Coda: Institutional Legacy and Critical History

Even during its lifetime, the Institute for Architecture and Urban Studies not only made history but also wrote its own: be it with its promotional material which listed its achievements for the purposes of public relations and media outreach, or with an exhibition for its fifteenth anniversary shown at the Institute's premises at 8 West 40th Street in November 1982 after the once so charismatic Peter Eisenman, the Institute's founder and longtime director, stepped down earlier that year.[895] Exhibits included the Institute's research and design projects, posters of its events—both lecture series and exhibitions—and various printed matter—early brochures and especially the covers and single pages of publications—as well as architectural projects stemming from the education program.[896] The fundamental differences between the possible narratives about the Institute were highlighted in the December 1982 issue of *Skyline* which, below a triptych of three portraits—in the middle Eisenman, now Vice President of the Board of Trustees, flanked by Kenneth Frampton, who took over the Institute's day-to-day management as director of programs in June 1982, and Edward Saxe, who was briefly the President and CEO of the Institute in 1982–83 and for the past year had been tasked to look after its economic well-being and financial survival,

895 On the naturalization of making history, see Tomàs Llorens, "On Making History," in Ockman, ed., 1985, 24ff. Eisenman launched a successor grouping to the Institute with a two-day symposium at the University of Pennsylvania in Charlottesville, mysteriously named "P3," of selected practicing architects—the very weekend that the Institute's anniversary was to be celebrated. See Robertson, 1985; Robertson and Tigerman 1991.

896 In the run-up to the anniversary exhibition, the editors of the IAUS Exhibition Catalogues had already spoken out against a catalogue that would have been nothing short of a requiem for them.

featured two articles celebrating its anniversary.[897] Under the heading "The IAUS at 15," Margot Jacqz and Frampton jointly wrote a matter-of-fact report on the Institute's various fields of activities, i.e., about what it had intended to accomplish as a group and what it actually had accomplished over the past years by focusing on architectural movements and their manifestos (as Frampton, the historian, had done in *Modern Architecture*), while Suzanne Stephens, who as the editor of *Skyline* was in charge of both quality and entertainment journalism, wrote about the Institute's influence on architectural discourse, its outstanding personalities, and their individual contributions—also with the goal of maximizing the journal's readership to make it commercially viable. At this point, the Institute's story was not yet over, even if its fate seemed sealed by the fundamental fifteen-year conflict between all the discontinuities of bureaucracy and charisma, institutionalization and consolidation, professionalized business, and generational change.[898] While categories of critical theory such as race, class, gender, and sexuality were kept out of these kinds of institutional accounts, the institutional legacy, continuation, and influence of the Institute's hard-won position was not just about "scattered elements of building knowledge and notions of design," but the authority that came with "the whole process of symbolization, mythical transposition, taste, style, and fashion."[899]

Building Institution thus expands conventional narratives in architecture history on knowledge production. A critical history of the Institute would relate this to the architectural community in New York, the USA, and across the world, as reflected in the Institute's educational and cultural offerings, and especially in its publications since the mid-1970s, all of which were put to the test in the early 1980s with the elimination of public cultural funding in the summer of 1980, the greater role given to patronage, the demand for publishing commitments, and the shift to commercial publishers. Eventually it was the Institute's publications (more than the profession) that laid the groundwork for widespread impact on the discipline and still resonate in architecture and architectural education today (and the debates about criticality and post-criticality, pragmatism and dogmatism of the 1980s, 1990s and 2000s were arguably a symptom rather than a cure): First, a juxtaposition of very different but ultimately

897 Margot Jacqz and Kenneth Frampton, "The IAUS at 15," *Skyline* (December 1982), 33; Suzanne Stephens, "Notes from the Sidelines," *Skyline* (December 1982), 33.

898 In her history of Oppositions, Joan Ockman characterizes the large-scale development of the Institute as a history of "bureaucratization," see Ockman, 1988. While at the Institute there was evidence of bureaucratization, be it political or financial, since the beginning, with the granting of non-profit status, the negotiation of the Fellowship, and the accountability to third parties, she thus addresses, whether consciously or unconsciously, sociologist Max Weber's threefold definition of types of rule, and the transition from traditional, or charismatic to legal-rational authority. See Weber, 2019.

899 Demetri Porphyrios, "On Critical History," in Ockman, ed., 1985, 16ff. For Porphyrios, critical history examines "the process of naturalization of architectural ideology into myth" and is structured "by relations invested in institutions."

self-centered and self-serving theories (and to a lesser extent histories) competing for intellectuality and debatability; second, a diffuse concept of research that is absorbed in the dominance of research and curation as practices; and third, the lack of specific content, as certain issues that architecture has had to address—domination along one or more axes of inequality, oppression, power, prejudice, stratification, and subordination; housing that has been privatized and urbanization that has been economized; or more global, bio- and geopolitical trends such as environmental degradation, resource scarcity, population growth and labour migration—were ultimately largely ignored.[900]

Archives, Discontinuities, and Institutional Endings

Building Institution concludes with a look at the Institute's gradual decline, the waning and eventually cessation of its institutional operations, following an analysis of its social constructedness in terms of its founding narratives and mythmaking, the specificity and ephemerality of all the projects, programs, and products—both realized and unrealized—that were undertaken under Eisenman's lead, its creation and repeated reinvention and restructuring, always building on a degree of administration, the composition and re-composition of the Board of Trustees, depending on its shifting institutional mission, and the establishment and expansion of the Fellowship, which was awarded on merit and characterized by a system of roles and assignments. In conclusion, the epistemic shifts, that emerged at the Institute, the historical ruptures and breaks, following Michel Foucault, and the series of contested institutional endings that ultimately led to its closure in the spring of 1985, allow us to better understand the transition from one era to another and to draw general conclusions about the conditions and constraints of the very institution of architecture, explicitly of architectural culture today, in terms of knowledge, power, and subjectivities.[901]

900 A special issue on "History/Theory" was published on *e-flux Architecture* in the fall of 2018, in collaboration with the Institute for the History and Theory of Architecture (gta), ETH Zurich, with some contributions by American architecture historians addressing the discursive legacy of the Institute implicitly, if not explicitly: see Reinhold Martin, "On the Uses and Disadvantages of Architecture for History" *e-flux Architecture* (November 2, 2018): "History/Theory," last accessed: May 31, 2023, www.e-flux.com/architecture/history-theory/225181/on-the-uses-and-disadvantages-of-architecture-for-history; Mark Jarzombek, "The School of Architectural Scandals" *e-flux Architecture* (October 29, 2018): "History/Theory," last accessed: May 31, 2023, www.e-flux.com/architecture/history-theory/225182/the-school-of-architectural-scandals; Joan Ockman, "Slashed" *e-flux Architecture* (October 27, 2018): "History/Theory," last accessed: May 31, 2023, www.e-flux.com/architecture/history-theory/159236/slashed.

901 Even the grand narratives of former Fellows, give different ending dates. See Frank, 2010. Also, in the title of Diana Agrest's film *The Making of an Avant-garde: The Institute for Architecture and Urban Studies 1967–1984 (2013)*, *suggests that the Institute lasted until 1984*, the year of her own departure. Other historical accounts have used this date without further looking into the matter.

There is some evidence in established and private archives, however, that the Institute underwent a slow decline that stretched out over a longer period of time; the new decade saw a gradual waning of interest and commitment of the veteran Fellows who had shaped its agenda, venture, and output in the 1970s. Before this decline became palpable, however, the Institute faced another major reinvention in the early 1980s, when many commendable contributors were inducted into the circle of Fellows and tasked with managing the now complex publication apparatus, with *Oppositions*, *October*, *Skyline*, the IAUS Exhibition Catalogues, and the Oppositions Books series (finally launched in early 1982), which shaped the discursive and material conditions of the production, use, and dissemination of knowledge, power, and institutionality, and when, at the same time, the next generation of institutional talent was being encouraged and called upon to take responsibility.[902] The changes on the management level and concerning the organizational structure were no less significant, as evidenced by the minutes of the Institute's meetings as well as those of the Board of Trustees.[903] Not only was Saxe, who as deputy director and general manager had formerly advised MoMA but was otherwise not experienced in the field, appointed to executive management, but the existing leadership for development, public relations, and outreach was replaced and restaffed. The appointment of Philip Johnson as a member of the board in 1980—at the same time as his first official appearance—followed by his office partner John Burgees in 1982 was decisive in terms of structures of power, along with the political and financial rationality at play. However, the motives and processes, interests and responsibilities for the Institute's transformation as a cultural institution, and the changes in the institutional and cultural production contexts that ultimately led to the demise of the Institute are difficult to reconstruct from the documentation kept in the archives.[904]

902 Porsché, Scholz, and Singh, 2022.

903 Suzanne Stephens published a brief commentary titled "Skyline Rises II" in "The Byline" section of the October 1982 issue of *Skyline* on the occasion of the newspaper's two year anniversary, in which she informed the readers of the recent change in the Institute's direction, which she welcomed and considered beneficial in terms of the strength of its internal structure and effectiveness in informing, if not influencing, decision-making processes in architecture and urbanism; see Suzanne Stephens, "Skyline Rises II," *Skyline* (October 1982), 34. Eisenman, Frampton, and Saxe were subsequently added to *Skyline*'s editorial board.

904 In the IAUS fond at the CCA in Montréal, which presents itself, by title alone, an official archive, there are some gaps on the events of 1981–82 and 1982–83 compared to the scope of the founding years, not to mention completeness. One reason for this is that the IAUS fonds was compiled and bequeathed by Eisenman personally and thus actually belong to the Eisenman fonds. That the IAUS holdings are nevertheless administered independently can be understood as an argument for the independence of the Institute vis-à-vis Eisenman, even if archival questions of provenance remain unanswered. While the route to the CCA is established, it remains unclear how the Institute's archive came into Eisenman's hands. According to oral history, Eisenman took a large number of documents with him, when he stepped back as Institute director. Whether this occurred while he was still at the Institute or only after the Institute moved from 8 West 40th Street to 19 Union Square West in 1983 is not clear.

There are several sets of documents that are particularly revealing in terms of institutional history: these include a folder on the so-called "Philip Johnson Center for Architecture," a last major project planned under Eisenman in fiscal year 1981–82 but ultimately not realized, which was intended to transform the Institute into a more enduring institution.[905] According to the concept papers, the Philip Johnson Center was to create an umbrella that would have housed "The Archive of American Architecture," "The Center for Advanced Studies in Architecture," and "The Library for Primary Sources of Modernism," while also being home to "The Institute for Architecture and Urban Studies" itself.[906] While the Institute had for years been discussing whether to become a registered school of architecture with accredited degrees and to establish an academic library, not least because the "Educational Programs" had formed the backbone of the Institute's operations since the academic year 1974–75 and covered the fixed costs for rent and staff, it was now looking nervously and somewhat enviously toward Montréal, where the architect and philanthropist Phyllis Lambert had in 1979 just founded the Canadian Centre for Architecture (which, however, would first be accommodated in existing office spaces—the actual building designed by Peter Rose was not ready until 1987). Other documents indicate that the Institute had already found suitable Manhattan premises and had a "lovely landmarked building" at 123 East 35 Street in mind.[907] Naming the center after Philip Johnson, who before officially serving as a trustee had remained largely in the background while possibly acting as the main donor (and making only a limited appearance in the books), was a strategic choice.[908] It helped to open the doors to the corporate world; after all, Johnson, considered to be "indisputably America's leading architect," was the key power broker in the New York architectural world, holding court at the Four Seasons Restaurant on Park Avenue in the Seagram Building.[909] The fact that Johnson's fascist past had become known at the time did not matter here—on the contrary.[910] As part of this capital campaign, Eisenman then approached Houston-based developer Gerald Hines, among others, upon Johnson's recommendation.[911] At the same time, the Institute's Board of Trustees, and with it, its connections to social, political, and economic affairs, was restructured and expanded to include

905 IAUS, project description for "The Philip Johnson Center for Architecture," 1981, Source: CCA Montréal, IAUS fonds: A.1-13 / ARCH263662.

906 Cynthia Warwick Kemper, letter to Mrs. Armand P. Bartos, April 9, 1982, Source: CCA Montréal, IAUS fonds: A.1-13.

907 Minutes of the Board of Trustees meeting, February 22, 1982, Source: CCA Montréal, IAUS fonds: A.1-13.

908 Johnson as the Institute's "prime benefactor and *éminence grise*" had already been honored, not without controversy at the time. See Sorkin, 1978 (1991).

909 Warwick Kemper, 1982.

910 Varnelis, 1995.

911 Thomas Weaver and Peter Eisenman, "Peter Eisenman in conversation with Thomas Weaver," *AA Files*, no. 74 (2017),: 150–172.

commercially successful American architectural firms and clients and an impressive roster of international architectural stars.[912] In the end, however, despite Hines' substantial donation of US$1.4 million and other fundraising efforts, the Institute was apparently unsuccessful in raising the US$10 million it had sought for the purchase price, US$5 million for the building and US$400.000 operating costs annually, and Eisenman's most ambitious institutional plan, except for perhaps the establishment of satellites of the Institute in various North American cities, failed. Ultimately, plans for the Philip Johnson Center and the Institute's hopes of managing the turnaround and realizing its long-term goals had to be buried—certainly a loss for New York, if not American and even global architecture culture. It is hard to imagine how the Institute's institutional legacy would have manifested itself and be perceived today compared to other institutions besides the CCA, e.g., the Getty Center for the History of Art and the Humanities in Los Angeles, 1983 (now the Getty Research Institute) or the Deutsches Architekturmuseum in Frankfurt, 1984 (DAM). However, it would be years before the Institute's overwhelming whiteness at the time was fully exposed.[913]

Other documents show that, after the appointment of Hamid-Reza Nouri as the Institute's associate director and Lynn Holstein as a new director of development (having been in office since 1976, Frederieke Taylor had resigned from her post as well as her role as Institute Fellow in 1981), fundraising became a branch of its own and now defined every other activity. The Institute's successful association between architecture culture and commercialization was exemplified by Eisenman's almost single-handedly pushing through a 1981 relaunch of *Skyline*, which he vaunted as the Institute's most important publication (even more than *Oppositions* or the Oppositions Books series), not only as an architectural newspaper but also as a fundraising tool. In addition, a series of official and unofficial minutes from meetings of the Institute's Fellows held in the fall of 1981 testify to the fact that the Institute was not yet defunct, but had grand ambitions, as this was when the institution, which had in practice already been in place for five years, was for the first time divided into four functional departments (or "silos"): "Publication," "Education," "Public," and "Development."[914] These meetings once again addressed the truly big issues, e.g., the transformation of the Institute's publishing activities into a full-fledged publishing house, the professionalization of the "Internship Program" (under Mario Gandelsonas), the continuation of the "Advanced Design Workshop" (under Diana Agrest), the role of the lecture series and exhibitions and their funding, the resumption of commissioned work, and, by extension, the establishment of a research library, etc.

912 As of October 1982, the board also included John Burgee, Henry Cobb, Arata Isozaki, Phyllis Lambert, Cesar Pelli, Kevin Roche, Aldo Rossi, and James Stirling. The acquisition of donations was neatly recorded in an index card system that resides in the IAUS fonds at the CCA.

913 Linder, 1996. In 1996, an entire issue of *Any* magazine, produced out of Eisenman's office, was devoted to "Whiteness."

914 Minutes of Fellows' meetings, fall 1981. Source: CCA Montréal, IAUS fonds: A.2-9.

The IAUS fonds at the CCA also holds several miscellaneous documents (applications, flyers, posters, and press releases) in a folder about what was known as the "Young Architects' Circle," a group that almost had parity and operated on an equal footing.[915] Part of the program they curated, generously sponsored by Walter Chatham, one of the Institute's trustees, in the spring of 1981 consisted of an event series, under the title "ReVisions," organized and administered by Joan Ockman and Christian Hubert, of twelve Monday evenings held at the Institute. Another part was the announcement of an architectural competition for individuals aged thirty-five or under for an intervention in Columbus Circle in midtown Manhattan (the winning entry was Elizabeth Diller's installation of 2,500 traffic cones, each spaced four meters apart). This was, according to participants, followed by the formation of the Young Architects' Circle as a reading group, which held its meetings outside of the Institute, in private SoHo lofts, where it focused on post-structuralist, post-Marxist theory.[916] For in the spring of 1982, at a time when individual Fellows were starting to voice internal complaints about Institute matters apparently being settled at the "Century Club" and wondering what direction they wanted the Institute to take,[917] the Young Architects' Circle organized a symposium at the Institute on the topic of "Architecture and Ideology: Notes on Material Criticism."[918] In order to avoid casting themselves in a polemical role of the postmodern era, they invited three speakers—Demetri Porphyrius, Tomàs Llorens, and Fredric Jameson—all of whom were working on an ideological criticism of architecture, i.e., the relation of critical history to practice, the limits of positivist and structuralist architectural theory, and the question of whether a new architecture culture could contribute to society and social change.[919] All these different, if not opposing developments of institutional continuation, or even institutional opening came to an abrupt end when Eisenman surprisingly stepped down from his post as the Institute's director in June 1982, ostensibly in response to outside pressure. As a

915 "Young Architects' Circle," 1981. Source: CCA Montréal, IAUS fonds: A.5-10.

916 Members of ReVisions were: Deborah Berke, Walter Chatham, Alan Colquhoun, Pe'era Goldman, Denis Hector, Christian Hubert, Michael Kagan, Beyhan Karahan, Mary McLeod, Joan Ockman, Alan Plattus, Michael Schwarting, Bernard Tschumi, Lauretta Vinciarelli. See Joan Ockman, ed., *Architecture Criticism Ideology* (New York: Princeton Architectural Press, 1985).

917 Minutes of a Fellows' meeting, November 5, 1981. Source: CCA Montréal, IAUS fonds: A.2-9. The most outspoken voices here were Kenneth Frampton, Silvia Kolbowski, and Rosalind Krauss. For a critique of the Century Association being turned into a powerhouse of New York's architecture community, see Plunz and Kaplan, 1984.

918 Margot Norton and Margot Jacqz, "Lecture Notes: The Other Day," *Skyline* (May 1982), 32.

919 Mary McLeod, "Introduction," in Ockman, ed., 1985, 7–11. In 1985, the three papers were published in the anthology *Architecture Criticism Ideology*, edited by Joan Ockman; see Porphyrios, 1985, 16–21; Llorens, 1985, 24–47; Fredric Jameson, "Architecture and the Critique of Ideology," in Ockman, ed., 1985, 51–87. Another relevant publication was to emerge from the Young Architect's Circle, published by the newly founded Princeton Architectural Press, which was based in New York long after the Institute had ceased to exist. Colomina, ed., 1988.

result, the Institute was beset by power struggles and disputes over Eisenman's unresolved succession. Just shortly after celebrating its fifteenth anniversary in November 1982, the Institute disintegrated within the space of only a few months. This was triggered by the mass resignation of Fellows, old and new, a development from which it would never fully recover, and the backstory of which can only be speculated upon in oral history.

The transformations and conflicts of this period, in which the establishment prevailed, can be inferred from the public events organized by the Institute, such as the "On Style" lecture, featuring Michael Graves on his iconic, postmodernist *Portland Building* in December 1982 or Gwathmey Siegel Architects on their Beach Houses in February 1983.[920] Issues of *Skyline* are another historical source, not only in terms of its coverage of the Institute's anniversary, but also reviews and interviews, columns that were formerly quite specific to the architecture scene, announcements of recent events at the Institute, and ultimately the declaration of the reconstitution of the Board of Trustees.[921] *Skyline*, which was published until May 1983, was a vehicle for institutional communication and eventually became an archive of the paradigm shift to which the Institute had contributed:[922] the differentiation, marketization, and commercialization of architecture culture, education, and practice, the triumph of "starchitecture" (a process in which the Institute was not uninvolved) and the increasing dominance of the archetype of the architect as developer in the world of construction, the transformation of New York, especially the sanitization of Times Square as an entertainment district, and the resurgence of conservatism in the United States, especially under the new Ronald Reagan administration after the January 1981 election. Further developments, especially those leading to the ultimate decline of the Institute, are however difficult to reconstruct from archival records. 1983 saw a new start for the Institute at a new address, 19 Union Square—the graduated rent of the old lease had become a huge, even fatal burden—with Diana Agrest, Mario Gandelsonas, Rosalind Krauss, and Anthony Vidler as the remaining Fellows. While the successful, income-generating Educational Programs continued under the lead of Gandelsonas as director of education, now with a strong preponderance of faculty members from Princeton, not least as a source of revenue, the Institute's publications, except for a final twenty-sixth issue of *Oppositions*

920 Suzanne Stephens, "At the Institute: The Portland Building Analyzed," *Skyline* (January 1983), 20–21; "Gwathmey/Siegel's Beach House. Discussed at IAUS," *Skyline* (March 1983), 8–9.

921 In the *Skyline* issue of November 1982, a news item was inserted in the "Dateline" section that read like an official report on reorganization and restructuring; see "Dateline: The Institute for Architecture an Urban Studies," *Skyline* (November 1982), 34.

922 Usually, the postmodern paradigm shift is illustrated by architectural projects presented in the context of the two major events of the time, the 1980 Venice Architecture Biennale and the IBA International Building Exhibition Berlin 84 (from 1979 onwards, and extended to 1987); by the time Eisenman and Frampton, like other former Institute Fellows, visited Berlin in 1983 at the invitation of the American Academy, the Institute, as it was known, had already ceased to exist.

and the successful continuation of *October*, were halted (Manfredo Tafuri's *The Sphere and the Labyrinth*, originally contracted for Oppositions Books, was finally published in 1987 by MIT Press).

In 1984–85, the Institute underwent a final, comprehensive redesign under Steven Peterson as new Institute director and with an ambitious program that included the resumption of the events series—now on urban topics—as well as exhibitions and new plans for publishing; but this attempt to rebuild the institution failed. Even though barely a stone was left unturned, the institutional graphic identity, which continued to be the responsibility of Massimo Vignelli and was partly designed by his employee Michael Bierut, remained its cornerstone. Ultimately, in the last two to three years before its final dissolution, the Institute was unable to regain the importance it had assumed under Eisenman. But historiography was astonishingly silent on the end of the Institute, and while only scattered traces can be found about the academic and fiscal years 1983–84 and 1984–85, details about institutional practices, discourses, and materializations can still be gleaned from oral history, i.e., from interviews with individuals who had been involved.[923] If one thing is certain, it is that the events came to a head in the spring of 1985 when, after public criticism of their Times Square Center project at an Institute event moderated by architect and critic Michael Sorkin, Johnson and Burgee—the latter serving as the Institute's president since 1983—terminated their financial support, which for the last years had been vital to the Institute's livelihood.[924] Finally, in May of 1985, the Institute declared bankruptcy and closed its doors forever.[925]

Evidence, Narrative, and Research Contribution

Postmodernism, as architectonic expression, discursive formation, and material culture from the 1960s to 1980s, is one of the fields extensively explored and written about in architecture history. Writings on its protagonists, their projects and positions, housing and planning, schools and pedagogy, books, periodicals, and exhibitions, drawings, and models highlight the thematic strands that reference the postmodern paradigm shift. In addition, there is a well-established

923 Minutes of the meetings of the Board of Trustees can be found in the Vignelli Center for Design Studies at the Rochester Institute of Technology. In general, oral history is a historiographic method that serves everyday rather than institutional or cultural history and contributes to the history of empowerment (as opposed to disempowerment). In the case of the Institute, the limitations and possibilities must also be reflected upon in terms of faded memory, identity, and experience.

924 Joshua Leon, "The Times Square Postmodern," *Urban Omnibus*, September 30, 2015, https://urbanomnibus.net/2014/09/times-square-postmodern/ (last accessed: May 31, 2023). An article written by Sorkin in the *Village Voice* described the events, while calling for a profound reform of the Institute. See Sorkin, 1985 (1991), 102.

925 There is much speculation and rumor about the whereabouts of the Institute's archive from that period, whatever it contained. Some say it was sunk in the East River; others that it was presented to the bankruptcy trustee and auctioned off to the highest bidder.

body of work on social and cultural change in the United States primarily in literary and cultural studies, sociology, and geography, which includes important work by Fredric Jameson, John McHale, and David Harvey.[926] While there have been biographical studies on the architecture historian and critic Manfredo Tafuri at the Istituto di Architettura di Venezia (IUAV) and the architect and educator Alvin Boyarsky at the Architectural Association (AA) in London, the last decade has seen several isolated and promising approaches, both historical and critical, through the study of the architect Peter Eisenman at the Institute.[927] What makes Jameson's critique of ideology so relevant within the Institute's history is that he concluded the paper he presented at the "ReVisions" symposium at the Institute in 1982 by stating that he did not engage in moralizing judgments that stem from the opposition between dialectical thought and aesthetics, but instead demanded that any position on postmodernism, including that of the historian and the critic (and he explicitly mentioned Tafuri here), be seen as a product of the times and that it must therefore begin with self-criticism.[928] And yet the Institute's history was rarely viewed in the context of the changes of the 1970s, the breakdown of the promise of modern architecture, or the new revisionism of neoliberal politics, along with the processes of de-bureaucratization, the withdrawal of the state, and the outsourcing of state services from the public sphere in the 1980s.[929]

Building Institution, conceived as a collective biography, has undertaken the historiographic challenge of examining the Institute in retrospect as a complex entity: how it was created when the opportunity arose, and how it was characterized, transformed, and resisted over the seventeen years of its existence, in terms of the discourses and materializations related to the four major institutional roles of "project office," "architecture school," "cultural space," and "publishing imprint"—an almost impossible undertaking. The highly detailed historical analysis, while quite difficult to untangle, does allow us to focus not only on one aspect and/or to highlight a single person, e.g., the autonomous practices of theory production or historiography expressed in publications, or the strategic orientation of the pedagogical experiment (if not how it adjusted to the changing conditions).[930] Rather, this book, as an institutional and cultural history that employs both socio-analysis and discourse analysis, explores the multifaceted institutional project of Eisenman and his followers that is paradigmatic of the larger changes of the mid-1970s, especially after its initial intent

926 Harvey, 1989; McHale, 1976, Jameson, 1984.

927 When Eisenman resigned, there was a search for his successor, and next to Daniel Libeskind one of the candidates who was contacted was Alvin Boyarsky.

928 Jameson, 1985, 87.

929 Leach, 2005; 2007, 2014; Sunwoo, 2009; 2012,

930 On the synergies of teaching and publishing, see Martin, 2010, 66; on the Institute's production of theory, see Allais, 2012; on the Institute's pedagogical experiment, see Esther Choi, "Life, in Theory," in Colomina, et al., 2022, 146–149.

to make an impact—as a group, as an organization, even as an institution—on the architecture community in New York through research and design, and eventually by making, exhibiting, and realizing a prototype for low-rise housing. The archival research is what makes it possible to question not only how the Institute portrayed itself, i.e., as working as an interface between theory and practice, as a think tank, or as an educational alternative in architecture. A key research contribution of *Building Institution* has been to explore the formation of the Institute itself, how it was made and unmade through everyday practice and the circulation of all sorts of texts, beginning with the name "Institute for Architecture and Urban Studies," be it in terms of orientation, committees, organization, attribution, resources, reputation, etc. In addition to the Institute's own agency, how it was socially embedded and contextually dependent, its relationships with other social institutions—next to planning authorities and ministries, universities, and museums, these also increasingly included the art and culture scene and the publishing industry with its publication and distribution channels—are central to the study of institutions, power, and architecture as exemplified by the Institute.

As a contribution to the institutional history of architecture, *Building Institution* was written on the basis of diligent research and due care in the complex documentation and multi-layered narrative regarding the institutional agenda, goals, and responsibilities of the Institute. Unlike the long narratives from the circles of former Institute Fellows that previously dominated the subject, testifying to the fact that romantic transfiguration always plays a role alongside the need for biographical work and coming to terms with the past, this book draws on exhaustive archival research at the various institutions involved (and myriad oral history interviews). It is based on the study of original documents that provide insight into the mix of multiple interests and stakeholders, both institutional and personal, the everyday practices of the Institute's leadership, its Fellows, Visiting Fellows, staff, students, and interns at various points in time. Chapter one thus explored how the Institute was initially legitimized through its collaborators and networks, which encompassed not only the Museum of Modern Art and the Department of Architecture at Cornell University, but also the State University of New York and the Graham Foundation for Advanced Studies in the Fine Arts. Eventually, the biographical and the institutional were strangely combined in Eisenman's initial claims of radicalism, as asserted in a *New York Times* article (and subsequently unquestioningly promulgated).

Teaching and learning at the Institute, on the other hand, which was shaped by Eisenman's persona, fluctuated between formalist and contextual, sociological and art historical approaches, in accordance with the preferences of the faculty's most dedicated members. While it was grounded in reality by performing commissioned work for public authorities, the New York City Planning Commission, the Urban Development Corporation of New York State, and the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, and by contributing to

downtown revitalization as well as to a solution to the housing crisis, at least on paper, this book has shown how fragile the construction was in the early years, and that the Institute was repeatedly doomed to failure, not least because of the clash of strong personalities. And unlike the short narratives that shape the historiography of the Institute today, which, beyond friendships and intrigues, misunderstandings and conflicts, testify to the fact that even scholarly work runs the risk of devoting itself to personal attacks rather than institutional critique and of taking too simplistic a view of the institutional order under consideration, this study differentiates between the preconditions, ideas, and interests of the Fellows involved, who at some point demanded rights and assumed duties. The development of the Institute's organization and structure, depending on monetary as well as non-monetary resources, and mediated by the Board of Trustees, especially the establishment of IAUS Central as an accounting office in the fiscal year 1972–73 under Peter Wolf as the new, second partner of the Institute's dual leadership, provided transparency and obligated the Institute's administration to accountability.

Building Institution has shown how, through its relationship with other institutions, the Institute took advantage of all the capital that came with the positions held by its Fellows at universities and colleges on the East Coast, whether at Columbia University, Cooper Union, MIT, or Princeton University and how, along with the redisciplining of architecture at the established schools of architecture there, it sought to gain—i.e., support, rather than subvert—hegemonical power over the institutional order.[931] Chapter two then discussed the intellectualization, i.e., the academization, if not scientification of architecture, as Fellows, with the launch of the journal *Oppositions*, semanticized, historicized, and aestheticized developments in contemporary and modern architecture, which informed the development of curricula and new doctoral programs. At the Institute, history and theory (along with planning, construction, and design, with a focus on semiotics and typology; urbanism was added later) were, according to the syllabi that can be accessed as historical documents, taught from the 1974–75 academic year, with educational offerings related to the development of a new kind of network of liberal arts colleges, led by Sarah Lawrence College, where one of the relevant archives can be found, as part of the internship offerings with which the Institute positioned itself as an entry point to graduate schools, or the continuing education offerings in the spirit of "life-long learning" in cooperation with the New School—all of which contributed to the redefinition of architecture as one of the humanities. The Institute's history shows that even though it never offered accredited degrees, it received institutionalized recognition in 1976 when it was awarded the AIA Medal, the highest honor bestowed by the American Institute for Architecture.

931 Regarding this relationship of architecture culture to hegemonic power, see Porphyrios, 1985, 16.

From an interdisciplinary perspective, drawing on concepts and methods of institutional and cultural sociology, and literary and cultural studies, one important contribution of this study to the history of institutions in architecture, if not the institution of architecture itself, is to have analyzed the impact and relevance of the Institute from its reinvention in 1974–75 as a "cultural space," with a variety of cultural offerings, in the interplay of propaedeutic and adult education, that oscillate between high and popular culture, instituting and instituted practices. At the time, Tafuri, as participant and observer, already highlighted the emergence of a new type of institution, designed more for entertainment than for anything else, and above all, new mechanisms of production, use, and circulation.[932] At a time when the construction sector was strongly affected by the fiscal and financial crisis in New York (before major commissions were awarded for a new generation of skyscrapers), the Institute was exemplary for this, but it was never, in the interplay of material and immaterial culture, really made the subject of historical research. Notwithstanding, education and culture were at the time viewed together in sociology as core areas of the post-industrial knowledge and information society, which was characterized by the transition from the production of goods, in this case architectural production, to a service economy, or architectural reproduction.[933] Pierre Bourdieu's concept of cultural production, developed in relation to developments in art and literature in nineteenth-century bourgeois Paris at the transition to modernity and applied to architecture culture in 1970s New York, offers a useful approach for addressing not only the discursive but also the material conditions of the broader paradigm shift to postmodernity.[934]

Chapter three, in this sense, focused on the Evening Program curated at the Institute, which included lecture series of both an academic and a more popular nature, and its "Exhibition Program", which was successively professionalized—the production and reception of both of which can be reconstructed through concepts, minutes, reports, posters, and flyers, and, in the best case, through publications of the works shown, drawings or models, and reviews in the daily and professional press.[935] While Robert Stern, then president of The Architectural League, became Eisenman's main collaborator at the Institute, offering his own lecture series and attracting a specific audience, the introduction and expansion of Vignelli's graphic design, now encompassing all of

932 Tafuri, 1976, 1987.

933 McHale, 1976; see also Daniel Bell, *The Coming of Post-Industrial Society* (New York: Basic Books, 1973), Alain Touraine, *The Post-Industrial Society. Tomorrow's Social History: Classes, Conflicts and Culture in the Programmed Society* (New York: Random House, 1971).

934 Bourdieu, 1983 (1994).

935 Like educational programs, the events themselves, the lecture series, and exhibitions, can only be partially reconstructed for posterity in terms of what was ultimately conceived, presented, and exhibited.

the Institute's work, and the use of event photographs by Dorothy Alexander, which made up a large part of the institutional visual language, offer further approaches to the intertwining of institutional identity, politics, self-image, and self-representation. With funding, particularly from the National Endowments for the Arts and the Humanities, the "Architecture" and "Open Plan" lecture series were for a long time organized by Andrew MacNair (in dialogue with senior Fellows), who also curated the first solo and group exhibitions. This study has made it possible to see the exhibitions at the Institute in relation to those at other New York institutions, MoMA and commercial galleries, such as Max Protetch and Leo Castelli, and new spaces that specialized in architecture, such as the Architecture Room at P.S.1, which had a greater proximity to alternative art spaces. Specifically, in terms of institutional administration, *Building Institution* shows how the Institute, through the work of MacNair and especially Taylor as director of development, financed itself and cross-funded programs through revenue from tuition, private and public grants, and increasingly patronage in the form of individual, institutional, and corporate sponsorship. Not only did the Institute (and individual Fellows) celebrate itself with events and publications—as evidenced by articles, reviews and interviews, as well as the society photographs taken at the release parties and published in *Oppositions*, or at exhibition openings in *Skyline*, both of which created publicity, i.e., the changing social relationship of marketing, and the politics of envy under capitalism.[936] Ultimately, these cultural productions demonstrated that the Institute was already operating a symbolic economy that produced attention and stars, both architects and people engaged in architecture history, theory, and criticism. This is one main research contribution of this book, as the development has previously only been discussed in relation to trends in deconstructivist architecture in the 1980s, drawing on Pierre Bourdieu's (and indirectly on Karl Marx's) notions of capital.[937] In this respect, the tenth anniversary of the Institute in 1977 represented a turning point in its history.

In addition to being the most comprehensive study undertaken on the Institute's publications to date, another contribution of *Building Institution* is chapter four's investigation into the production, use, and circulation of its

936 The last issue of *Skyline*, which appeared in April 1983, is notable here since it featured two articles, a preprint of one book and a book review of another, both of which exemplified central modes of discourse of New York architecture culture that had been successfully implemented at the Institute with its publications since 1973: first, opposition, i.e. ideas and criticism based on speech and counter-speech as a basic discursive configuration, and second, hype, an exaggerated communication of certain positions as a defining rhetorical stylistic device. One was an excerpt from *Hype* by Steven Aronson, published in conjunction with the release of the book, which encompassed an architecture chapter originally titled "Philip Loves Them, Philip Loves Them Not," based on an interview that Aronson had conducted with Philip Johnson; see Steven Aronson, "Philip's List," *Skyline* (April 1983), 18–19; see also Steven Aronson, *Hype* (New York: William Morrow and Company, 1983).

937 Franck, 1998; 2000.

entire portfolio and, above all, the collaboration with academic and commercial publishers (after Wittenborn Art Books, its collaborators were MIT Press with Roger Conover from 1976, later Rizzoli International with Gianfranco Monacelli from 1980, and to a certain extent Princeton Architectural Press with Kevin Lippert). This immense corpus of texts, next to the impact on biographies, both individual and collective, is certainly one of its lasting institutional legacies, and with it the Fellows' profound influence on the architectural practice, thought, and aesthetics of at least an English-speaking readership. In this sense, the emphasis on (or challenge to) the importance of theory and history in architectural debate should be understood as a symptom rather than a reflection, for the Institute's publication apparatus was becoming increasingly multi-layered in the second half of the 1970s, encompassing documents, criticism, interviews, reviews, gossip, hype, etc., with implications for the understanding and practice of culture and institution. However, this study has shown that at no point did the Institute take the step of operating as a publishing house itself, although *Oppositions*, *October*, *Skyline*, and the IAUS Exhibition Catalogues (but not Oppositions Books) were initially self-published, self-produced, and self-distributed (while all being anything but micro-productions). And yet the Institute's publishing, as well as its other institutional practices, are neither standardized mass productions of a culture industry, as discussed by Theodor W. Adorno and Max Horkheimer, two representatives of the Frankfurt School of social theory and critical philosophy, in relation to developments in film, radio and print in the USA in the first half of the 20th century, nor to developments in television and advertising in the post-war period[938]—on the contrary, limited editions of books and other printed matter such as posters were sometimes produced as collector's items.[939]

Thus, *Building Institution* has ultimately also shown the extent to which the Institute not only related to the museum and university landscape of the New York metropolitan region, but also, through its various publications,

938 Adorno and Horkheimer, [1944] 1972, 120–176.

939 The April 1983 issue of *Skyline* also featured a review by Brendan Gill of Eisenman's first monograph, *House X*, which was eventually published in 1982; see Brendan Gill, "On Reading. Peter Eisenman's House X," *Skyline* (April 1983), 33; see also Eisenman, 1982. Initially full of praise for the book as an aesthetic object of material culture, particularly for Vignelli's graphic design, Gill aimed for nuanced criticism. However, unimpressed with the design of *House X*, he lambasted Eisenman's writing as "highfalutin nonsense," particularly for his conception of the city. This was a devastating judgment, underscored by Gill's declaration that Eisenman's statements about the suburbanization and automobilization of the United States, namely that the American city was based on tabula rasa planning and that the automobile had emerged from urban space, were a distortion of history that completely ignored white settler colonialism and the significance of the automobile industry for rural spaces. The publication of *House X*, however, reproduced Eisenman's unresolved contradiction between theory and practice, the seductive projects on the one hand, whether as drawings or models, and the disconcerting texts on the other.

documented and reflected, if not contemporary building activity as intended, then at least local art and cultural activity, and the extent to which the Institute influenced changes in the publication landscape in North America. Previously afforded less consideration in architecture history, *October*, *Skyline*, and the IAUS Exhibition Catalogues can be understood as chronicles, while the editorials of *Oppositions* issues and the prefaces of Oppositions Books in particular can be read as important sources of insight into the social construction of what was considered architecturally valuable, culturally acceptable, and institutionally powerful.[940] *Building Institution*, however, in its structure and scope, ultimately suggests that it would be too short-sighted, despite all the correct and justified criticism, to identify the Institute's institutional legacy merely in terms of a particular institutional figure or a single publication or event, journal or exhibition, at best as a case study in institutional practice in architecture. By the early 1980s at the latest, this development, the turn to the architecture establishment, the ultimately failed transition to a veritable institution, and moreover, a postmodernization between simulation and spectacle that requires institutional critique from the perspective of a sociology of institutions and culture in terms of the commodification of education and culture was truly celebrated at the Institute as the new functional elite in North American architecture. As a contribution to the broadening of architecture history, indeed the architecture humanities, with a critical, interdisciplinary outlook on the role of institutions, organizations, and groups in architecture, and the basis for not only the processes of urbanization that determine social life but, as we know today, more sustainable social-environmental relations, this book offers insights into the ideas about architecture that have been powerful in New York as well as a globalized architecture culture, shaping research and design, education, culture, and publishing for the last half a century.

940 The "distinctions" in cultural consumption and artistic taste that Bourdieu discussed at length in his 1979 monograph to be published the following year in an English translation, were once again evident here, as the new connection between architecture culture and celebrity culture first emerged, along the difference of elite culture and popular culture, prominence and populism, etc.; see Pierre Bourdieu, *Distinction. A Social Critique of the Judgement of Taste* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, [1979] 1984).