One of the primary preoccupations of contemporary architecture theory is the concept of 'other' or 'otherness.' Members of the so-called neo-avant-garde – architects and critics frequently affiliated with publications such as *Assemblage* and *ANY* and with architecture schools such as Princeton, Columbia, SCI-Arc, and the Architectural Association – advocate the creation of a new architecture that is somehow totally 'other.' While these individuals repeatedly decry utopianism and the morality of form, they promote novelty and marginality as instruments of political subversion and cultural transgression. The spoken and unspoken assumption is that 'different' is good, that 'otherness' is automatically an improvement over the status quo.

While the formal and ideological allegiances of these advocates vary considerably, most fall into two broad categories. The first consists of self-identified proponents of deconstruction in architecture, who seek to find an architectural equivalent or parallel to the writings of Jacques Derrida. This group includes the so-called deconstructivists Peter Eisenman, Bernard Tschumi, Andrew Benjamin, Geoff Bennington, Mark Wigley, and Jeffrey Kipnis. The second category is a diverse group of critics and theorists without any collective identity but who are all adherents of Michel Foucault's notion of 'heterotopia.' These include Anthony Vidler, Demetri Porphyrios, Aaron Betsky, Catherine Ingraham, and Edward Soja.

The desire for 'otherness,' shared by these two groups, raises a series of questions concerning theory's political and cultural role that have been largely unexplored in recent architectural debate. To what extent is this preoccupation with 'otherness' a product of critics' and practitioners' own identity and status? Does it elucidate or support groups considered socially marginal or 'other'? Are there positions in architecture outside these two tendencies that address concerns of 'otherness' relevant to 'ordinary' people – those for whom the avant-garde has little significance?

The deconstructivists have argued that Derrida's notion of *différance* (a word play on 'differ' and 'defer') challenges the canons of architecture, such as function,
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structure, enclosure – in other words, that his claim that meaning is infinitely deferred and has no extra-linguistic beginning or end undermines any notion of architectural truth or foundation. Proponents, such as Eisenman and Wigley, value the disclosure of this instability as an end in itself. They claim that by revealing how binary oppositions such as form and content or structure and decoration are inscribed within a seemingly fixed, hierarchical structure and then eroded by the second or subordinate term in the opposition, the value system of architecture itself is eroded and put into flux. The second term is then seen as a condition of possibility for the whole system. For the most part, these theorists view the ‘secondary,’ the ‘other,’ as something largely internal to architecture. They assert that binary oppositions in architecture can be undone, or dismantled from within, through an investigation of the object. In his essay ‘En Tercor Firma: In Trails of Grotexloes,’ published in 1988 (the year of the Museum of Modern Art’s Deconstructivist Architecture exhibition), Eisenman makes this explicit:

Textual or textuality is that aspect of text which is a condition of otherness or secondarity. An example of this condition of otherness in architecture is a trace. If architecture is primarily presence – materiality, bricks and mortar – then otherness or secondarity would be trace, as the presence of absence. This other architecture . . . this second text will always be within the first text and thus between traditional presence and absence, between being and non-being.

Eisenman’s discourse is itself slippery, and the buzz words change every six months: ‘presence of absence,’ ‘grotesque,’ ‘monstrous,’ ‘the fold,’ ‘weak form,’ ‘slim mold,’ ‘anti-memory,’ and, most recently, ‘ungrounding the desire for ground-ing.’ With the possible exception of the writings of his palimpsest phase, coincident with the design of the Wexner Center, his rhetoric, whether structuralist or post-structuralist, has consistently proclaimed architecture as ‘independent discourse.’ In his essay ‘The End of the Classical, the End of the Beginning, the End of the End’ (1984), he asserts that architecture is ‘free of external values – classical or any other; that is, the intersection of the meaning-free, the arbitrary, and the timeless in the artificial.’ Bernard Tschumi has made similar claims in his oft-published account of La Villette. Although Tschumi alludes to intertextuality and applauds programmatic juxtaposition and experimentation, he asserts that ‘La Villette . . . aims at an architecture that means nothing, an architecture of the significant other than the signified, one that is pure trace or play of language.’ Otherness is confined here to form (language) and textuality, refusing any reality outside the object (text).

As I have argued elsewhere, several of these deconstructivist practitioners have based their political claims on this strategy and its discourse. Using words such as ‘unease,’ ‘disintegration,’ ‘decentering,’ ‘dislocation,’ and ‘violation,’ they have stated that their work subverts the status quo through formal disruptions and inversions within the object. Describing his Carnegie-Mellon Research Institute, Eisenman writes, for instance,
The presence of a 40\textdegree frame over a 45\textdegree solid leaves the outline of the 40\textdegree N cube as a trace on the surface of the 45\textdegree cube. In this way the fallibility of man is seen as undercutting the hyperrationality of the forms of knowledge systems, leading to a new and complex condition of the beautiful.\textsuperscript{7}

In other words, while such architecture forsakes the modern movement's political agenda, including the transformation of productive processes and institutional boundaries, it now gains political power simply through the cultural sign, or, more precisely, through revealing the disintegration of that sign. Newness and 'otherness' – traditional claims of the avant-garde – are largely an issue of formal strategy.

Although this tendency in architecture has found its most important theoretical source in Jacques Derrida's philosophy of deconstruction, other contemporary architecture critics have linked this new fragmented architecture (and what are sometimes considered its historical precedents, such as Piranesi's Carceri or Campo Marzio) with Foucault's more politicized concept of 'heterotopia' – literally 'other places'.\textsuperscript{8} Here the notion of 'other' refers to that which is both formally and socially 'other.' Difference is a function of different locations and distributions of power, as well as formal or textual inversion. 'Other' is therefore not always an issue of 'within' but of arenas outside of or marginal to our daily life.

Foucault gives his most complete discussion of heterotopia in his essay 'Des Espaces autres,' a lecture that he delivered at a French architecture research institute in 1967 and which was not published in English until 1985.\textsuperscript{9} Since it was written as a lecture, it lacks Foucault's usual rigor; his argument seems loose, almost conflicted at times, as if he were groping for examples. But it is also his most comprehensive discussion of physical space,\textsuperscript{10} and its very looseness may account for its influence in recent architecture discourse.

In 'Des Espaces autres' Foucault distinguishes heterotopias from imaginary spaces – utopias – and from everyday landscapes. He proposes that certain unusual or out-of-the-ordinary places – the museum, the prison, the hospital, the cemetery, the theater, the church, the carnival, the vacation village, the barracks, the brothel, the place of sexual initiation, the colony – provide our most acute perceptions of the social order. These perceptions might derive either from a quality of disorder and multiplicity, as in the brothel, or from a kind of compensation, a laboratory-like perfection, as in the colony, which exposes the messy, ill-constructed nature of everyday reality. Many of the spaces cited, such as the prison or asylum, are exactly the arenas that Foucault condemns in his institutional studies for their insidious control and policing of the body. In this essay, however, his tone is neutral or even laudatory of those 'other' spaces. Foucault suggests that these heterotopic environments, by breaking with the banality of everyday existence and by granting us insight into our condition, are both privileged and politically charged. He asserts that they 'suspend, neutralize, or invert the set of relationships' that they designate.\textsuperscript{11}

What are explicitly omitted in his list of 'other' spaces, however, are the residence, the workplace, the street, the shopping center, and the more mundane
areas of everyday leisure, such as playgrounds, parks, sporting fields, restaurants, and cafés. (Cinemas, paradoxically, are both excluded and included as heterotopias.) Indeed, in his emphasis on isolated institutions – monuments, asylums, or pleasure houses – he forsakes all the messy, in-between urban spaces that might be considered literally heterotopic. For most contemporary architecture critics, the political ambiguity and two-sided nature of Foucault’s notion of heterotopia (its diversity or its extreme control) have been ignored. Following Foucault’s alluring account of Borges’ Chinese encyclopedia in *The Order of Things*, they interpret the concept simply as incongruous juxtaposition, all too frequently equating Foucault’s notion of ‘otherness’ with Derrida’s concept of *différence*.12 With a kind of postmodern ease, critics have created a heterotopic tableau of these theories seeking to undermine order.

However, my objective here is not to expound upon the distinctions between Foucault’s and Derrida’s versions of poststructuralism in terms of architecture, although at times distinctions will be made. Nor is there the opportunity to expand on the philosophical differences in the meaning of the word ‘other,’ namely the differences between Sartre’s reworking of a Hegelian other in existentialism and Lacan’s notions of split subjectivity and linguistic drift.13 Though certainly significant in philosophical and literary discourse, these distinctions, for better or worse, are typically blurred in architecture theory. The subject of this essay is a more basic issue: What are some of the limitations of a political and social vision of architecture that so exclusively focuses on ‘otherness,’ ‘disruption,’ and ‘break,’ and thus posits its political role as negation?

‘GETTING A BIT OF THE OTHER’ (WITH A DEBT TO SUZANNE MOORE)14

A paramount problem in poststructuralist theory generally and contemporary architecture theory specifically is the omission of any connections between an abstract notion of ‘other’ and women’s actual social situation – connections that would seem to follow from their proponents’ initial preoccupations. As critics have frequently noted, the positions taken by both Derrida and Foucault (and, one might add, the sometime poststructuralists Roland Barthes and Jacques Lacan) have much in common with feminist theories, especially in their rejection of a universal subject, originary essence, and the notion of objective truth – too often the viewpoint of the white Western male. In fact, one of the most continually repeated refrains in poststructuralist theory is the reassertion, indeed celebration, of the secondary or marginal that had been previously repressed. Focusing more specifically on a Derridean/Lacanian strain of poststructuralism (and momentarily leaving aside Foucault’s more social model), femininity becomes ‘lack,’ ‘absence,’ the ‘unconscious,’ ‘that which cannot be represented’ – in short, the ‘other.’ It would appear, following this line of thought, that an architecture that seeks to represent ‘the presence of absence,’ an ‘other’ architecture, might be about women.

But how can an absence be about anyone? And is ‘other’ genuinely an ‘other’, or is it simply the all-too-common perspective of a repressed masculine
discourse? These two questions – the first raising issues of subjecthood, the second alluding to the homogenizing quality of 'otherness' – point to the difficulties some feminist theorists have had with aspects of Derrida's and Lacan's legacy. As Nancy Hartstock has asserted:

Why is it, exactly at the moment when so many of us who have been silenced begin to demand the right to name ourselves, to act as subjects rather than objects of history, that just then the concept of subjecthood becomes 'problematic.'

The frequent equation of woman with 'lack' recalls Luce Irigaray's caustic critique of psychoanalysis as part of phallocentric culture. Is 'woman' the unconscious, as Lacan claims, or does a woman have one? Do women have any positive identities apart from masculine models? What are women's own desires and social realities? For many women architects, the critical point is not just the undermining of binary oppositions, but the denial of women per se. Can you play Eisenman's game if you're not permitted to play, or not even recognized as a potential player? Or more importantly, can you create different games – new forms and spaces – if your very existence is denied? Must the rejection of essentialism imply absence?

Paradoxically, the poststructuralist rejection of masculine hierarchies has tended to essentialize all that is 'feminine.' All women become subsumed into the category of Woman, which then embodies all that is mystical, dark, and otherworldly. For deconstructivist architects, if they recognize the issue of Woman at all, to enter this 'dark continent' is in itself transgressive. Whereas modernism's universal subject excluded women, poststructuralism's celebration of 'otherness' presents another problem: Too often it consigns women to being the means of constructing the identity of men. It is no accident that Peter Eisenman pays homage to Blue Velvet, in which women exist primarily as choices for men, as their 'other.' However aesthetically alluring and richly ambiguous the film, part of its appeal for men (especially 'with-it' men) is that they can have 'their sex, their myths, their violence, and their politics, all at the same time.' Instead of celebrating the avant-garde’s desire for 'otherness,' architects and critics might investigate the desires of those multiple others, those actual, flesh-and-blood women. The feminine is experienced differently, at different times, in different cultures, by different people. The point is not just recognizing 'difference,' but all kinds of difference.

Foucault's conception of 'other' (autre) stands apart from Lacanian and Derridean models in that it suggests actual places and actual moments in time. It acknowledges that power is not simply an issue of language. And this insistence on seeing institutions and practices in political and social terms has been welcomed by many feminist theorists. Yet, one of the most striking aspects of Foucault's notion of heterotopia is how his concept of 'other' spaces, in its emphasis on rupture, seems to exclude the traditional arenas of women and children, two of the groups that most rightly deserve the label 'other' (if by now one can abide the term's universalizing effect). Women have a place in his discussion primarily as sex objects – in the brothel, in the motel rented by the hour. (And what might be even harder for most working mothers to accept with a straight face is his exclusion of the
house as a heterotopia because it is a 'place of rest.') Foucault seems to have an unconscious disdain for aspects of everyday life such as the home, the public park, and the department store that have been provinces where women have found not only oppression but also some degree of comfort, security, autonomy, and even freedom. In fact, the writings of Foucault and some of his architecture-critic followers (most notably, Mike Davis)\(^1\) display an almost callous disregard for the needs of the less powerful – older people, the handicapped, the sick – who are more likely to seek security, comfort, and the pleasures of everyday life than to pursue the thrills of transgression and 'difference.' In applauding the rest home, for instance, as a microcosm elucidating social structures, Foucault never considers it from the eyes of the resident. Insight seems to be the privilege of the powerful.

Another major, and all-too-obvious, problem is the exclusion of minorities, the third world – indeed, most non-Western culture in architects' discussions of 'other.' Some of the same issues surrounding the end of subjectivity and the tourism of 'otherness' raised with regard to women are relevant here.\(^2\) One of the most paradoxical aspects of Foucault's notion of heterotopia is his example of the colony. Although the concept of the 'other' has had a powerful influence since World War II on third-world political and cultural theorists (from Frantz Fanon to Edward Said),\(^2\) Foucault himself never attempts to see the colony through the eyes of the colonized, just as in his earlier institutional studies he avoids the prisoner's viewpoint in his rejection of experiential analysis.\(^4\) In philosophical and literary deconstruction, a major claim for political validity is the notion of dismantling European logocentrism. Yet despite this embrace of 'otherness' in some of its theoretical sources, poststructuralist tendencies in architecture posit a notion of 'other' that is solely a question of Western dismantling of Western conventions for a Western audience. Again, 'other' seems confined exclusively to a Western avant-garde. And once more, deconstructivist currents and the unconscious biases of Foucault appear to converge in architecture discourse.

Thus far, this argument about the exclusion of 'others' in the concept of 'other' has been restricted to theoretical propositions that have at best – perhaps fortunately – only marginal relation to the architecture produced by these practitioners, or by those that have been loosely grouped with them (such as Zaha Hadid, Daniel Libeskind, and Coop Himmelblau).\(^5\) And by no means is the negative tone of these remarks meant to disparage the incredible aesthetic energy and invention of many of these designs. What is disturbing is the link between theory and the architecture culture surrounding this theory. In the United States the focus on transgression in contemporary architecture circles seems to have contributed to a whole atmosphere of machismo and neo-avant-garde aggression. The theoretical language of deconstructivist theory is violent and sharp; the architecture milieu is exclusive – like a boys' club. One is reminded how often avant-gardism is a more polite label for angry young men, sometimes graying young men. All too frequently, lecture series and symposia have at best a token representation of women – and no African Americans or non-Western architects from anywhere but Japan. One of the most telling examples was the first 'Anyone' conference, staged at the
Getty Center at immense expense. Among the twenty-five speakers, at a conference supposedly about the multiplicity, diversity, and fluidity of identity, there were only two women, and the men were all white American, white European, and Japanese. In fairness, it should be noted that this exclusionary attitude is not the sole province of the deconstructivists. American and European postmodernists and proponents of regionalism are equally blind to the issues of the non-Western world beyond Japan. Most recently, the same charge might be brought against the Deleuzean 'de-form' nexus, despite its rhetoric of continuity and inclusion.

These blatant social exclusions, under the mantle of a discourse that celebrates 'otherness' and 'difference,' raise the issue of whether contemporary theorists and deconstructivist architects have focused too exclusively on formal transgression and negation as a mode of practice. Undoubtedly, the difficult political climate of the past two decades and the economic recession of the late 1980s and early 1990s in the United States have contributed to the profession's hermeticism (namely, its rejection of constructive political strategies and institutional engagement), but the consequences of this retreat are now all too clear. Are there other formal and social options – options beyond transgression and nostalgia, deconstructivism and historicist postmodernism – that embrace the desires and needs of those outside the avant-garde?

EVERYDAY LIFE

The seduction and power of the writings of Derrida and Foucault, and their very dominance in American academic intellectual life, may have encouraged architects and theorists to leave unexplored another position linking space and power: the notion of 'everyday life' developed by French philosopher Henri Lefebvre from the 1930s through the 1970s and by cultural theorist Michel de Certeau shortly thereafter. A peculiar synthesis of Surrealist and Marxist notions, Lefebvre's concept of everyday life might be best understood as a series of paradoxes. While the 'object of philosophy,' it is inherently nonphilosophical; while conveying an image of stability and immutability, it is transitory and uncertain; while unbearable in its monotony and routine, it is festive and playful. It is at once 'sustenance, clothing, furniture, homes, neighborhoods, environment' – material life – but with a 'dramatic attitude' and 'lyrical tone.' In short, everyday life is 'real life,' the 'here and now,' not abstract truth. De Certeau, in his book The Practice of Everyday Life (L'Invention du quotidien, 1980) gives the notion of everyday life a somewhat more particularist, less Marxist cast, stressing the localized and transitory qualities of daily existence.

In contrast to Foucault, both these theorists not only analyze the tyranny and controls that have imposed themselves on 'everyday life,' but also explore the freedoms, joys, and diversity – what de Certeau describes as 'the network of anti-discipline' within everyday life. Their concern is not only to depict the power of disciplinary technology, but also to reveal how society resists being reduced by it, not just in the unusual or removed places but in the most ordinary. And here, they place an emphasis on consumption without seeing it as solely a negative force, as
some leftists have, but also as an arena of freedom, choice, creativity, and invention. De Certeau, who dedicated his seminal work *The Practice of Everyday Life* to the "ordinary man," is strangely silent on the issue of women (except for one female flâneur in his chapter "Walking the City"). Lefebvre, however, despite moments of infuriating sexism and disturbingly essentialist rhetoric, seems to have an acute understanding of the role of the everyday in woman's experience and how consumption has been her demon but also her liberator, offering an arena of action that grants her entry and power in the public sphere. This argument has been further developed by several contemporary feminist theorists, including Janet Wolff, Elizabeth Wilson, Anne Friedberg, and Kristin Ross. What these critics share, despite their many differences, is an emphasis on pleasure, the intensification of sensory impressions, the freedom and positive excesses of consumption as experiences that counter the webs of control and monotony in daily life. Here, 'other' is not so much a question of what is outside everyday life – events characterized by rupture, transgression, difference – but what is contained, and potentially contained, within it. In short, their emphasis is populist, not avant-garde. They articulate a desire to bring happiness and pleasure to many, rather than merely to jolt those who have the textual or architectural sophistication to comprehend that a new formal break has been initiated. Of course, these two goals need not be exclusive.

EVERYDAY AND OTHER ARCHITECTURE

This notion of an 'intensification of the everyday' – and even an appreciation of the pleasures of consumption – is not something totally new to architecture or architecture criticism. Groups and individuals as diverse as the Situationists, the Independent Group, Denise Scott Brown and Robert Venturi, and Jane Jacobs have all addressed these issues. Tracing this lineage, however, requires a critical distance. While some of the attempts to embrace the 'everyday' have succeeded, or have at least suggested promising strategies, others now appear ineffectual or regressive, frequently carrying overtones of adolescent rebellion and machismo. Especially in the case of the Situationists, the differences between certain positions – notably, the celebration of shock, transgression, and violence – and deconstructivist theory are not so clear.

The Situationists, indebted to Lefebvre and to whom Lefebvre himself was indebted, proposed a complicated mixture of long-standing avant-garde practices involving negation and innovative strategies emphasizing everyday pleasure and its intensification. Formally launched in July 1957, the Situationist project might be summarized as 'the liberation of everyday life.' This involved studying the whole range of diverse sensations that 'one encounters by chance in everyday life' and then proposing acts, situations, and environments that transformed the world in those same terms. One of the major Situationist techniques was dérive – literally, 'drift' – a kind of mindless wandering in the city which would open up the existing environment to new considerations. Guy Debord's *Mémoires*, published in 1959, evoke, through a montage of assorted quotations, the nature of these new percep-
tions. The investigations of chance urban encounters, everyday locales (streets, cafes, bars), and the latent desires and techniques of mass culture (comics, film, advertising) -- all for radical, new ends -- convey a milieu more accessible and literally heterotopic than Foucault's 'other' spaces. The Situationists attacked both bourgeois art (high modernism) and earlier avant-gardist movements, explicitly denouncing the Futurists' 'technological optimism,' the Surrealists' 'ostentatious "weirdness,'" and Duchamp's 'gamelike rebellions.' But as much as those of their predecessors, their visions of pleasure are permeated with sexism, a sexism inextricably entwined with their revulsion against bourgeois family life. They categorically ignore issues such as domesticity, childcare, reproduction -- indeed, all aspects of women's situation in society; and their insistent allusions to sex, debauchery, violence, cruelty, and madness suggest a kind of puerile avant-gardism, one that may have unfortunately left its heritage in the deconstructivist movement. The Memòires feel, as critic Greil Marcus notes, 'like a drunken sprawl through the encyclopedia of common knowledge.' (A quotation that appears on the first collage is 'our talk is full of booze.') Debord calls women 'girls,' and among his 'girls' are a model named Sylve, a 'beautiful wife,' and 'poor' Ann -- the young prostitute in Thomas De Quincey's Confessions of an English Opium Eater. Here, 'other' seems again to be for the benefit of male identity.

The few architecture projects by Dutch painter and architect Constant are among the most evocative and exhilarating aesthetic visions of the 1950s, anticipating the formal vocabulary of much deconstructivist work. The Situationists' designs, in contrast to those of their formal heirs, are assertively constructive. Debord once claimed that his objective was to negate negation. Yet, their program presents other difficulties. Although Constant's utopian scheme, New Babylon, dedicated to a postrevolutionary society of play, proposes a communal and festive use of space, it also carries peculiarly behaviorist connotations in its attempt to manufacture emotions. What he calls the yellow sector shelters a complete zone of play, including labyrinthine houses for endless adventure; and there is also a deaf room, a screaming room, an echo room, a room of reflection, a room of rest, and a room of erotic play. The project's flexible walls and fluid modes of circulation are supposed to allow inhabitants to change their milieux, but psychogeography's correlation between physical environment and emotion, and the suffocating sense of there being 'no exit' from this brave new world, seem to kill the very freedom of discovery and chance so celebrated by the group. Indeed, New Babylon's programmed indeterminacy eliminates privacy, domesticity, social obligations, and loyalties to locales -- most of everyday life as we know it. Notions of drift, so difficult to make architectural, are reduced to a project for an admittedly seductive 'gypsy camp.'

Less overtly revolutionary and less rooted in philosophy, but with a stronger grasp of daily life as experienced by most, is the work of the Independent Group (IG) in London. In contrast to the Situationists' fascination with vagrants and bars, the participants of the IG examined more 'normative' conditions of working-class and lower middle-class domestic and commercial life. They embraced American mass culture as a foil to both the deprivations of postwar Britain and the sterility of
modernist abstraction, and were especially attracted to an aspect of mass culture that had been largely neglected in the first phase of the modern movement: advertising. This break with the imagery of Machine Age production was a stand self-consciously proclaimed by Alison and Peter Smithson in their 1956 manifesto: 'Gropius wrote a book on grain silos, Le Corbusier one on aeroplanes... But today we collect ads.' Nor did the Smithsons overlook the feminine overtones of this new vision of mass culture when they alluded to the 'patron's wife who leafs through the magazines.' The writings and designs of the Independent Group being to suggest the double nature of consumption as oppression and liberation, and its particular meaning to women.

The Smithsons' architecture clearly embodies an early critique of avant-garde elitism and its neglect of 'everyday' concerns. However inclusive the modern movement's initial objectives, by the 1950s it stood for stylistic formalism and abstract functionalism removed from actual human needs. Reyner Banham dubbed the Smithsons' work an 'architecture autre' – not because of its iconoclastic marginality, but for its very insistence on banality and realism. Housing, the street (not just the traffic corridor), and the playground were arenas to explore; and if their sensibility of pop humor meant including images of Joe Dimaggio and Marilyn Monroe in a photomontage of Golden Lane's street deck, the exterior views of this unbuilt housing complex showed existing urban blight with a poignant realism. Photographs of their few built projects included actual inhabitants (children, old people), not avant-garde drifters. The Smithsons' designs struck a delicate balance between invention and appreciation of the ordinary – a balance that was undoubtedly appreciated by architects more than the population at large. While their refusal to compromise may have itself carried elitist overtones, their inclusive vision began to address (in the sphere of their profession at least) what Andreas Huyssen has called 'the Great Divide' between modernism and mass culture. However, the IG's embrace of consumerist culture was not without its own political ambiguity. As Banham noted, 'We dig pop which is acceptance – culture, capitalist, and yet in our formal politics, if I may use the phrase, most of us belong firmly on the other side.'

Denise Scott Brown (one of the Smithson's ambivalent heirs) and Robert Venturi break even more definitively with modernist dogma in their advocacy of consumerist culture. In their publications, exhibitions, and teachings of the 1970s (most notably, Learning from Las Vegas and the Smithsonian Institution exhibition Signs of Life), they allude to a world neglected in both modern architecture and Foucault's heterotopic landscape: the A & P supermarket, Levittown, mobile homes, fast-food stores – the milieu of ordinary middle- and lower-class people. Learning from Las Vegas does contain an overdose of honeymoon motels and gambling casinos, but in contrast to Foucault's heterotopic spaces or Anthony Vidler's examples of the uncanny, this landscape is not privileged for its difference or strangeness but taken as part of a continuum of daily existence. Like the Independent Group, Scott Brown and Venturi grant the world of women, children, and elderly people – domestic culture – a place in aesthetic culture. Even Dr Seuss receives homage in Scott Brown's 1971 Casabella essay, with its slogan 'Hop on pop.'
What has been noted less frequently is that Scott Brown also gives one of the sharpest, and Wittiest, critiques of the machismo underlying modern architecture and the profession at large. In *Learning from Las Vegas*, the authors characterize the modern movement as ‘heroic and original,’ ‘violent, high adventure,’ ‘a bunch of angry young men under 30,’ ‘imposing on the whole landscape heroic representations of the masters’ unique creations.’ No less acerbic are their remarks about contemporary architecture in 1970. While the stalwart modern architects of that era are ‘aging architectural revolutionaries who man the review boards and who have achieved aesthetic certainty,’ avant-garde designers such as Archigram are the ‘last, megalomaniac gasps’ of a puerile rebellion: ‘look Ma, no buildings.’

Scott Brown and Venturi’s critique of the heroic gestural designs of the 1960s might apply equally well to more recent deconstructivist works:

Our heroic and original symbols, from carceri to Cape Kennedy, feed our late Romantic egos and satisfy our lust for expressionistic, acrobatic space for a new age in architecture.

Throughout *Learning from Las Vegas* Scott Brown and Venturi convey an intuitive understanding of the problems of universal subjectivity, an insight that some current architecture theorists would like to claim as their own. They use the term ‘Man’ sarcastically, for example, alluding to the aesthetic experts who ‘build for Man rather than for people.’

However, Scott Brown and Venturi’s populism, which seems so removed from the iconoclastic *epater la bourgeoisie* of so much avant-gardism, raises other political issues. While they challenge the stance of heroic originality embedded in so much of modernism, their very preoccupation with the everyday becomes at times precariously close to an endorsement of the status quo. Must the affirmation of those groups traditionally neglected by the avant-garde necessarily preclude substantial invention and change? And does ‘ordinary’ necessarily have to be ugly or mundane? In short, one yearns for a bit more ‘other’ – another other, a new vision emerging from their very sensitivity to the everyday.

Arguably, the most influential critic to stress issues of the ‘everyday’ in architecture was a non-architect, Jane Jacobs, whose 1961 book *The Death and Life of Great American Cities* (published nearly a decade before *Learning from Las Vegas*) had a powerful impact on a whole generation of social and architecture critics that emerged in the 1960s and 1970s. While the book preceded the advent of modern feminism in the United States and does not make gender a specific issue, Jacobs’ urban landscape comes, as Elissa Rosenberg has argued, explicitly from a woman’s experience. A domestic perspective is critical to Jacobs’ development of the idea of mixed use. This proposal is not only an attack on modern architecture’s functional segregation but also an implicit challenge to the traditional split between domestic and public life. Jacobs deliberately rejects theoretical models and relies on empirical observation to examine how space is actually used. Of the individuals discussed in this essay, she comes closest to realizing de Certeau’s plea for an account of cities, not from the bird’s-eye view, but from the experience of
the pedestrian, the everyday user. And the terrain she describes is very different from that traversed by Baudelaire’s flâneurs, from Foucault’s prisons and brothels, or from the Situationist bars and gypsy encampments. What is evoked in her descriptions of New York City’s West Village and Boston’s North End is an informal public life: the world of the stoop, the neighborhood bakery, the dry-cleaning establishment, and, most importantly, the street; and with these come new subjects – mothers in the park, children, grocers, and newsstand attendants. In contrast to Foucault and Mike Davis, who are preoccupied with policing and control (a reflection, I would argue, of their own unspoken subjecthood as men, relatively strong men), Jacobs is concerned with freedom and safety for children, elderly people, and those most vulnerable to attack. She grants a public meaning to domestic life – one that refuses a segregation of the sexes as well as of functions.

This is a vision that shares much with postmodern thought: an interest in blurring categories, in diversity, in understanding and enjoying a genuinely heterotopic milieu. Jacobs’ detailed and vibrant picture of daily urban life opens the door for a critical re-evaluation of social and functional divisions that are embodied in the physical form of modern economic development. But there is also a nostalgia and a conservative dimension to her interpretation of Hudson Street as a natural order. Her depiction of the city as a ‘self-regulating system’ overlooks the positive potential of human agency and cultural transformation, and despite her acute analysis of many aspects of daily life, the book offers few insights into confronting the connections between space and power.\(^24\)

**‘OTHER’ ARCHITECTURES**

What I have tried to do in this brief survey is to point to another series of concerns that have somehow been forgotten in the plethora of recent theoretical writings surrounding deconstructivism. These examples are cited not as endorsement but as territory for rethinking. On the positive side, they offer models of architectural production that counter notions of both cultural elitism and isolated artistic rebellion, finding a stratum of creativity and invention in more familiar terrains. They explore – with different degrees of success – the gap between architecture and what people make of it, seeing its occupants no longer simply as passive consumers or victims but also as vital actors contributing a multiplicity of new images and modes of occupation. Although these groups and individuals cannot provide a framework for political action (nor would any except the Situationists claim to), they articulate a range of concerns neglected in traditional political analyses and theoretical critiques. Most optimistically, these architecture positions embody new social and cultural formations. Yet it must also be stated that any facile rehabilitation of the ‘ordinary’ readily becomes problematic. There is, of course, no ‘common man,’ just as there is no universal ‘other.’ Despite Lefebvre’s and de Certeau’s recognition of the polymorphous fluidity of the ‘everyday,’ populist tenets frequently homogenize and subsume stratifications of power, such as class, gender, and race, in the fray of contemporary architectural practice and polemics.
The 'ordinary' becomes a rationalization for market forces and passive consumption; 'common sense' becomes a means to avoid the rigors of ideological critique. However, progressive and radically generative the proposals of Scott Brown and Jacobs were at their inception, the subsequent history of postmodern architecture, and its easy compliance with the boom forces of the 1980s, invites caution. Indeed, the blatant commodification of postmodernism fueled the attraction to deconstructivism's subversive claims.

But that time has passed, and now deconstructivism itself faces co-option. Transgression and shock have themselves become part of commodity culture (grunge, deconstructionist clothing, the 'junky' look, MoMA exhibitions, Decon coffee-table books); deconstructivist practitioners are firmly entrenched members of the cultural establishment. In this light, it appears that a reconsideration of everyday life might serve as an antidote not only to the solipsism and implicit biases in much contemporary architecture theory but also to the commodification of 'avant-garde' rebellion.

Recently, there have been a few signs of a shifting mentality in American architecture. 'Politics' – feminism, issues of gay and lesbian identity, race, ethnicity – have themselves begun to gain a certain fashionability in academic circles, though often in the framework of previous Derridean currents. It would seem these developments too might gain in vitality and breadth by a reconsideration of themes such as consumption, mass culture, and popular taste. Are there politically and aesthetically constructive positions beyond pure negation? Can buildings and urban space also be seen in terms of pleasure, comfort, humor, and emotion? Are there 'other' architectures to explore – ones that are less hermetic and more engaged in individuals' emotional and physical lives?

AFTERWORD

It is always safer for an architecture critic to avoid showing exemplary or instrumental images; not only does it save the critic from embarrassment (the examples rarely seem to live up to the grandiose claims), but it also invites closure. Neverthless, I would like to propose – modestly – two urban places that I believe escape the mechanisms of discipline, and not primarily through negation or transgression. They are cited here neither as social prescriptions nor as formal models, but simply as places that might suggest other urban tactics. Both sites, perhaps not coincidentally, were designed in part by women, women not exactly at the forefront of the avant-garde culture (one early in her career, the other later). Both sites are populist, and highly popular with ordinary people. One is humorous, witty; the other is deeply contemplative involving participation. The first is Niki de Saint-Phalle and Jean Tinguely's Stravinsky Fountain adjacent to Centre Pompidou in Paris. The second is Maya Lin's Vietnam Veterans Memorial in Washington, DC. They present possibilities of architectural space beyond conformity or disruption, both everyday and other.
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