or era, or even those positions that had previously been held by the “Venice School” around Tafuri. In

890 The exhibition on William Lescaze was taken over by Syracuse University and subsequently went on tour; the exhibition “Le Corbusier’s Firminy Church” was shown in 1981–1982 at six other venues: Zolla-Lieberman Gallery, Chicago; Harvard GSD, Cambridge; Louisiana Tech, Ruston; Rice University, Houston; Carnegie-Mellon University, Pittsburgh; University of Minnesota, Minneapolis.

891 Vidler, 1982.

892 Alois Riegl, “The Modern Cult of Monuments: Its Character and Its Origin,” trans. Kurt Forster and Diane Ghirardo, *Oppositions 25* (Fall 1982), 21–51.

his editorial, however, Forster, drawing on Riegl and his concept of the will to art, rejected eclecticism as a central defining characteristic of a postmodern age and thus of the contemporary, playful, and at times ironic view of history.⁸⁹³ The new *Oppositions* in its graphic variations—the cream-colored title, the simple journal cover—indicated a trend toward a different, more conservative form of postmodern discourse on history, but also testified to a thoroughly economized future of publishing at the Institute which reflected recent developments.⁸⁹⁴ Despite all the changes and uncertainties, however, 1982 also brought cause for celebration: *Oppositions* was awarded a gold medal by the American Institute for Architects, the highest honor bestowed by the association every year on architects whose work had a lasting impact on architecture. Because of its merits, the journal continued to be considered the Institute’s flagship publication, the primary medium of architecture debate (rather than practice) in North America, even as other publications competed for its market position.

893 Kurt Forster, “Monument/Memory and the Mortality of Architecture,” *Oppositions* 25 (Fall 1982), 2–15.

894 Postmodern architecture was characterized precisely by the fact that architecture historians had set themselves the goal of reviving old forms of historiography; see Angelika Schnell, “What is Meant by History?” *Oase* 87 (2012): “Alan Colquhoun: Architect, Historian, Critic,” 58–76, here 59.

