Relationships with the City

The principal interrelationships with the city, as far as this project is concerned, consist mainly in its precise architectural definition so as to constitute "an architectural place" where the form and rationality of the construction — interpreters of the pietry and meaning of the cemetery — are an alternative to the brutal and disorderly growth of the modern city. The cemetery, as an architectural place, just like other public places, is capable of creating the collective memory and will of the city. Thus, the cemetery, articulated around the central burial grounds and around the building containing the ossuaries and the perimeter repositories for the bodies of the dead, offers its dominant elements under the hypostases of the cubic sanctuary and conic tower of the communal grave. These elements, towering over the confining wall, are references to the exterior surrounding cityscape and signal the cemetery.

Realization through Successive Stages of Development

The rational and rigorous implementation of the entire cemetery scheme allows for construction over a certain period of time following alternative and equally valid propositions. This fact is primarily due to concepts of symmetry and order, to the design of an ordered plan resulting from an additive system; these plans permit the growth in time by the addition of various elements. From a functional and aesthetic point of view, it is possible to build in a first phase the perimeter building of the repository for dead bodies, then the central section. It is equally possible to execute the internal part and the central structure of the ossuaries and then the perimeter buildings.

The Cemetery as a Public Building: Its Significance

Together, all of the buildings read as a city in which the private relationship with death happens to be the civil relationship with the institution. Thus the cemetery is also a public building with an inherent clarity in its circulation and its land use. Externally, it is closed by a fenestrated wall.

The elegiac theme does not separate it much from other public buildings. Its order and its location also contain the bureaucratic aspect of death. The project attempts to solve the most important technical issues in the same manner as they are solved when designing a house, a school or a hotel. As opposed to a house, a school or a hotel, where life itself modifies the work and its growth in time, the cemetery foresees all modifications; in the cemetery, time possesses a different dimension. Faced with this relationship, architecture can only use its own given elements, refusing any suggestion not born out of its own making; therefore, the references to the cemetery are also found in the architecture of the cemetery, the house, and the city. Here, the monument is analogous to the relationship between life and buildings in the modern city. The cube is an abandoned or unfinished house; the cone is the chimney of a deserted factory. The analogy with death is possible only when dealing with the finished object, with the end of all things; any relationship, other than that of the deserted house and the abandoned work, is consequently untransmittable. Besides the municipal exigencies, bureaucratic practices, the face of the orphans, the remorse of the private relationship, tenderness and indifference, this project for a cemetery complies with the image of cemetery that each one of us possesses.

With this piece Manfredo Tafuri turns the critical method of his essay "L'Architecture dans le Boudoir" (Oppositions 3), to an appraisal of the "New York Five." In regarding modern avant-gardism as being in essence schizophrenic, as being split between a nostalgia for Kultur and an anti-historical determination to sadistically destroy its very substance, Tafuri maintains that, notwithstanding the hermetic polonies of "Grey" versus "White," "to speak of architecture today is to speak of events which are at best a testimony to the restless dreams which upset the drowsiness of the intellectual conscience." He goes on to argue that both the Venturi and the Five are equally "vouyeristic"; the one indulging in "a sly schizophrenic game with the masks of reality"; the other "standing masochistically transfixed before their own creations." Tafuri's argument is an attempt to analyze their architecture not as a product of a group but rather as the work of five individual architects, as the result of both the context established by American culture and the present situation in the world of architectural ideas.

The Five, Tafuri maintains, are to be distinguished by their formalist commitment to the kurtos conclusus of language; that is, by their exclusive concern for a self-referential architecture and by their specific adoption of the arbitrary, yet historically referential, signs, which they syntactically manipulate as ends in themselves. As Tafuri puts it, Eisenman, Graves, and Hejduk manipulate linguistic material in such a way as to betray that state of affairs where the "war" of the Enlightenment is over and nothing is left save the inescapable ambiguity of intellectual pleasure.

This emphasis on the difference rather than the similarities of their works allows him to disassemble some of the schematic labels used to characterize their work as a revival of the Modern Movement, as "White" formalistic architecture confined to the design of private houses. He describes their operation as more subtle than a simple formal revival of the early twentieth-century avant-gardes. He sees their work as an attempt to explore problems which are antibalistically opposed to American pragmatism.

For all that the logic of this linguistic purity is compromised by a recourse to the principles of a realistic architecture, in the practices of Gwathney/Siegell, and Richard Meier, much of their work still remains contained within the bounds of their concern for form. Thus even Meier, in his public work, still renounces that utopian gesture of charging "built forms with impossible myths." That such a renunciation is the inescapable fate of architecture in the last phases of capitalism glimmers through as the latent argument of Tafuri's text.

"European Graffiti." Five x Five = Twenty-five

Manfredo Tafuri
Translation by Victor Calandro

"European Graffiti." Five x Five = Twenty-five

Manfredo Tafuri was born in Rome in 1935. He graduated in architecture in 1969, and has taught the history of architecture at the Universities of Rome, Milan and Palermo. Since 1969 he has been Chairman of the Faculty of the History of Architecture and the Director of the Institute of History at the Architecture Institute in Venice. He is a member of the Scientific Council at the International Center of Studies of Architecture "Andrea Palladio" of Vicenza and on the committee of editors of the magazine Architettura. His published works include: Teorie e Storia dell'Architettura, Bari 1968; L'Architettura dell'Umanesimo, Bari 1969; Progetto e Utopia, Bari 1973; La Città Americana dalla Guerra Civile al New Deal (in collaboration), Bari 1973. He is presently working on a book on the study of the relationship between the avant-garde and contemporary architecture.

Moscow, September 1921. Alexander Vesnin, Liubov Popova, Aleksandr Ester, Aleksandr Rodchenko, and Varvara Stepanova organize an exhibition entitled "2 x 2 = 5." Here the themes of a constructivist poetic are defined in terms of the "engineered aesthetics of forms."

There is nothing new to the fact that American culture is possessed of a deep sense of nostalgia for that which it has never had. It is not surprising that our attempt to define the “never had” does not produce an object, but a pair of opposites; opposites, moreover, that are dialectically related. On the one hand, there is Kultur, what Goethe meant by the “spirit of Weimar”; and on the other, there is an antihistorical ideology which radicalistically fractures that very Kultur—a painful self-reflection of intellectuals exiled from the world who, beginning with Nietzsche, continue to chant the canzoni del secolo (song of what is and of what might be). From Benjamin Lautro, to the City Beautiful Movement, to Louis Kahn (and his followers), there exists a tie which unifies these different experiences into a “principle of value,” that is, etwines them into the Lukasian myth of “totality.” Yet from John Cage, to Robert Rauschenberg, and Robert Venturi, there is an insistant search to recapture the European myth of the dialectic; through the inherently irrational, through kitsch, through the happenstance and the informal.

It matters little that the experiences which preceded Dada were in fact born in America. What matters is that in the U.S. those experiences, just as those which are apparently the antithesis of the neue Sachlichkeit, have not become institutionalized in their own time.

Nostalgia thus envelops both historicism and antihistoricism. Indeed, without that tormented sense of deprivation which lies at the origin of nostalgia, many American intellectuals would lack an instrumentality; this is also true in relation to recent American history, as the films of Peter Bogdanovich and Sidney Pollack testify.1

In approaching the architectural work of the so-called Five Architects, we shall lay aside those questions which have preoccupied many Americans. We are not interested in ascertaining whether they do in fact constitute a “New York School,” or whether they are a self-proclaimed group deliberately created to drive a wedge into the American architectural marketplace. We will assume instead that the Five are bound to each other by more or less strong ties and that they have reached, by means of even disparate paths, a common “poetics of nostalgia” that is interesting in itself, if only because it is a manifestation of upper-class behavior. Let us remove all possible misunderstandings. It is not the intention of this essay to espouse the ideas of the Five nor to declare them an anachronism. These are not the tasks of criticism which must give historical perspective to its object and cast light upon its less evident aspects; all the while remaining as detached as possible. We will also not waste any time explaining that the architecture of the Five is hermetic, sophisticated, suitable only to the initiated, removed from the social context, theoretical, manneristic, etc. It is all of these things: but not less so than the works of Kahn, Venturi, Giorgola, Moore, Stirling, et al. So much by way of stating that to speak of architecture today is to speak of events which, at best, are expected to be a testimony to the restless dreams which disturb the half-awakened intellectual conscience.

It is nevertheless certain that the attitude of the Five includes nostalgia as an instrumentality: be it a desperate attempt to recapture those avant-gardes which America experienced only in its superficial aspects, or be it an exploration of those methods which are the antithesis of the American pragmatic tradition. In a certain way, the Five express a sense of revolt. To have closed themselves into the hortus conclusus of language is a polemic act—not only with respect to those efforts which are aimed at reinstating a sense of meaning into a world which has erased the problems of artistic communication, but also with respect to those institutional realities which control the formation of American cities. “L’homme revolte” is not a revolutionary man. In fact, the Five oscillate between nostalgia and des-ign. An astonished reflection of language upon itself is in fact the opposite, but also the equivalent of, the indiscriminate collection of messages generated by Venturi’s flirt with the mass media: on the one hand, we have the rigorous selection and clarification of one’s personal limitations; on the other hand, we have redundancy elevated into a system. Each of these attitudes take on the stance of the voyeur: the first, because it masochistically stares at its own image as it is multiplied and distorted through mirrors; the second, because it plays a sly schizophrenic game with the masks of reality.
But it is mistaken to prejudge an architecture which presents itself so proudly in its own separateness and asks to be recognized as such. Let us therefore attempt to approach the architectural works of the Fried on their own grounds.

John Hejduk: House 10, 1966 (fig. 2). Without doubt this is the most programme of Hejduk's works, much more so than the Diamond Projects of 1967 (figs. 3, 4). Yet whosoever wishes to read into House 10 certain themes common to those of Graves' "magical sequences" or of the structural sequences of Meier would be mistaken. Nor is Kenneth Frampton convincing in his association of the qualities of horizontal dislocation with Frank Lloyd Wright's object-forms. The real meaning of this esoteric diagram can only be grasped by comparing it to the One-Half House designed in the same year. In fact, both designs are based on geometric forms which have been cut according to elementary rules: in the One-Half House (fig. 5), circle, square and diamond - simple planimetric units grouped in close proximity - are cut in half; in House 10 (fig. 6), the same elements are cut into quarters and, more importantly, are separated and grouped at the ends of a long, paradoxical path. Two organically-shaped spaces are placed along this path as if they were growths inserted to confirm the laws of the axis. In other words, Hejduk performs two complementary tasks: he chooses absolutely trivial forms, and then deforms them according to arbitrary, but nevertheless elementary, rules. The arbitrary quality of these signs - as in the entire Cubist tradition - is the basis of any act of deformation; but the deformation is contained in order to confirm the nature of the original geometry. Such a method would seem to be most basic to the techniques of montage; but Hejduk pushes his polemic even farther. For him space is a neutral field: the relationships between objects, which are still mute in spite of their manipulations, obey the indeterminacy of the laws of topology. The path connecting the two extremes of House 10 could be stretched out to infinity; it is not the chief element in the composition. The path, however - not unlike that platform which in the One-Half House is defined by the wall and by the long rear-side rectangle which encloses the central assembly - has the same value which the screen has in the cinema: it is
only the support onto which a cruel sequence of fragmented happenings are projected.

The "poetics of the object" are thereby simultaneously recalled and instantly destroyed. What matters in this game is the perverse and lucid exposition of its own futility. In this case, the references to Purism are misleading: in spite of the "quotations" embedded in the Bernstein House of 1968 (fig. 7), Hejduk appears to follow different objectives. Even in the works of Picasso and Braque of the early 1910s, the triviality of the common objects which surface or the fragments of real object applied to the collage serve to declare that the true protagonist of the composition is the artificial quality of the manipulation; and Oxenfant does nothing more than reduce that manipulation to its bare essentials. Hejduk, however, nails the object to its own triviality. The process of deformation is instantly clear: the geometric solids, cut and empty, lie stunned in the conceptual jail into which the architect has slyly locked them, while feigning to set them free.

Despite its appearances, Hejduk's formal method is purely tautological. The sign is only itself elaborated or distorted to no avail; its finality is that of its meaning lost forever. In 1967 Hejduk and Robert Slutsky explicitly stated their sources in the exhibition "Diamond and Square," held at the Architectural League. Let us accept that Mondrian's Boogie Woogie (fig. 11) is at the source of these projects. It is certain, however, that the three designs developed at the Cooper Union only confirm his prior experiences. Research into the basic disposition of an elementary form rotated on forty-five degrees may also be justified by Hejduk as a repêchage into a theorem of Mondrian's — a theorem not yet appropriated by architectural culture. Yet the fact is that the three diamond projects of 1967 (figs. 8-10) cling to what remains unchanged after the intersections and manipulations brought about by elementary but arbitrary laws of geometry.

"The mysteries of central-peripheral-frontal-oblique-concavity-convexity," writes Hejduk, "of the right angle of perpendicular; of perspective, the comprehension of sphere-cylinder-pyramid, the questions of structure-
9 Diamond Project B, House. Roof level plan and projection.

11. Construction-organization, the question of scale, of position, the interest in post-lintel, wall-slab, the extent of a limited field, of an unlimited field, the meaning of plan, of section, the meaning of spatial expansion—spatial contraction—spatial compression—spatial tension, the direction of regulating lines, of grids, the forces of implied extension, the relationships of figure to ground, of number to proportion, of measurement to scale, of symmetry to asymmetry, of diamond to diagonal ... all begin to take on the form of a vocabulary.** We are therefore confronted by the reconstitution of a fully-fledged syntactic code wherein the reference to De Stijl has meaning only if we consider that, in all of the intellectual baggage of the elementalist avant-garde, Hejduk is only interested in the final nihilism — an attitude towards the poetics of mere signs. Because of this, among the Five, Hejduk is closest to Eisenman. If this is the base, what is his intention in blocking the articulation of the sign itself in a deliberate imprisonment, in denouncing its very "poverty"? From Project A to Project C, the diamond field is employed to explore the effects of subdivision or compression of space: once again the base form is like a movie screen. But what takes place on the screen does not explode into the imaginary. It rather confirms — despite Hejduk's sophisticated rendering — the "nothingness" of the empty screen. Since we have referred to the cinemas and to the neoplastic movement, we may hazard an historical analogy. Project A is to the experimental film *Rhythm 21* of Hans Richter, as Project C is to the *Dyagonale Symphonie of Viking Eggeling* (fig. 12); planar structures and curvilinear ones in a diagonal field are complementary — a fact which demonstrates the limits of manipulating an elementary sign.

To verify how such an elementalist logic may emerge from the limbo of theory and enter the real world, it is not nearly as useful to examine Hejduk's only done restoration of the nineteenth-century Cooper Union *as* it is to examine his Wall Houses: and specifically the studies and designs for the Bye House.

"To fabricate a house is to make an illusion," writes Hejduk in the margins of one of his 1973 studies for the Bye House. And, by way of explaining his Wall House, he states: "The


These observations on Hejduk bring us directly to an examination of Peter Eisenman’s work. With Eisenman, the cruel interplay of impoverished formal materials assumes a theoretical consistency. Beginning with certain insights from Eisenman’s own vast writings, Mario Gandelsonas has accurately stated: “In the case of Peter Eisenman’s work, the traditional play of modifications within a semantic dimension has been abandoned. . . . One of the most interesting and original aspects in the work of Eisenman is the discovery of the possibility of modifications within architecture which are the result of a shift in the dominant characteristic of architecture from the semantic to the syntactic. By “paralyzing” the semantic dimensions, the syntactic dimension is seen in a new light. In this way both the syntactic and the semantic dimension of architecture stand uncovered, thus permitting not only new access to their make-up, but also a potential point of departure for the development of a non-ideological theory.” Moreover, Gandelsonas links this approach to the consumption of superarchitectural utopias — which are tied to the recovery of an “aure” semantic — spanning Archigram, the populist intellec
tualism of Robert Venturi, and the technocratic regressions in the architecture of the sixties.

Eisenman himself links the exaltation of logic in the processes of form development to a criticism of the historical avant-garde ideology. He has written that, “the Modern Movement has tended to identify itself with change and ideas of change, because it too has thought itself to be a ‘permanent revolution’ and consequently its particular mode of speculation has been historical rather than logical. There is an inherent danger in this absence of logical thought.” Here the avant-garde persists as an ideology of innovation. We are certainly in full agreement with this. But for Eisenman to be free of ideology has a precise mean-
ing. That which he has called “conceptual architecture” is supposed to give prime importance to the relationship be-
transformation of form, and the relationship between the building as a whole and the surrounding environment. Kručenčyč's work continues to resonate with modern architects and scholars alike, reminding us of the enduring relevance of avant-garde architectural thought.
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the same as that employed in the two previous works. But this time, another reagent is introduced to the chemical process of catalyzing the form: the forty-five degree rotation of the geometric solid relative to the cage which, through this rotation, is emptied. This theme bears only a superficial resemblance to Hejduk's Diamond House or to some of the work of Graves. To Eisenman, rotation serves only to question the very concept of “composition.” There can be no synthesis after this transgression — as there is for Graves — nor any self-satisfaction in the work — as there is for Hejduk in Projects A, B, and C.

In House III, Eisenman carries his method through to the end. It is necessary for him to demonstrate the very process of alienation of form, not only with respect to reality but also in terms of itself.

In other words, the microcosm of signs arrayed so as to discourse only with themselves — which in previous works appear as a synthesis and reflect a level of linguistic accomplishments — is now broken and compromised through the simple, though arbitrary, act of decomposition and the subsequent intersection of two virtual solids. The principle which links Eisenman to the work of the first Russian Constructivists, beyond merely stylistic affinities, is to “work on form” as a means of “highlighting the linguistic procedures.” Eisenman therefore follows the “school of formal method,” as set out in the experiments on the effects of alienation of forms by Tatlin and Puni and theorized by Sísakis and Tynjanov. (Perhaps one of the meanings of the title to this article begins to be clear.) But, unlike the prien estranjenoje of the Russian avant-garde, Eisenman turns the linguistic search upon itself. Net without reason Eisenman compares the paradoxical work of House III to the film, A Letter to James, by Jean Luc Godard and Jean Gorin;14 in both cases the very emphasis placed upon the montage of the sign complicates an identification of its meanings. Eisenman takes his article on House III “To Adolf Loos & Bertold Brecht,” thereby clarifying the nature of the procedure underlying his entire research. “While the architectural system,” writes Eisenman, “may be complete, the environment ‘house’ is almost a void. And quite unintentionally — like the audience of the film — the

owner has been alienated from his environment. In this sense, when the owner first enters ‘his house’ he is an intruder; he must begin to regain possession — to occupy a foreign container. In the process of taking possession the owner begins to destroy, albeit in a positive sense, the initial unity and completeness of the architectural structure. . . . By acting in response to a given structure, the owner is now almost working against this pattern. By working to come to terms with this structure, design is not decoration but rather becomes a process of inquiry into one’s own latent capacity to understand any man-made space.”

We are therefore confronted with a reduction of the architecture to its underlying structure, as the means towards alienation. And the allusion to Brecht is legitimate only if it refers to a technique of dislocating the spectator from his habitual codes. Then, to inhabit, in this particular conception, does not mean what it says. Instead, to inhabit means to challenge the limits which the language imposes upon itself and upon existence. Form, then, is a challenge and an obstacle which must be overcome. The man who claims to live forms is condemned to a double alienation, from which it is possible to escape only by aggressing that form, taking on its challenge. The language, in House III and even more so in Eisenman’s subsequent houses, codifies its own limitations: by excluding a relation with the public through communication or “invitations to action,” it postulates a behavior which sets it apart from the “outsider” dimension which it creates. There is in all this no identification between form and life. Eisenman’s merciless manipulations recognize that an architectural language cannot be set forth if it is not outside conventional practice. Furthermore the syntactic laboratory, as it is invoked through objects which are perfectly locked into a mutual dialogue of signs, accepts no intruders. Man’s pressure there is nowhere shown: once into Eisenman’s laboratory, he cannot avoid destroying its suspended totality and in so doing giving substance to the intangible.

As can be seen, in analyzing the work of Eisenman and Hejduk we have avoided any precise linguistic reference. Their nostalgic interpretation of the heroic years of the avant-garde is in fact much more subtle and perversive than a simple revival. Colin Rowe, in his introduction to the Free Architects, has recalled the hopes and frustrations of the ideology of the Modern Movement.15 But in their work, Eisenman and Hejduk do not attempt to recapitulate that ideology. Instead they mercilessly dissect it. Any evocation of the processes typical to the avant-garde is blocked at the very points where the avant-garde proposed itself as a "political" instrument. The disenchantment with pure syntax corresponds to that "grand illusion," refusing to go back over the road of frustration. It is true that Eisenman has proposed urban renewal projects and worked on mass housing. It is enough to recall his participation with groups which have proposed a restructuring of mid-Manhattan and housing types for the New York State Urban Development Corporation.16 But the thrust of his work is not at all related to the utopia of Le Corbusier. He engages Puriens, as does Graves, in the most abstract of its forms, apart from Terragni, Vietti, architects, 1924.

of painters close to Lingeri and Terragni. Yet points of departure do not always coincide with points of arrival. Belli wrote, "Art is the liberation of the eternally human," thereby interpreting the linguistic absolutism of the "Millesme" rationalists: it is an interpretation which is closer to the central themes of Malevich, Ivan Puni or Schwitters than it is to those of Kandinsky. The syntactic emphasis of Hejduk and Eisenman is within the "suspended tonality," replete with the magical and modern evocations of the Como groups, or of certain works by Adalberto Libera. (A suspended tonality that movie directors, such as Godard or Bertolucci, have captured far better than many critics — just think of the use made of Malaparte's house at Capri which the former employed in "Meppe or by the latter's use of the terrace at the Palazzo dei Congressi at EUR in The Conformist.)

In other words, a reduction to pure syntax embraces an "involuntary semantic." This "interrupted signification" also reintroduces a sense of ambiguity to the emptied sign, and permits another semantic dimension to enter into the fabric of rigorous conceptual penetrations. It is a dimension which is antithetical to the original theoretical assumptions: it is "magical." Now, and only now, is it possible to speculate about what is perhaps an unconscious source of Hejduk's Wall Houses: Project A, presented by Carminati, Lingeri, Salmia, Terragni, and Vietti in 1954, in the competition for the Palazzo del Littorio on the Via dell'Impero in Rome (fig. 21).

The above leads us directly to the work of Michael Graves. It is often seen as a sort of pendant to Eisenman's syntactic elaborations: it is not by chance that we find Graves and Eisenman associated in an urban design proposal for the Upper West Side, Manhattan, in the "New City" exhibit of 1967.

In 1967 Graves designed the Hanselmann House (fig. 23): a pure prism violated by a set of accidental cuts. It is an attempt to precisely define its relationship to its surroundings. This is accomplished through a series of formal devices: through access to the second level by an external stair connected to an elevated walkway; through a transparent screen which is placed between the stair and the walkway; and finally by expressing the relationship between built and open areas, based on a double square, and articulated in plan by a ninety degree rotation of the exterior paved area (figs. 22, 24).

Commenting on the Hanselmann House, William La Riche refers to the transition from profane space to sacred space at the Acropolis. The Purist and the Classical are here intertwined. We are confronted with the problem of finite forms in the presence of the infinity of nature. This reference to Greek architecture may overwhelm the object in question, but it is nonetheless effective. The Hanselmann House fully captures the essence of Le Corbusier's villas of the 1920s and 1930s: they are discrete fragments in a space which is theoretically continuous and homogenous. For Le Corbusier the homogeneity of space is rich with ideologic content: even in reduced architectural terms, it is for him an expression of the basic postulate of the Ville Radieuse — that is, of the full social availability of the ground and the surrounding environment. For Graves, however, the availability of the ground is an abstract assumption unquestionable in and of itself. His house "reacts" to potential external forces which impinge upon it, as if assaulted by invisible currents. The two stairways which converge towards the second floor entry are in a certain way the visible manifestation of some of these forces. A transparent diaphragm set across the elevated walkway marks the entry into the realm of total artifice. The cuts into this pure prism, the play of overlaps and the intact transparent surfaces are but the means to make manifest the artifice: and here real space and virtual space mutually exchange their meanings. Therefore ambiguity becomes the principal value of Michael Graves' architecture. Proceeding on the southern stair of the Hanselmann House, we note that the left side parapet has been omitted, thereby allowing a full view of the interplay of the objects — a view which varies with the observers' upward movement. The elements which contribute to this dynamic play are the diagonal cut of the second stairway, the dialectic between solid surfaces and the deep spaces as revealed through the glass openings, and the
shear of the curved plane on the upper terrace. The formality of entry also reveals a dynamic interrelational of discrete geometric forms: the axis of approach becomes the visual pivot of Graves' pluralistic formal setting. In this context, the murals which Graves deploys within his buildings are not the vehicles of an anachronistic Gesamtkunstwerk, but a means to accentuate the virtual nature of the space. His paintings are certainly rooted in Cubism and Purism, but they are also the result of a sort of idealized conflict between artificial forms and nature. This aspect is very much in evidence at the Rockefeller House of 1969 in Pocantico Hills, New York (fig. 25). Behind the pierced screen and paradoxically suspended above the uneven terrain, there unfolds a series of passages and open spaces defined by curved surfaces. These are the same surfaces which conjure the soft conflicts of Grundriss' paintings (fig. 26). But, above all, they reappear at the intersection between architecture and nature in the "grotto" of the Rockefeller House. The finite qualities of form are thus always in a tenuous balance with nature: the marriage of opposites — nature and artifact — is impossible. Their conflict may be frozen and exhibited in narrative form.

This is precisely what occurs in the irregular spatiality of the Dreeser House, project Michael Graves, architect, 1970. Plan.


explain a certain magical quality which it acquires through the play of elements related to each other only by means of opposition and contrast. The layering of screens which characterizes this small house creates a sense of unreality charged with allusive irony. For example, the curvilinear profile of the cornice (fig. 30) defining the space of the upper terrace—a traditional element now deformed—estabishes a subtle dialectic between the necessary and the arbitrary. This dialectic is much more heightened in the Medical Office for Ear, Nose and Throat Associates in Fort Wayne, Indiana, of 1971 (fig. 33). Once again, only an interior architecture, but Graves overcomes this limitation by rotating the geometric structure of the central nucleus of the nurses' station into the diagonal. In other words, he inserts into the given space another closed space, thereby permitting the central block to be read as an independent architecture set into a sequence of tangential paths. These paths then take on the role of virtual external spaces. The technique of rotation, which we have already found in Hejduk's and Eisenman's work, assumes new value here. This is especially true if we consider how Graves makes the examination/treatment rooms into truly illusionary boxes through mural painting (figs. 34, 35). The entwined and diagonally-broken forms of the "murals as extended landscape" are explained by the architect as a means "to help alleviate the trauma of treatment. . . . The diagonal produces a sense of perspective that distances and sets the patient apart from his medical concerns or fears." Yet, as has been rightly observed, "the mural walls—as walls become stronger and enclosing because they have an object painted on them; yet, alternately, they become less strong as walls since they depict an extension out into the pictorial landscape beyond. . . . The mural becomes illusion or deep because of the space in the picture, so you have two worlds to deal with. The idea is that one can become involved in the spatial expansion and still experience the enclosure."88

The diversion of experience into opposing aspects becomes undoubtedly the most important factor. The dominance of linguistic elements leads to the greatest ambiguity in the use of language itself.
Some preliminary conclusions may be drawn now. Hejduk, Eisenman and Graves represent in their work three approaches to linguistic "alienation," to experimentation with functional languages which have been paradoxically removed from the field of language. But this is not all. Their reference — and only their reference — to the hide-and-seek game with language is also part of the heroic years of the Modern Movement. It has but one result: Hejduk's, Eisenman's and Graves' three ways of manipulating linguistic materials bespeak a very real phenomenon — namely, that "the war is over."

After all, was it not Barthes who decried polemically and insistently that, "there can be tranquil moments in the war of languages, and these moments are texts." The languages of the twenties and thirties, to which our architects allude, were, in one way or another, "battle cries." Now, as always, in the experimental fields of the new avant-gardes, these battle cries are transformed into "languages of pleasure." The war is over, but with a checkmate by the adversary. All that is left is to declaim with affectation irony, and with barely concealed nostalgia, the verses of a decomposed and frozen "Marseillaise." (Is not freezing the surest mode of preservation?)

Barthes writes: "Still far too much heroism in our languages; in the best I am thinking of Bataille's — an erethism of certain expressions and finally a kind of insidious heroism. The pleasure of the text (the bliss of the text) is on the contrary a sudden desummatization of the writer's backside, a suspension of the 'heart' (of courage)."

To insist on the pleasure of a text, is to bring back to reality one of the least remembered of Brecht's proposals — and in a roundabout way we return to one of Eisenman's postulates. But Barthes continues: "How can a text, which consists of language, be outside language? How to exteriorize the world's jargons without taking refuge in an ultimate jargon wherein the others would simply be reported, recried? As soon as I name, I am named: caught in the rivalry of names. How can the text 'get itself out' of the war of fictions, of sociocritics — by a gradual labor of extermination? First, the text liquiates all metalanguage, whereby it is text: no voice (Science, Cause, Institution) is behind what it is saying. Next, the text destroys utterly, to the point of contradiction, its own discursive category, its sociolinguistic reference (its genre): it is 'the comical that does not make us laugh,' the irony which does not subjugate, the jubilation without soul, without mystique (Sardoy), quotation without quotation marks." Precisely, a Marseillaise without a Bastille to overthrow. Yet it is just this aspect which allows one to "enjoy" Cardboard Architecture insofar as it is a theoretical experimentation. The pleasure which arises from reading the works of Hejduk, Eisenman and Graves is entirely intellectual. I enjoy the subtle mental games which subjugate the absolute nature of the forms (whether they be designed or built, at this point it does not matter). Clearly there is no "social" value in all of this. And, in fact, is pleasure not an entirely private affair? It is all too easy to conclude that this architecture is a "betrayal" of the ethical ideals of the Modern Movement. On the contrary, it records the mood of someone who feels betrayed and reveals fully the condition of those who still wish to make "architecture." (If there is a truly arbitrary act, it lies precisely in the choice to make "architecture").

Let us allow Barthes to continue: "The pleasure of the text does not prefer one ideology to another. However: this impertinence does not proceed from liberalism but from perversion: the text and its reading are split. What is overcome, split, is the moral unity that society demands of every human product. We read a text (of pleasure) the way a fly buzzes around a room with sudden, deceptively decisive turns, fervent and futile: ideology passes over the text and its reading like the blush over a face ... in the text of pleasure, the opposing forces are no longer repressed but in a state of becoming: nothing is really antagonistic, everything is plural. I pass lightly through the reactionary darkness."

Further comment would be superfluous. Only one last note to make: if it is true that pleasure is of an asocial nature, then, having chosen the field of art as an intellectual game, we cannot help but recall Schiller — that is, to recognize that the spirit is never more serious as when it is at play. In any case, take note: we are dealing with the spirit, not with social practices.
In relation to the three architects we have discussed, the personalities of Charles Gwathmey, Robert Siegel and Richard Meier appear decidedly out of place, except for certain works. Let us look at the Cogan House, the Cohn Residence, Pearl's Restaurant in New York, or the student residential complex of the State University College at Poughkeepsie, New York. In these works, Gwathmey and Siegel distill compositions from the purity of geometric solids, through a dialectic of routes and passages, of transparency, and of isolated volumes. In these examples, abstractions pervade socially usable spaces. The prohibitions which weigh so heavily on "free" social use in the works of Hejduk and Eisenman are lifted. The Purist rigors dissolve into formal articulations and pleasurable cadences. Hermeneutics is not eliminated from these works, but it is made accessible. The play of design is brought back into the realm of safe professional controls. What is lost in linguistic purity has been gained in architectural realism. This is not a value judgment but a statement of fact. Gwathmey and Siegel employ as a current language some of the results of linguistic experimentation so which they only marginally subscribe. This does not take away from the fact that in a large-scale project, such as the Perrinton Housing project (five hundred dwelling units commissioned by the U.D.C., Greater Rochester, New York) (fig. 36), the dialogue between the red bricks, which display a densified modularity, and the unfolding of open spaces, achieves a timeless quality without losing the desired model-like character.

But, as we have stated, these are works which "use" an experimental method, which test its capacity to compromise itself with the space of life. But this is not the case of the Ellis Beach Residence project (fig. 38) or the Stagner Residence project (fig. 39). Here Gwathmey and Siegel employ to maximum advantage the technique of volume deformation, of the interpenetration of forms, of "surprise"—techniques that are also used as heterogeneously a group of works as the Whig Hall at Princeton University (fig. 40), the Bridgehampton Residences, the Toban Residence (fig. 37), and the Gwathmey Residence and Studio. Whig Hall might very well be defined as a monte Carlo analogy. A. Page Brown's neoclassical temple of 1893,
standing isolated on the Princeton University campus, is opened on one side so as to allow a Puristic assemblage of white volumes to emerge (fig. 41). In the belly of academic purility there lives the dawning nucleus of the avant-garde: this is what the surprising assemblage of Whig Hall wishes to express metaphorically. Such a foreshortening of historical perspective is stated without any polemic intention: the Ionic temple and the Purist quotation are complementary to each other and seemingly parallel in time, and — as if time itself were suspended — reduced to an eternal present.

A suspended tonality — once again, but not by chance either — for the magic box of Whig Hall metaphorically evokes a section, an X-ray of the building's own "soul." The dream vision of the nineteenth-century temple, brought to light through the intervention of the architect/psychologist, reveals an unconscious pregnant with the future — were it not that the entire operation is conducted in the past tense.

The Geathney Residence and Studio of 1963 and the Tobin Residence of 1970 (figs. 42-45) are neither part of the same professional wisdom which informed the Perinton Housing project, nor do they share the surrealistic stupor of Whig Hall. The three blocks, located on the southern shore of Long Island, employ in plan the technique of sectioned geometric solids so dear to Hejduk. The regulating lines which guide the placement of the three volumes are fixed by the irregular contours of the paths and open spaces. There results a sort of imaginary explosion, of which the three buildings on the flat land of Long Island are but residual fragments. And, like fragments, they are irregular and random, while their disposition studiously avoids any conventional relationships among these three splintered bodies. This is no longer a "Cardboard Architecture," but rather a return to the material nature of architecture which led Frampton to speak of a possible inclusion of the Geathney House into the American wood-building tradition.31 But the same material density, the same taste for the fragment, the very same method of composing through an apparently disconnected geometry — which is nonetheless tied together by complex interrelationships — characterizes the Bridgehampton Residences of 1969 (figs. 46, 47).
We are thus at the opposite poles of either Whig Hall or Eisenman's conceptualism. Yet, even these works end up being signs astonished at their own presence in the world. The "commonplace," into which Hejduk locks his geometry, is only apparently "overplace": for, where Hejduk places an addition sign, Gwathmey/Siegel put in a multiplication sign; the results differ only superficially.

The work of Richard Meier departs even further from the linguistic absolutes of Hejduk, Eisenman and Graves than does the work of Gwathmey/Siegel. Should anyone wish to challenge the consistency of the Five, Meier's work would offer the best proof. It is not by chance that, in the 1972 edition of the book on the Five, Meier is represented only in the Smith House of 1969 (fig. 60) and by the Saltzman House of 1967 (fig. 49). These villas have a layered structure, in which the relationship between volumetric order and transparency, and the analysis of possible geometric articulations, suggest certain analogies to the syntactic purity of Eisenman and even to some of the ambiguous metaphors of Michael Graves. Without doubt, the two villas invoke a "charmed and magical" atmosphere in their absolute isolation from their context. This might even make them suspect of historicism. Nor is a sense of irony lacking: for example, in the Smith House, we notice the contrast between the weightlessness of the glass block and the mass of the chimney. There is more: the cut which exposes the internal structure of the Saltzman House, so reminiscent of Loos at the Tsara House, is there as if to challenge the ambiguous geometry of the prism with the great rounded corner built on the diagonal grid.

The Saltzman House is certainly within the realm of that same suspended tonality which we have recognized in Whig Hall and in the Bye House. The Old Westbury House of 1973 (fig. 56) is even more a part of it. The extent of its length permits us to recall the metaphysical distillations of Piranesi in the work of Figini and Pollini (fig. 52), the works of Dujker or of Howe & Lescaze in the 1960s. Yet in the Old Westbury House, the long ramp, which joins the refined residential volumes, is housed in a glazed gallery with a semi-circular roof — an evocation of the Victorian
The fact that a circulation element is emphasized in the Old Westbury House must give pause for reflection. In a recent presentation of his works, Richard Meier, while discussing design tools, gave principal importance to circulation systems in the interior as well as on the exterior of his buildings. Graves and Hejduk also emphasize the “circulation” component. Vertical or horizontal circulation systems played a precise role in Le Corbusier's small-scale architecture, namely, to reproduce within each single building the type of free relationship between street and buildings which he had postulated for interventions on the urban scale. Meier follows neither the Corbian symbolism nor Hejduk's abstractions. Circulation systems, as well as the clarity of organization, bearing structures, and access points, are for Meier simply materials of design. They must be correlated in complex ways once their roles have been selectively analyzed. It is the complex web of their relationships which makes the architecture so compelling. In Meier's work, typological invention is the basis for an effort to completely recapture the functional aspects of language.

Were architecture to be a dream of pure structure, Eisenman is the one who, more than any other in America, comes closest to achieving it. If, however, architecture is a “system of systems,” if its expressions belong to different but interwoven areas of language, then it is Meier who is able to grasp those relationships. Compare two works apparently based on the same theme: House III by Eisenman (fig. 54) and the Hoffman House of Meier (fig. 55). In the former, as we have seen, the two rotated solids present without commentary the result of the arbitrary act which has placed them thus. In the latter, what matters most is the joining between forms, their synthesis. Models for this type of approach, however distant, seem to be found in the Kallin-}


67. External stairway.
several designs by Luchhardt and Anker (fig. 55). In other words, Meier is proposing a method wherein the initial separation of components and the testing of a codified typology, by means of free variation, in no way obstruct their eventual synthesis. By means of this recovery of the “function of the sign”—wherein we define “function” in its broadest terms—Meier advances a tacit criticism of Eiseman’s conceptualistic reduction of sign and structure. Geometry is no longer crucially chained to its own harrowing silence, there is no search for “deep structures,” or any attempt to extract multiple meanings from the signs, as Graves attempts to do. Meier’s use of geometry also excludes any attempt to regain semantic values: the articulation of his signs is in but a testimony to the presence of objects which display their function in absolute clarity. 

“Meier’s architecture,” writes Joseph Rykwert, “is always understated, and yet always assertive through its insistently complex geometry, which he somehow always reduces to appearing absolutely inevitable. That is its strength: the assertion of an inevitable order, which exalts the functional patterns of the occupation. Meier is a maker of objects whose power is in the obsessive elegance of their cut, in their cool though exemplary and somehow didactic detachment from their surroundings.”

This may be true for works such as the house in Pound Ridge (fig. 56), where the themes of the Smith House and the Saltzman House overlap in the poetics of “dynamic equilibrium,” that leave nothing to their historical models. It is no longer proper to speak of “nostalgia” in the presence of a classic example of “survival” rather than “revival.” However, Rykwert’s judgment may still appear pertinent for the four designs developed by Meier for the American Division of the Olivetti Corporation (figs. 55, 61), or for that of the prototype of a local industrial buildings alongside a highway. These designs display, among other things, Meier’s unprejudiced sense of typological experimentation. (For example, the use of a serpentine plan for the Olivetti residences in Tarrytown, 1971 (figs. 57, 58), whereas the winding of the main body and the concentration of service cores and vertical access at nodal points on the curves, spell out criticism of Aalto’s Dormitories at M.I.T. in Cambridge.)

But we maintain that the meaning of Richard Meier’s work is not fully comprehensible without considering the relationship he has established between his research into forms and his large scale design. It may be possible to grasp some of this in his Health and Physical Education Facility for the State University College of Fredonia of 1968 (fig. 62) and in his Bronx State School in New York City of 1970-76 (now under construction) (fig. 63). As Meier himself points out, the enlargement of the scale at the Fredonia complex corresponds to the same organizing principles that are found in the Smith House and the Saltzman House. Different nuclei are linked to a spine which in turn gives them life and configuration. One may here criticize the laborious composition formed by I. M. Pei’s circular campus space and tangential juxtaposition of the building to it. But at the Bronx State School, a residential complex for 750 mentally retarded children, the deployment of units around the central space fully recaptures the typically urban qualities of the relationship between public and private spaces. In other words, Meier seems to go back over, though in a deeply critical manner, some of the stages already travelled by the classical “masters” of the Modern Movement: from the self-sufficiently perfect configuration of objects rich in metaphorical reference, to the institutional values of technology, and finally to their reconfiguration within the urban fabric.

In the Douglas House on Lake Michigan in 1973 (fig. 66), Meier continues an investigation, begun with the Saltzman House and the house at Pound Ridge, of a language of “oppositions,” of a denied dialectic between the total transparency of the front and the solid compartmented rear. One must highlight here the compositional “mechanism”: in section we find once again a “machine age” modelling vaguely resembling Stirling’s. But what matters more is that the building deliberately relates to its environment by means of an emphasis on external stairs (fig. 67). The two stairs and the elevated bridge, which lead directly from the hillside to the topmost terrace, form an independent circulation. The interior corridor and the halways connect to this system. In this manner, the Douglas House establishes a dialectic between the independence of the object itself and its surrounding space. We believe that we must read this as a
Let us look at the seven designs which Meier and his associates have prepared, together with Emery Roth & Sons, for Madison Associates and Tishman Realty and Construction Corporation (figs. 64, 65). It is a development in mid-Manhattan with six-hundred residential units and 300,000 sq. ft. of office and retail space. From a single and simple rectangular block set into the central green (rich with reference to Le Corbusier), we pass on to a richly varied articulation of masses, and then to a separate tall building connected to a stepped-back volume. This corresponds to a second development, characterized by a stepping outward. It is a difficult exploration, one which cannot be considered as a general model. And like the other, Meier talks his explorations at the edges of a utopia; he should the continuity of the circulation system be directly projected on to the urban scale, it would still appear as the "thread of Ariadne," giving direction to the labyrinth of forms. Yet that "direction" is neither unique nor final. It does not resolve, it does not attempt to erase the difficulties or the contrariness of the intervention itself, it does not attempt to create an "axis of order." It is possible to speak of a deep "critical realism" in Meier's large-scale designs. This is well shown in the exceptional renovation of Westbeth (fig. 70) — in the first of New York City's special zoning districts (FHA sponsored) — and by Twin Parks Northeast, designed for the U.D.C. (figs. 68, 69).

Kenneth Frampton rightly compares Meier's solution to that of Giovanni Pasanella for Twin Parks Southwest (fig. 71); the latter is a mannered revival of the Unite at Marseille, where the relationship between public and private space is undefined. The alternative advanced by Meier oscillates between accepting the existing urban grid or deforming it — a deformation which would be created as a function of the precise definition of the social use of spaces. "One may argue," writes Frampton, "that the overall parti of the Meier scheme stems from a curious compound of Le Corbusier (after Hénard), on the one hand, and Sitte's notions of urban space, on the other. The usual formal and social interaction that the Meier scheme invokes, in conjunction with the existing urban context, no doubt derives from this conscious attempt to confute two ultimately antithetical models drawn from nineteenth-century urban theory." The immobile à résident dies after all make an explicit appearance in one of Meier's preliminary designs for Twin Parks. As built, however, this form is cut apart, deforming itself, following or altering the existing street lines, as the case may be, and coming to a formal conclusion in the tall blocks at both ends. What we have called "realism" in Meier's work is fulfilled at Twin Parks. The ability of the prototype of Hénard and Le Corbusier to function as the universal remedy of urban ills has been challenged. There is not even a nostalgic longing for that particular prototype. Rather, it is quoted with detachment, it is criticized, and it is immersed in a contradictory reality — the Bronx slums. It is as if one wished to underline the limitations of the intervention, that its importance is as a social service which stands in the face of metropolitan conflicts. (And Twin Parks will heighten these conflicts rather than resolve them.) This explains why Meier chose to forego any linguistic exploration in this design. The concrete tautness of the wall surfaces follows from the self-imposed denial of any typological invention: there is no neo-Brutalism here, snug in its materiality, but rather a subtle cadence of rhythmical holes wherein any minimal variation accentuates the compactness of the wall itself, and heightens its despairing unity. The assurance of this work with existing buildings has therefore a deep meaning. And even in this work there is no populist approach; the refinement of clean cut edges on the walls and the geometric deformations of the main blocks exclude any and all sentimentalism. This linguistic reduction is based on another model, Mies's "less is more." And, to be precise, it is the less of the residential units on Berlin's Afrikanischesstrasse (1955) (fig. 72) rather than the Mies of America. We therefore have an architecture which presents itself on two levels: the one, replete with social utility, and the other reserved for those who are able to read the deep meaning in the refusal to charge built forms with impossible myths.

Thus, the analysis of the small scale works of 1966-1970 has as its result one of the best works in the field of contemporary American housing. The experimentation with the possibilities for the independent expressive function of language must (provisionally) conclude with a painful reflection on the limits of language itself and on its capacity for typological invention.

From Højunkt to Meier: the avant-garde, having been revisited, undergoes an autopsy. We have tried to point out in what manner the Five are far from being a homogeneous group. But at the same time, they have helped us to trace a section through a particular state of mind, one which twists through present-day architectural culture in America. And we might add that, unlike the mysticism of the Kahn school or the facile ironies of Venturi, what is most characteristic of this state of mind is a sort of backtracking from the original traditions of the avant-garde — traditions which must be pieced back together in order to form a continuum.

No one ought to be deceived by the optimistic declarations or by the finality of the positions taken by the Five (or the more theoretical among them). In 1972, Colin Rowe spoke of an "expansion of simulacra," and more recently others have wanted to see in their work a sort of "repeatable coercion." Their images and their themes tend to confirm only one reality: the strength and cruelty of the golden gable within which this intelligentsia is locked, and the limits of this cell where they are only able to leave graffiti on the underside of the walls, bearing, if anything, mute testimony to their lacunar presence.
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