



Transpositions: On the Intellectual Origins of Tschumi's Architectural Theory

Author(s): Louis Martin

Source: *Assemblage*, No. 11 (Apr., 1990), pp. 22-35

Published by: [The MIT Press](#)

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3171133>

Accessed: 22/06/2014 01:54

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at
<http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.



The MIT Press is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Assemblage*.

<http://www.jstor.org>

Louis Martin

Transpositions: On the Intellectual Origins of Tschumi's Architectural Theory

Louis Martin received his S.M.Arch.S. in the History, Theory, and Criticism of Architecture at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology and is currently working toward a Ph.D. in the History and Theory of Architecture at Princeton University.

With the writer of bliss (and his reader) begins the untenable text, the impossible text. This text is outside pleasure, outside criticism, *unless it is reached through another text of bliss*: you cannot speak 'on' such a text, you can only speak 'in' it, *in its fashion*, enter into a desperate plagiarism, hysterically affirm the void of bliss.

Roland Barthes, *Le Plaisir du texte*

The Revolutionary Potential of Architecture

Bernard Tschumi was working in Paris, for the firm Candilis, Josic, and Woods, on the realization of the new town of Le Mirail in Toulouse, when the May '68 student revolt occurred. At age 24, Tschumi was profoundly affected by these events. In 1970, in collaboration with Fernando Montès, Tschumi published in the French periodical *L'Architecture d'aujourd'hui* a project entitled "Do-It-Yourself-City."¹ The project was based on the statement that the success of urban life depends on the relationships established between peoples, ideas, and objects. To improve the existing situation, the architects proposed to insert into the built environment a series of electronic devices that would accelerate these interactions. Communication technology could provide a new and uncontrolled public space, new modes of interaction provoking new kinds of human relationships. The project was entirely programmatic; form was never an issue.

"Do-It-Yourself-City" marked a break in Tschumi's design activity; for the next seven years he concentrated on the production of theory. In the fall of 1970 the Architectural

1. Cover of Roland Barthes, *Le Plaisir du texte*, 1973

Roland Barthes

Poires

Le plaisir du texte

La mort du Père enlève beau-
coup. ~~Le plaisir du~~ ^{à la} ~~plaisir.~~ ^{si il n'y a pas}
Père, à quoi bon ~~raconter~~ ^{raconter} ~~des~~ ^{des} ~~histoires~~ ^{histoires} ?
Tout est réglé de la ~~main~~ ^{main} ~~de~~ ^{de} ~~Dieu~~ ^{de} ~~le~~ ^{le} ~~Père~~ ^{Père} ? Raconter, à l'instar des ~~poètes~~ ^{poètes} ~~cherche~~ ^{cherche} ~~son~~ ^{son} ~~général~~ ^{général} ~~à~~ ^à ~~dire~~ ^{dire} ~~des~~ ^{des} ~~de~~ ^{de} ~~metres~~ ^{metres} ~~avec~~ ^{avec} ~~la~~ ^{la} ~~loi~~ ^{loi} ~~, entre~~ ^{, entre} ~~dans~~ ^{dans} ~~la~~ ^{la} ~~dialectique~~ ^{dialectique} ~~de~~ ^{de} ~~l'alternance~~ ^{alternance} ~~et~~ ^{et} ~~de~~ ^{de} ~~la~~ ^{la} ~~haine~~ ^{haine} ~~, sur~~ ^{, sur} ~~courber~~ ^{courber} ~~à~~ ^à ~~la~~ ^{la} ~~peur~~ ^{peur} ~~, etc.~~ ^{, etc.} ? Aujourd'hui on balance d'un même
coup l'Œdipe et le récit : on n'aime plus, on
ne craint plus, on ne raconte plus (les "histoires" com-
munes, elles-mêmes sont à peine des récits, dans un
film "James Bond", l'histoire est à peu près in-
compréhensible, s'échappe aux lois structurales de la
 vraisemblance, congelée avec des ~~scènes~~ ^{scènes} ~~volontaires~~ ^{volontaires} ~~, tout~~ ^{, tout} ~~l'~~ ^{l'} ~~intérêt~~ ^{intérêt} ~~est~~ ^{est} ~~dans~~ ^{dans} ~~la~~ ^{la} ~~seule~~ ^{seule} ~~in~~ ⁱⁿ ~~compréhension~~ ^{compréhension} ~~des~~ ^{des} ~~gags~~ ^{gags} ~~, qui~~ ^{, qui} ~~sont~~ ^{sont} ~~des~~ ^{des} ~~flashes~~ ^{flashes} ~~poétiques~~ ^{poétiques} ~~et~~ ^{et} ~~non~~ ^{non} ~~des~~ ^{des} ~~articula-~~ ^{articula-} ~~tions~~ ^{tions} ~~narratives~~ ^{narratives}). Comme fiction, l'Œdipe ferait
au moins à quelque chose : à faire du bon
roman, à bien raconter (ce n'est peut-être pas
vraiment le général de l'homme).

Association Diploma School in London hired him to teach a seminar on urban politics. Inspired both by the political involvement of the French activist architects and by the contemporary practices of the Italian radical avant-garde (Superstudio and Archizoom), Tschumi wanted to develop a theory of revolutionary architecture. In the early seventies, in addition to regular book reviews, he wrote a series of articles on politics and urbanism, deriving his analytical methodology from contemporary French sociopolitical theories of urbanism of structuralist and Marxist tendency, particularly those of Henri Lefebvre and Guy Debord. In a first article, written with Martin Pawley, Tschumi explained the meaning of the events of May '68 for French architecture.² In two others, he criticized capitalist speculation for its effects on the urban environment.³ Looking at Los Angeles and London, he showed how both cities were adversely affected by a division of the urban landscape into "sanctuaries" of homogeneous populations segregated according to socioeconomic characteristics, race, or age. Tschumi valued the heterogeneity of the city: not only did it essentially define urbanity, it also provided necessary conditions for the emergence of spontaneous uprisings catalyzed by the action of small elite groups.

In 1975 Tschumi published his final article on urban politics under the title "The Environmental Trigger."⁴ He presented the results of his research in a coherent explanation of the three ways to use environmental knowledge as a means of resistance: rhetorical action, counterdesign, and subversive analysis. These had in common the intention to refuse "to come to any alliance, however temporary, with existing institutional forces." Fascinated by the revolutionary potential of the Situationist theory of actions, Tschumi was trying to keep alive the hopes of the '68 generation of architects. Nevertheless, the article revealed a disillusionment with the possibility of changing the socioeconomic structure of society. The text concluded with an unexpected reflection on architecture's autonomy, and "The Environmental Trigger" marked the end of Tschumi's polemics in favor of urban uprisings.

At the start of the academic year 1974–75, Tschumi, who entered his second year as unit master at the AA, explained that "rather than analyzing the variables of archi-

tectural activities," he wanted to "deliberately concentrate on the oldest constant of all, space."⁵ Confronted with the failings of architecture as a revolutionary force, Tschumi now intended, with a series of manifestos, to put architecture into crisis. To understand the nature of the shift in Tschumi's research requires a brief analysis of the change in his literary sources, in particular, the move to the theory of the text developed by the authors published in the journal *Tel Quel*.⁶ In the following section, the works of Roland Barthes and Jacques Derrida are taken as representative of the preoccupations of these authors — Philippe Sollers, Julia Kristeva, and Michel Foucault, among others.

Toward Poststructuralism

From Language to Text

When, in the early 1960s, Roland Barthes initiated the "structuralist activity" in various fields of production, he quickly realized that most fields, including architecture, were resistant to the binary reading of Saussurian linguistics.⁷ Although Barthes wrote little on architecture itself, he tackled the problem of the meaning of the city in a lecture given in Naples in 1967. Three years later, his text, "Sémiologie et urbanisme," was published in an issue of *L'Architecture d'aujourd'hui* dedicated to urban semiological studies.⁸ Barthes considered his study as that of an amateur, and he began his exposé with a quotation from Victor Hugo to demonstrate that someone had already intuited that the city was a kind of writing. For Barthes, the problem of semiology was that it could only talk about the language of the city as a metaphor; to achieve a true "scientific jump," urban semiology had to give to the metaphor of language a "real meaning" by emptying it of its metaphorical content. In the end, the real problem of urban semiology was that the urban signified was never definitive. As in Lacan's psychoanalysis, urban semiology was caught in an infinite chain of metaphors in which the signified is always a signifier in another group of signs, and vice versa. Barthes saw this chain of metaphors as a hidden dimension of the city — the erotic. This erotic dimension was not functional but semantic and hence social. According to Barthes, it could not be understood through socio-

logical inquiries and polls. The multiplicity of readings stemmed from the subjectivity of each reader. For him, historically, only writers had provided access to the city's eroticism.

By the early 1970s Barthes had considerably changed his opinion on semiology. Semiology now represented the institution to which were resistant not only the different systems of signs but also literature itself. In 1973 he wrote *Le Plaisir du texte*, in which he presented his theory of the text's erotic dimension. Barthes's theory of the text could in many ways be seen as a personal synthesis of the themes debated in the pages of *Tel Quel*. Establishing a metaphorical link between text and human body, he set forth the following: The text and its double — its reading — are split. This split of the object (text) is the split of the subject (writer/reader). The text being split, so is the pleasure: while the pleasure of the writer is essentially the perversity of writing without function, the pleasure of the critic is that of the voyeur observing clandestinely the pleasure of others. Barthes also demonstrated how resistance is an essential characteristic of modern literature. Looking at the economy of the work, he defined modernity as the constant attempt to defeat exchange: it resists the market (by excluding itself from mass communication), the sign (through exemption of meaning, through madness), and sexuality (through perversion, which shields bliss from the finality of reproduction).⁹ Therefore, he argued, the split perversity of the modern author is to exploit the uselessness of the text and to write, simultaneously, two texts, one participating in the profound hedonism of culture and the other in the destruction of that very culture.

Unfortunately, exchange recuperates everything; even the uselessness of the text becomes useful. Barthes saw clearly the paradoxical role of avant-garde art that works against established opinion while certain it will eventually be recuperated by it. He understood that the author who wants his work to resist recuperation faces two choices: to stop writing, an act that means the destruction of the text, or to exploit the pleasure of the text. He suggested that only a subtle subversion, a "third term," could escape the structural paradigm that linked contesting and contested forms. He offered as an example the work of Georges Bataille,

who did not "counter modesty with sexual freedom but . . . with laughter."¹⁰ In literature this third term was pleasure, for, Barthes argued, it lay beyond ideology — "The pleasure of the text does not prefer one ideology to another. *However*: this impertinence does not proceed from liberalism but from perversion." — and could not be reduced to a method or science.¹¹ Accordingly, the theory of the pleasure of the text could never be institutionalized because it could only produce theoreticians or practitioners, not critics, teachers, or students. In a move away from his initial embrace of the system of language, Barthes thus claimed in *Le Plaisir du texte* that the transcendence of structuralism's binary system could be subverted through textual practices.

Writing and Poststructuralism

In 1967 Jacques Derrida argued in *De la grammatologie* that the series of binary oppositions theorized by Saussure to explain the structure of language reproduced the dominant system of Western thought.¹² Philosophy had historically developed sets of binary opposites — man/nature, good/bad, truth/falsehood, etc. — that were condensed in the dialectical problem of subject and object or, in contemporary terms, of same and other. For Derrida, this system of thought mirrored the metaphysical dialectics of presence and absence. His reading attempted to expose the theological aspect of structuralist thought at its theoretical root.

Saussure had concentrated on the spoken dimension of language, in accordance with the Western philosophical tradition that held writing to be merely a supplement to, or a double of, speech — a violence done to writing which Derrida attacked. In his *Cours de linguistique générale*, Saussure had foreseen the possibility of a new science of the sign, of which linguistics would be only one branch. In the early sixties, Barthes had already reversed Saussure's proposition: holding that the development of semiological studies showed their dependence on linguistics, he had placed the science of language at the top of the theoretical pyramid. In *De la grammatologie* Derrida radicalized Barthes's proposition, giving priority to writing over speech in a very tight theoretical argument in which he tried to

prove the historical anteriority of writing. Derrida invented the concept of *différance* to explain the evolution of writing from the reading of a hypothetical initial trace to the structure of language.

In arguing that there exists an abyss between signifier and signified, Derrida wanted to deconstruct the logic of absolute presence. To deconstruct the whole tradition of Western philosophy meant to dislocate all binary oppositions, all dualisms and dialectics having for a unique theme the metaphysical presence. Initially, deconstruction could be defined as a reading and a production (writing) that attempted to reveal the absence of a transcendental signified.

For Derrida, once the concept of sign was dislocated and its logic destroyed, the sign reflected no definitive meaning. It was always doubling, redoubling, and dedoubling what it reflected. Writing became a game open to all manipulation. To deconstruct was to think writing as the game of language, but for Derrida this game, which was thinking the absence of the transcendental signified, was not only a game *in* the world, it was the game *of* the world. To play the game of language was to think the world. Therefore deconstructionist studies tried to demonstrate a difference between the internal reality of the “Sausurian psychic image” and external reality. The first imperative was to show the ambivalence of any reading, the plurality of meaning being considered, in the end, proof of the absence of an absolute metaphysical and pure signified. For Derrida, the meaning of the text was caught in a labyrinth of mirrors — a model similar to the Lacanian chain of metaphors with which Barthes was, at the same moment, characterizing architectural meaning.

A decade later, in the second half of the seventies, Barthes’s affinity with Derrida’s position appeared clearer. In the “Leçon inaugurale de la chaire de sémiologie littéraire” given at the Collège de France in 1977, Barthes reflected on his earlier activity, hence once again on language.¹³ He explained how, in revealing the coded nature of language, linguistic analyses had pointed out that language was fundamentally a legislation, the place of an oppressive power that *literature* alone could resist. In playing with words, in trying to express in its unidimen-

sionality the pluridimensionality of reality, literature combatted language from within. Barthes further explained how he conceived of semiology as a deconstruction of linguistics. Linguistics in dissociating language and speech was mystified. In concentrating on the structure of language, it neglected speech and thus the rhetoric of power. For Barthes, only the text could resist power, and, when applied to the text, semiology was necessarily transformed into a nondiscipline, a nonscientific text. Barthes thus viewed the semiologist as an artist playing with signs, conscious of, yet fascinated by, the lure of the sign. This fascination was another face of the pleasure of the text, the erotic deconstruction of language.

The Pleasure of Architecture

In 1974 Tschumi tried to translate into architectural terms the concepts of this theory of the text, working mainly with four of its salient points: the resistance of modernity through pleasure, the research of limits, the practice of intertextuality, and the crisis of the sign. He introduced the concept of pleasure in his work with a manifesto entitled “Fireworks” in which he stated that architecture should be built and burned just for pleasure.¹⁴ Then, in a series of articles published between 1975 and 1977, Tschumi fabricated, in an intertextual fashion, a theory of the “pleasure of architecture.” In the first of these articles, “Questions of Space: The Pyramid and the Labyrinth (or the Architectural Paradox),” he explained that the logic of his manifesto ensued from a new definition of architectural space.¹⁵ For him, architecture faced a paradox, an abyssal problem that was putting architecture into crisis.

The Paradox of Architecture

Tschumi’s paradox and its solution were a perfected version of the Barthesian notion of architectural eroticism. He conceived it in adapting for architecture the textual theory of the *Tel Quel* group, onto which he superposed the metaphor of “the pyramid and the labyrinth” discovered in Denis Hollier’s book on Georges Bataille, *La Prise de la Concorde*. Through Hollier, Tschumi came to understand the fascination of the authors of *Tel Quel* with Bataille;

moreover, Hollier's book turned out to be a treasure, establishing a solid link between text and architecture.¹⁶

Bataille was obsessed with architecture. For this reason, Hollier analyzed his work using an architectural metaphor borrowed from philosophy: the interplay between pyramid and labyrinth. More precisely, philosophy, caught in the labyrinth of experience, tries to erect a pyramid of reason (science) to overlook the labyrinth (nature) and understand it. With this metaphor, Hollier explained Bataille's offensive against the Hegelian "philosophical edifice." For Bataille, the labyrinth could never be overlooked because of the impossibility of building the pyramid, that is, reason and its invention, science, could never explain nature. The labyrinth, constituted by language, was not a simple prison, for one never knew whether one was inside or outside. Therefore, in Bataille's logic, writing was a game played with elusive reality.

Tschumi used Hollier's model to explain his architectural paradox. He argued that architecture consisted of two interdependent but mutually exclusive terms: "conceived space" and "perceived space." As the ultimate symbol of reason, the pyramid represented "conceived space," or the dematerialized mental space where matter is molded by ideas. The pyramid was the very tradition of architecture. But Tschumi held that built space affected the senses long before reason. The labyrinth represented "perceived space"; it was the prison of sensations, an elusive model of spatiality that contemporary architectural theories had forgotten. For Tschumi, following Bataille, the labyrinth's importance was precisely that it offered no point of transcendence and was thus radically opposed to "conceived space," the space of reason. The paradox was that architecture was both pyramid and labyrinth and, as Tschumi wrote, "architecture is always the expression of a lack, a shortcoming, a non-completion. It always misses something, either reality or concept." This paradox was due to "the impossibility of both questioning the nature of space and, at the same time, experiencing a spatial praxis." To clarify his thought, Tschumi invoked a paradigm central to structural linguistics, writing that as "the concept of dog does not bark," similarly, "the concept of space is not space."¹⁷

Tschumi's paradox placed architecture within a system of oppositions that only a third term could dissolve. He suggested two readings of his paradox, one political and the other disciplinary. The political reading referred openly to the Frankfurt School and the Situationists, but also tacitly to Barthes. Reviewing current architectural avant-garde tendencies, Tschumi could explain without difficulty how the structural paradigm that linked contesting and contested forces was also valid in architecture. His solution was to exploit radically architecture's nonnecessity: as a result, architecture had to be built and burned simply for pleasure. The disciplinary reading of the paradox had more tragic consequences because, for Tschumi, the sole alternative was silence: for the first time in history architecture faced self-annihilation. He proposed that the only way to reconcile "conceived" and "perceived" spaces was to discover architecture's eroticism, in other words, to reach the point where the subjective experience of space becomes its very concept. The disciplinary implications of the paradox were a rhetorical dramatization for the introduction of the third term of architecture: "experienced space." For Tschumi, situated at the limit of conceptual and performance art, "experienced space" was a concept similar to Bataille's notion of a deep interior experience.¹⁸

Tschumi's plan was clear. He read architecture through a dualist model and introduced a third term to subvert the duality. From the superposition of Hollier's reading of Bataille onto the theory of the text found in *Tel Quel*, Tschumi fabricated his own theory of architectural eroticism. In substituting architecture for text, he was also indirectly reintroducing an up-to-date version of the old organicist analogy with the human body in which the split nature of architecture reflected both the split of the writer/reader and that of the philosophical subject (mind/body). He thus established a chain of metaphors linking architecture, text, and human body. In the end, "Questions of Space" was a reorganization of Tschumi's own theory of architecture. In 1970 he had proposed a tripartite reading of the city as ideas, objects, and peoples. In 1975 he argued that architecture comprised three modes of space, "conceived," "perceived," and "experienced." Bridging sensory perception and reason, architecture represented, for Tschumi, the erotic object par excellence.

Other Layers

In his next two articles, both written in 1976, Tschumi tried to deepen his theory by adding two more layers to his superposition. The first was a dualist reading of the history of architecture that attempted to show how architecture was essentially a seductive representation of order. The second was a critique of modernist architecture that employed elements of Bataille's theory of eroticism described in Hollier's book. With "Le Jardin de Don Juan," Tschumi wanted to establish the historical relevance of his paradox.¹⁹ For him, it was an invariant factor throughout the history of architecture. The paradox, which reflected the split between mind and body, was also apparent in dualities of order/disorder, chaos/regularity, rationality/sensuality, and so on. Tschumi examined the history of one architectural manifestation of these dualities: the opposition between cities and gardens. Classical or romantic, Apollonian or Dionysian, gardens were the mirror either of nature or of the city. Tschumi then associated architecture with the figure of Don Juan and presented it as a vulnerable seductress forever hiding behind the masks of different styles. Architecture, a decor built on carefully calculated laws, was a seductive illusion of an absolute order. Affecting the senses and the mind, the pleasure of architecture was so absolute for Tschumi that it could replace the pleasure of the text as a cultural model.

With "Architecture and Transgression," Tschumi explored the consequences of Bataille's theory of eroticism for his definition of architecture as an erotic phenomenon.²⁰ Yet Tschumi's operation was in itself a perversion of Bataille's position. Although Bataille considered literature and eroticism as indissociable, he never associated eroticism with architecture. Architecture was, for him, the symbol of reason and a metaphor for philosophy. Hollier explained in *La Prise de la Concorde* how Bataille was fundamentally acting against architecture and its central paradigm, the project, because he wanted to express its opposite, the other side of reason. His antiprojectual activity could be interpreted as the constant attempt to express the forces of destabilization. For Bataille, this was necessary in order to understand where positive and negative thoughts intersected. He had intuited that they met where social taboos

emerge. To transgress taboos was to have access to this point. Bataille considered such transgression to be essentially erotic because, for him, eroticism was the point where life meets death. For Tschumi, architecture also possessed taboos whose transgression was erotic. In fact, Bataille's eroticism did have an architectural equivalent in the ruin, which he presented as both the most erotic of objects and the symbol of architecture's resistance to society. Obviously, however, Tschumi was not attempting a rigorous presentation of Bataille's position. What mattered to him was that the metaphorical relation established by Bataille between architecture and the philosophical text provided him with the elements to criticize rationality in architecture. He could, for example, denounce modernist architecture for its unconscious attempt to hide death. Tschumi's critical work also had specific objectives within the internal debate of architecture. One effect of the assimilation of structuralist thought in architecture was the emergence, in the mid-1970s, of the neorationalists, who were establishing their work on a positive evaluation of architecture's rational tradition. The exacerbation of rationality by an excess of rationality became one of Tschumi's favorite slogans.

Antisynthesis

In 1977 Tschumi summarized his research on architectural eroticism with "The Pleasure of Architecture" — a title that unequivocally referred to Barthes's *Le Plaisir du texte*.²¹ Like several French intellectuals, Tschumi was seduced by the "Barthesian" definition of literary modernity as resistant to institutionalization. Seemingly, he perceived the consequences of Barthes's discourse on the textual and architectural resistance to semiology. He noticed, above all, that this resistance was erotic: in the text, eroticism was linked to the discovery of pleasure and the deconstruction of language; in architecture, it was linked to architecture's semantic dimension, caught in an infinite chain of metaphors.

Presented in the form of ten fragments, "The Pleasure of Architecture" was openly an antisynthesis in which more layers were added to the theory. Tschumi introduced the notion of pleasure by paraphrasing Barthes's argument on

the suspicious attitude of both the political Left and Right toward the hedonism of pleasure. As in the case of Bataille, however, Tschumi subverted Barthes's theory when he wrote that pleasure lay in "both the dialectics of the oppositions and in their disintegration." In reaching the "erotic" border between structuralism and poststructuralism, his theory was ambivalent. Moreover, Tschumi boldly associated Laugier's theory of the city with deconstructionist thought because it proposed a blend of regularity and fantasy. He also presented Kent and Brown, Lequeu and Piranesi as early deconstructionists. In addition, Tschumi used the very notion of the fragment, which he claimed to have found in Freud, to compare architecture with language. In "Sémiologie et urbanisme" Barthes had already indicated how in his theory of the language of dreams Freud had emptied the metaphor of language of its metaphorical content. Tschumi defended the analogy between Freud's dreams — fragments of the unconscious — and architecture as a way to explain how architecture, too, is an assemblage of fragments. His reference to Freud served to introduce a discussion on the split nature of architectural fragments (real/virtual). This, in turn, led him to a reading of architecture as an intertextual practice in which fragments are quotations without quotation marks.

Pleasure and eroticism were salient concepts in Barthes's theory of the text. The superposition of this new layer onto Tschumi's earlier theory distorted the original propositions of his sources. The "pleasure of architecture" was, in essence, an accumulation of definitions establishing a network of associations; these were never built on logical correspondences, but rather were stimulated by metaphorical relationships. The logic of Tschumi's operation came from the effects it sought to produce in the realm of architecture.

Transpositions

Intertextuality

After the publication of "Architecture and Transgression," a reader complained that Tschumi had failed to cite Thomas Kuhn's book *The Structure of Scientific Revolu-*

tions, although he had, without any doubt, almost integrally copied a passage from it.²² A comparison of the paragraphs revealed that Tschumi had simply replaced the word "science" of the original text with the word "architecture" in his own. He had then slightly transformed Kuhn's prose to make it fit into his article. Through this operation, Tschumi's text acquired an immediate depth. Without the quotation marks, the idea developed by Kuhn in the field of science was integrated into architecture and could be seen as an original theoretical concept. Once the appropriation was discovered, Tschumi's text remained autonomous, although it could also be read as an invocation of Kuhn's authority.²³

A verification of his sources reveals that Tschumi made extensive use of this procedure in the construction of his texts. That he did so consciously may be seen in another example, taken this time from "Questions of Space." Here Tschumi introduced his solution to the "paradox of architecture" as a proposition perhaps unbearable for scientists, philosophers, and artists alike. This description, however, employed the exact words that Philippe Sollers had used to characterize the work of Bataille.²⁴ With full awareness, Tschumi was trying to transpose into the realm of architecture the effects sought by Bataille in literature.

Although Tschumi publicly apologized for his "oversight" after he was discovered, these articles may be read as the site of a systematic operation inspired by another prominent element of *Tel Quel*'s theory of the text: the concept of intertextuality. In his article for the *Encyclopedia Universalis*, Barthes, responding to the question What is a text? summarized the theory.²⁵ For him, the notion of "text" emerged after the critique of the sign, when the sign entered into crisis. He attributed to Julia Kristeva the epistemological definition of the text, which incorporated several theoretical concepts including that of the intertext. Barthes explained that all texts are made of fragments of other texts and are thus necessarily intertextual. The production of the text is a permutative operation of the "deconstruction-reconstruction" of former texts. But the intertext is that which, in the text, is given, without quotation marks, as anonymous, unconscious, or automatic formulas. Barthes argued that the intertext gives to the text a

productivity that is not mere reproduction, because the intertext cannot be conceived as a voluntary imitation or a visible filiation.

After his reading of Barthes, Genette, and Kristeva, Tschumi conceived his texts as collages, palimpsests, composed through the intentional juxtaposition and superposition of fragments of other texts that were often reduced to mere objets trouvés whose origins and the context of their emergence were blurred. Together with Tschumi's technique of substituting one word with another — the title of "Architecture and its Double" directly referenced Antonin Artaud's *Theatre and its Double* — this operation was an extreme and provocative use of the concept of intertextuality.

Tschumi and Barthes

In transposing to his field the elements of Barthes's textual theory Tschumi produced another definition of architecture. As should be clear, this definition placed architecture within a chain of metaphors. Yet apparently Tschumi was not attempting to empty metaphors of their metaphorical content. His operation was less a "scientific jump" than a manifesto to expand and explore the metaphorical, thus nonscientific, nature of architectural theory. He exploited Barthes's definition of architectural eroticism in building a "Lacanian" chain of metaphors: Science, text, theater, human being, music, cinema, architecture were connected by a network of theoretical links that negated causal relationships: one system merely triggered acts in another. This nonscientific vision of the architectural task could, nevertheless, accommodate another definition of surrealist origin. In effect, Tschumi criticized postmodernism for reducing architecture to a mere knowledge of forms, while, as an art, it was a form of knowledge.²⁶ And, in emphasizing artistic exploration in architecture, Tschumi strategically avoided the difficulty of evaluating the relevance of this metaphorical "knowledge."

The assimilation of Barthes's theory considerably clarified Tschumi's work. First, in superposing the Barthesian pleasure of the text onto Bataille's theory of eroticism, Tschumi justified his own "Bataillean" correspondence between architecture and eroticism, a correspondence that

had been indicated in other terms by Barthes in "Sémiologie et urbanisme." Moreover, in substituting "architecture" for "text" in Barthes's theory of textual pleasure, he could define architecture as a medium irreducible to an ideology because able to represent all ideologies. Inspired by Artaud and Bataille, Tschumi's discourse on sex, crime, and violence aimed to extirpate from the definition of architecture all the moral overtones traditionally associated with it.²⁷ Architecture's new direction was to develop an analogue to the contemporary production of other fields. Tschumi's work can also be interpreted as a research program based on the definition of modernity as "the constant attempt to defeat exchange." He first stated that architecture had to negate what society expects from it: thus ruins became the most architectural of objects. Next he began to build temporary constructions that he named the Twentieth-century Follies, a kind of "instant ruin" without function. The Follies shared another explicit characteristic of Barthesian modernity: they resisted the sign through their lack of meaning and their direct reference to madness. Finally, Tschumi's entire discourse on eroticism mirrored a conscious resistance to ideological reproduction — the architectural analogue of sexuality.

Tschumi and Sollers

By the mid-1970s, the influence of Philippe Sollers on Tschumi's work was as direct as that of Barthes. His book *L'Écriture et l'expérience des limites* provided a program with systematic goals and methods that Tschumi used to criticize architecture.²⁸ Sollers's goal was to conceive a "reading machine" redefining literature not as a work of art produced by an author but as the product of a writer attacking language itself. Sollers opposed to the traditional history of literature, which praises "good writing," a history of writing whose logic was that of a relational network similar to spatial geometry.²⁹ In *L'Écriture*, he collected his earlier articles on the work of Dante, Sade, Lautréamont, Mallarmé, Artaud, and Bataille — writers that he thought had explored the limits of literature. For Sollers, their work showed the radical nonexpressivity of textual writing. These names appeared in Tschumi's work; but, more important, Sollers's concept of the experience of limits became a central aspect of his discourse.

After the publication of "The Pleasure of Architecture," Tschumi reoriented his research to concentrate again on the definition of architectural space. In the early 1980s, he introduced new themes and references through the definition of spaces of desire, of performance, of exhibitions, of manifestos, of lust, of sensations, and of borders.³⁰ For Tschumi, in exploring zones at the limits of architecture, the surrealists and futurists had initiated a work in need of pursuit. With the three-part article "Architecture and Limits," Tschumi transposed several of Sollers's themes including the reevaluation of history and the definition of architecture as a nondiscipline.³¹ One concept — the invention of new modes of writing — was seemingly the origin of *The Manhattan Transcripts* of 1977–81, a "reading machine" of architecture by which Tschumi reorganized, once more, his tripartite division of architecture.³² He replaced his earlier triad of conceived, perceived, and experienced spaces with a new one of space, movement, and event.

Tschumi and Derrida

The current attention toward deconstruction in architecture is largely the result of Tschumi's theoretical activity.³³ He was perhaps the first architect to have talked about deconstruction. Of greater significance, he has convinced Derrida himself of the relevance of a deconstructive practice in architecture. Derrida's commentary on Tschumi's project at La Villette effectively validated the architect's theory.³⁴ Although the subject is vast, only two aspects of Derridean thought in Tschumi's theory are underlined here.

Of first interest is how Tschumi used Derrida's theory to promote architecture to the status of cultural model of the 1980s. Tschumi had quickly concluded that the pleasure of architecture was superior to that of the text. In an article of 1980, he further claimed that all that Joyce did in literature with *Finnegans Wake* Bernini had already accomplished in architecture three hundred years earlier.³⁵ Just as Derrida had replaced speech with writing, in arguing that architecture was a form of writing historically anterior to textual writing, Tschumi proposed to replace writing with architecture.

A second Derridean strategy appears in Tschumi's work on the concept of *folie* (madness). As shown above, Derrida dislocated the concept of sign in demonstrating that the sign had no definitive, transcendental meaning. Tschumi attempted to illustrate this train of thought with his two series of *folies* — the Twentieth-century Follies and the *folies* of La Villette. His initial reference was Foucault's monumental work *Madness and Civilization*, a study of the genealogy of the concept of madness.³⁶ Foucault's work revealed that, historically, the word *madness* changed meaning on several occasions. Derrida explained thoroughly the intent of Tschumi's endeavor. To name *folie* a piece of architecture that openly had no fixed meaning was basically to deconstruct the architectural sign. This act was, for Derrida, to decenter architecture and thus to free it from its metaphysical meaning.

The concept of deconstruction in Tschumi's discourse, like that of pleasure, has, of course, taken many different forms, and a complete comparative analysis of Derrida's texts with those of Tschumi would probably show a certain divergence of opinion. Some of these forms, such as the association of Laugier with deconstruction, are not directly transposed from literature. As another example, in *The Manhattan Transcripts* Tschumi opposed deconstruction to representation.³⁷ In 1985 Derrida, in his commentary on La Villette, argued that Tschumi's deconstruction of architecture was not nihilistic, because it was followed by reconstruction — a statement that tacitly relates Tschumi's practice to Barthes's definition of the intertext as a "deconstruction-reconstruction."

Conclusion

In his analysis of La Villette, Derrida provided a list of words composed with the prefix *trans*; he could have added *trans-position*. Tschumi often insisted, in both his manifestos and texts, that architecture was not an autonomous discipline. Yet the transposition of concepts from one field to another was a radical act only for those who still believed in the strict autonomy of architecture. In effect, "transpositional" strategies marked the postwar structuralist theories of architecture and in the sixties became typical of the discipline. Recent studies also reveal that Le Corbusier

derived the basis of his purist theory from works in aesthetics, philosophy, and politics.³⁸ Likewise, as Werner Szambien has shown, already at the end of the eighteenth century, J.-N.-L. Durand constructed his architectural theory by paraphrasing Rousseau.³⁹ Thus architectural theory, in France at least, has a long tradition of “importation” from other fields. Tschumi’s manifestos were not in themselves radically disturbing.

Tschumi’s transpositional technique was nonetheless, strategic and more complex than this would indicate. Tschumi transposed concepts not only from one field to another, but, in establishing himself in England and America, very often from one culture to another. In a process of double defamiliarization, Tschumi rooted these concepts out of their original context, at the same time voiding them of their inherent problems. Promoting an openly antirational position, Tschumi’s transpositions were clearly not epistemologically rigorous. The goal being to create specific effects in architecture, his actions were justified by a contextual rather than scientific logic. An overview of the most obvious of these effects may yield the meaning of his transpositions.

The critical activity of Bernard Tschumi has been recognized, in the eighties, by both the political and academic institutions. In 1983 he won the international competition sponsored by the French socialist government for the Parc de la Villette in Paris. Later, in spring 1988, he was named Dean of the School of Architecture of Columbia University. In accepting this position, Tschumi was willing, at least temporarily, to come to an alliance with the institution, or perhaps he decided to resist it from within. Whatever the case, his work is now associated with the very institution that he denigrated in his early revolutionary period. His situation illustrates well the structural paradigm linking contesting and contested forces that Barthes had enunciated in *Le Plaisir du texte*.

As noted above, Tschumi gave a new direction to his research after the disillusionment of “The Environmental Trigger.” His statement then on the impossibility for architecture to change the socioeconomic conditions of society was perhaps an important side effect of his discovery of the Barthesian paradigm. But Tschumi’s critical work of the

mid-1970s was also a specific reaction to influential contemporary theoretical positions within architecture, among them the Marxist analysis of Manfredo Tafuri. A few months before Tschumi published his first manifesto on pleasure, Tafuri, in *Architecture and Utopia*, had analyzed the crisis of the ideological function of architecture and had pronounced its death. For him, architecture was in itself a bourgeois ideology, which had been replaced, in our late capitalist society, by more advanced ideological apparatuses. Tafuri’s rigorous work of demystifying architectural history led him to discard utopia as an “impotent and ineffectual” myth and an anachronistic hope for design.⁴⁰ Tschumi’s definition of architecture as an artistic medium was a direct critique of the Tafurian thesis. Although sympathetic with Tafuri’s political position, Tschumi refused to accept the somber conclusion of his theory. The theory of the pleasure of architecture, in itself a great propaganda in favor of architecture, was Tschumi’s way to counter Tafuri’s dead end: the seduction of architecture could dissolve traditional ideological compartments. Defined as nonideological, architecture was therefore in itself “transpositional,” capable of expressing all ideologies.

Tschumi’s theory of pleasure also reacted against neorationalism and Jencksian postmodernism, both movements established on the structuralist analogy with language. As we have already seen, Tschumi’s reading of Hollier’s thesis on Bataille provided new concepts by which to criticize both the architectural tradition and the contemporary work of the neorationalists, which gained an increasingly dominant position in the mid-seventies. Similarly, Tschumi used Sollers’s proposal to transgress disciplinary limits to criticize Anglo-Saxon postmodernism. In exchanging the structuralist analogy with language for the poststructuralist analogy with the text, Tschumi did not, however, radically change the rapport established between architecture and literature since the early sixties: more precisely, he updated it by introducing to architecture the crisis of the sign.

Tschumi’s theoretical work of the 1970s was thus both contextual and deterministic: contextual, because it criticized the events of architectural actuality; deterministic, because his definition of architecture as an artistic medium

implied that it should reflect on the themes of this actuality. So Tschumi incorporated into his theory strictly contemporary concepts, the most fruitful of which came from literature. After he abandoned the Situationist theories, the work of the *Tel Quel* circle became his essential reference and his key to enter the world of criticism. Following mainly Sollers (limits), Hollier (Bataille), Barthes (pleasure), Kristeva (intertext), Genette (palimpsest), and Derrida (deconstruction), Tschumi introduced into his work the major themes developed by the most visible French literary critics of the 1960s and 1970s.

Most of Tschumi's work was shown or published in art galleries and periodicals. Through the transposition of architecture into the realm of art, which was quite popular in the second half of the seventies, he wanted both to reintroduce architecture into the system of contemporary arts and to stimulate a metadiscourse that could decode his work. Tschumi complained that the traditional architectural critique still relied on the old category of style.⁴¹ The concepts and themes with which he worked — the crisis of the sign, the dissolution of disciplines, the death of the author (and birth of the reader) — were all elements integral to the literary discourse of the *nouvelle critique*. Through the translated work of Barthes and publications such as *Semiotext(e)*, the *nouvelle critique* permeated American art criticism in the mid-seventies. Tschumi meant his contaminated discourse on architecture to be recognized here.⁴² His strategic alliance with art criticism became public when he brought an art critic to the design team of his project for La Villette. Conscious of the validating role of the critic, Tschumi clearly understood the mechanisms building cultural history.

In the 1980s Tschumi was acknowledged by the authors who had inspired his work. Today he forms with them a cultural front. Any serious analysis of his position must, of course, take into account the work accomplished by the literary and cultural critics gravitating around *Tel Quel* since 1960. Such criticism could probably demonstrate the gap that exists between Tschumi's work and his sources. But this gap, seemingly a strategic displacement, could be either accepted as a necessary distortion of adaptation or dismissed for its cynicism. Tschumi, however, continues to

try to produce new effects with the same literary sources. In one of his latest articles, "Architecture: Stratégie et substitution," he laid out the elements for the discussion of a posthumanist architecture.⁴³ For him, the posthumanist heterogeneity of La Villette suggests new social and historical circumstances. It also marks the end of utopias, the sociocultural and technological ones as well as that of meaning — the same three "utopias" that produced the profound disillusionment of the '68 generation. And, in fact, contemporary philosophical antihumanism, originating in the 1960s, is typical of the French '68 thought.⁴⁴ With this text, Tschumi injected into his discourse on La Villette an explicit attack on the notion of author and humanism, an attack that echoes quite loudly the projects that Sollers and Derrida initiated with Barthes in the sixties. But, obviously, for specialists of architecture, Tschumi's denunciation of humanism has other clear meanings — such as the rejection of the old academic principles of classical architecture resurrected by postmodernism and also the Dutch architectural humanism developed by Aldo van Eyck and his followers. Moreover, as no definition of humanism could satisfy a community of specialists, one may see that here, as in his earlier work, Tschumi's transpositional operation attempts to stimulate a series of interpretations whose objective is not to develop a true and definitive understanding of his work, but rather to demonstrate its ambivalence. In other words, through interdisciplinary transpositions, Tschumi consciously inserts into the work the conditions of its resistance to interpretation. This active conscience, which is perhaps that of an author, considers architecture as a game in the world, a game thinking the world. Although this again echoes Derrida, Tschumi's work adopts a characteristic Barthesian strategy. Barthes's ability to erect bridges between literary criticism and other fields is emulated by Tschumi precisely in order to expand intellectuals' attention toward architecture.

To a certain extent, Tschumi remains faithful to his early research. Heterogeneity and resistance are still dominant themes in his work, although their early activist political edge has today given way to fragments of French antihumanist philosophy. In proclaiming the end of utopias, Tschumi seemed to adopt Tafuri's project of demystification. Like so many other aspects of his work, however, this

is only a façade; for Tschumi's ascension in the academic and professional worlds of architecture may be attributed to his ability to play on the most persistent of contemporary myths. Perceived as a European intellectual by Americans and as an American architect by the French, Tschumi has profited from both the prestige of French theory in America and the legend of American pragmatism in France. Judging Tschumi by his actions rather than his rhetorics, one discovers that the eroticism of the borders is not just a playful game.

Notes

This article is the partial result of a larger research on the process of the formation of architectural theory. It examines the references, construction, and goals of some texts written by Bernard Tschumi during the 1970s. It illustrates the rapport he established between architecture and literature, more specifically, placing the origin of his architectural theory within his reading of the theory of the text developed by intellectuals gravitating around the journal *Tel Quel*. A more exhaustive analysis would also discuss Tschumi's reading of the Frankfurt School's critical theory and Guy Debord's critique of the society of the spectacle. I would like to thank Francesco Passanti and Stanford Anderson for their constant support during the course of this study as well as Réjean Legault and Jean Papineau for their illuminating insights.

1. Fernando Montès and Bernard Tschumi, "Do-It-Yourself-City," *L'Architecture d'aujourd'hui* 148 (February–March 1970): 98–105.
2. Martin Pawley and Bernard Tschumi, "The Beaux-Arts since 1968," *Architectural Design* 41 (September 1971): 536–66.
3. Bernard Tschumi, "Sanctuaries," *Architectural Design* 43 (September

1973): 575–90, and idem, "La Stratégie de l'autruche," *L'Architecture d'aujourd'hui* 176 (November–December 1974): 71–72.

4. Bernard Tschumi, "The Environmental Trigger," in James Gowan, *A Continuing Experiment: Learning and Teaching at the Architectural Association* (London: Architectural Press, 1975), 89–99.

5. See "Diploma School Unit 2," in *Architectural Association Projects Review, 1974–1975* (London: Architectural Association, Diploma School, 1975).

6. Founded by Sollers in 1960, *Tel Quel* attempted to establish new methods of literary criticism. At the center of the debate on the *nouvelle critique*, it stimulated the polemics surrounding "the crisis of the sign" and "the death of the author." In accordance with their critique of the artificiality of disciplinary boundaries, the literary practice of the contributors to *Tel Quel* fell outside of traditional fields: Foucault could be seen as both historian and philosopher, Derrida as both philosopher and poet, Sollers as both novelist and theoretician, and Barthes as both specialist and amateur. In 1968 the members of the group published *Théorie d'en-semble*, in which they stated their

intent to establish their individual practices on a common theoretical reflection based on their reading of the most important nineteenth-century authors: Marx, Nietzsche, and Freud.

7. Along with Roman Jakobson and Claude Lévi-Strauss, Barthes had a major influence on the application of structuralist thought to architecture; in effect, the popularity of his theory determined that the structuralist architectural researches of the 1960s and 1970s would be derived dominantly from Saussure's linguistics — a model articulated on a series of dualities (signifier/signified, paradigm/syntagm, synchrony/diachrony). Fundamentally, structuralism's effect on architecture could be stated as a change of analogy: "architecture as an organism," the central analogy of modernist (and classical) theories, was gradually replaced by "architecture as a language." (Of course, the analogy with language was not in itself a new paradigm in architecture; see Jacques Guillerme, "The Idea of Architectural Language: A Critical Inquiry," *Oppositions* 10 [Fall 1977]: 21–26.) On the relationship between architecture and structuralism, see Alan Colquhoun, "Postmodernism and Structuralism: A Retrospective Glance," *Assemblage* 5 (February 1988): 7–15.

8. Roland Barthes, "Sémiologie et urbanisme," *L'Architecture d'aujourd'hui* 153 (December 1970): 11–13.

9. Roland Barthes, *Le Plaisir du texte* (Paris: Editions du Seuil, 1973), 40; trans. Richard Miller as *The Pleasure of the Text* (New York: Hill & Wang, 1975).

10. Ibid., 87. Barthes was not the only one interested in Bataille. The whole circle of Parisian avant-garde intellectuals was debating the valid-

ity of Bataille's position. In the summer of 1971 Philippe Sollers brought together numerous writers, including Barthes, Denis Hollier, and Julia Kristeva, for a symposium on Bataille. See Philippe Sollers, ed., *Bataille* (Paris: 10/18, Union générale d'éditions, 1973). On Tschumi's use of Hollier's reading of Bataille, see below.

11. Although I have given it here, I am not satisfied with Miller's translation. Barthes's sentence is more ambiguous: "Le plaisir du texte ne sait pas acception d'idéologie" (*Le Plaisir du texte*, 52); see also ibid., 95–96.

12. Jacques Derrida, *De la grammatologie* (Paris: Editions de Minuit, 1967); trans. Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak as *Of Grammatology* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1976).

13. Roland Barthes, *Leçon* (Paris: Editions du Seuil, 1977).

14. In spring 1975 Tschumi organized an exhibition in London, inviting thirty artists and architects to make a statement on space. In the fall the exhibition moved to the Institute for Architecture and Urban Studies in New York. See R. Goldberg and B. Tschumi, *A Space: A Thousand Words*, exhibition catalogue (London: Royal College of Art, 1975); see also Bernard Tschumi, *Architectural Manifestoes* (London: Architectural Association, 1979).

15. Bernard Tschumi, "Questions of Space: The Pyramid and the Labyrinth (or the Architectural Paradox)," *Studio International* (September–October 1975): 136–42.

16. Denis Hollier, *La Prise de la Concorde* (Paris: Gallimard, 1974); trans. Betsy Wing as *Against Architecture: The Writings of Georges Bataille* (Cambridge, Mass.: MIT

Press, 1990). Much of Tschumi's argument was drawn from Hollier's book, which was, in part, about architectural theory. The metaphor of pyramid and labyrinth led Hollier to reflect extensively on Hegel's conception of architecture as well as to refer to the writings of many architect-theoreticians (Vitruvius, Alberti, Boullée, Quatremère, etc.). His research showed that architecture has always been the fortress of reason for philosophical thought. Hollier demonstrated how the analogy that links philosophy to architecture is essentially theological: God as the Great Architect of the world. He also found in the writings of the architects, the notion of architecture as a *cosa mentale* — the forms conceived establishing the domination of idea over matter.

17. Tschumi, "Questions of Space," 137, 142.

18. Tschumi's whole argument is formally very similar to Barthes's paradox of the avant-garde — the structural paradigm linking contested and contesting forms. The solution for Tschumi, as for Barthes, lay either in silence or in a third term. While for Barthes this third term was pleasure, for Tschumi it was a conflation of two themes related to Bataille: the notion of deep interior space and of eroticism that Tschumi assimilated with pleasure.

19. Bernard Tschumi, "Le Jardin de Don Juan ou la ville masquée," *L'Architecture d'aujourd'hui* 187 (October–November 1976): 82–83.

20. Bernard Tschumi, "Architecture and Transgression," *Oppositions* 7 (Winter 1976): 55–63.

21. Bernard Tschumi, "The Pleasure of Architecture," *Architectural Design* 47 (March 1977): 214–18.

22. See "Letters," *Oppositions* 9 (Summer 1977): 117.

23. The correspondence established by Tschumi between science and architecture could also be seen as a pure equation of the two terms, that is, architecture *is* science. This, at least, is the reading of Christian Girard, who dismisses Tschumi's theory on the basis of his epistemological presentation. In fact, Tschumi was not arguing for the scientificity of architecture, rather to the contrary. See Christian Girard, *Architecture et concepts nomades* (Brussels: Mardaga, 1986).

24. Sollers, *Bataille*, 2.

25. Roland Barthes, "Texte (Théorie du)," in the *Encyclopedia Universalis* (1979), 15:1013–16.

26. See Bernard Tschumi, "Architecture and Limits I," *Artforum* 19, no. 4 (December 1980): 36.

27. See Bernard Tschumi, "The Violence of Architecture," *Artforum* 20, no. 1 (September 1981): 44–47.

28. Philippe Sollers, *L'Écriture et l'expérience des limites* (Paris: Editions du Seuil, 1968); trans. Philip Barnard with David Hayman as *Writing and the Experience of Limits* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1983).

29. Foucault explained the subversive action sought by Sollers in literature as an effect of his interest in surrealism. See Foucault et al., *Théorie d'ensemble* (Paris: Editions du Seuil, 1968), 11–17.

30. See Bernard Tschumi, "Architecture and its Double," *Architectural Design* 50, no. 11–12 (1980): 22, and idem, "Episodes of Geometry and Lust," *Architectural Design* 51, no. 1–2 (1981): 26–28.

31. Tschumi, "Architecture and Limits I"; idem, "Architecture and Limits II," *Artforum* 19, no. 7

(March 1981): 45; and idem, "Architecture and Limits III," *Artforum* 20, no. 1 (September 1981): 40.

32. Bernard Tschumi, *The Manhattan Transcripts: Theoretical Projects* (New York: Academy Editions/St. Martin's Press, 1981); also see idem, "Illustrated Index," *AA Files* 4 (July 1983): 65–74.

33. Deconstruction is always associated with the literary practice of Derrida, although it can no longer be reduced to his practice. Today, for some, the definition of deconstruction has become hazardous (see, for example, Didier Cahen, "Introduction à l'entretien avec Jacques Derrida," *Diagraphe* 42 [December 1987]: 11–13); however, it seems relevant to bear in mind Derrida's critique of the Saussurian sign in order to understand Tschumi's ambition for architecture.

34. Bernard Tschumi, *La Case vide: La Villette*, with essays by Jacques Derrida and Anthony Vidler (London: Architectural Association, 1985).

35. Bernard Tschumi, "'Joyce's Garden' in London: A Polemic on the Written Word and the City," *Architectural Design* 50, no. 11–12 (1980): 36.

36. Michel Foucault, *Madness and Civilization: A History of Insanity in the Age of Reason* (New York: Random House, 1965).

37. Tschumi, *Manhattan Transcripts*, 8.

38. See Kenneth E. Silver, "Purism Straightening Up after the Great War," *Artforum* 15, no. 7 (March 1977): 56–63.

39. Werner Szambien, *Jean-Nicolas-Louis Durand, 1760–1834: De l'imitation à la norme* (Paris: Picard, 1984), 85.

40. See Manfredo Tafuri, *Architecture and Utopia: Design and Capitalist Development* (Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press, 1976). Italian edition published in 1973.

41. Tschumi, "Architecture and Limits I," 36.

42. Kate Linker provided a beautiful example of the possibilities offered by Tschumi's work in "Bernard Tschumi: Architecture, Eroticism, and Art," *Arts Magazine* 53, no. 3 (November 1978): 107–9.

43. Bernard Tschumi, "Architecture: Stratégie et substitution," *Diagraphe* 43 (March 1988): 38–46.

44. For a brief analysis of the work of this movement, which based its theory on a reading of Nietzsche, Heidegger, Marx, and Freud, see Luc Ferry and Alain Renault, *La Pensée '68: Essai sur l'anti-humanisme contemporain* (Paris: Gallimard, 1985).

Figure Credit

1. Roland Barthes, *Le Plaisir du texte* (Paris: Editions du Seuil, 1973).