Late Modernity and the Dilemma of *Intra*disciplinary Discourse

PATRICIA MEEHAN
University of Arkansas

0. PRE(R)AMBLE

I read this conference's call for papers only days after attending a focus group discussion regarding the University of Arkansas's 2010 Commission vision statement and development plan. More specifically, the call for papers on *Design Culture* brought home a discussion I had with a colleague in Chemical Engineering. This conversation dealt with the rate at which knowledge increases in the world today, and the difficulties this poses for developing adequate curriculum and content.

Roughly, the rate at which general knowledge doubles accelerated from every 100 to every 50 years during the period extending from 1700 to the beginning of the 1900's. Knowledge rates then increased to doubling every 30 years through the early part of this century. By the 1990's it had accelerated to doubling every 20 months. Knowledge in chemical engineering is currently doubling every nine months.

The big question was, how does one best prepare graduates, in such a context, for their professional lives? 'Information delivery' will make them more immediately useful to employers, but will carry them only so far and so long. More theoretical or research skills will not necessarily help them to be immediately productive, but will serve better to support their long term success, should they survive their early years.

It was in this context that I read this session's topic statement, whose oft repeated caricatures, limits, and assumptions I will push against here. It is an initial exploration into disciplinary matters in the late modern context, and is admittedly provisional. This passage from Sanford Kwinter frames this beginning:

> What is at stake in the question of modernity is, of course, an ontological problem regarding the nature of Being, but equally important and equally at stake is an epistemological one dealing with the nature of knowing. Today's crisis...may be seen as an effect of the discrepancy between the steady emergence of a new mode of Being and the failure to evolve adequate modes of knowing that would be proper to it. [1]

I. LATE MODERNITY AND THE NATURE OF THE CRISIS

Today, disciplines struggle to form a sense of self in a world defined by the 'radicalization and intensification'[2] of the processes of modernity. A reflexive dialogue is necessary if the tension between thinking and doing, thinking and making, is to enable a more productive disciplinary discourse. Conventional discussions extending from this opposition — profession versus academy, conservative versus progressive, or business versus art — have long since ceased to be productive. These face-offs exist today simply as matters of habit. A more productive questioning of the dichotomy between thinking and making is the challenge before us, not just as members of this discipline, but also as members of late modern society.

'Practice' versus 'academy' dialectics lie beneath many current discussions on the state of the discipline. The profession accuses the academy of undertaking marginal and unnecessary activities providing no benefit to 'the public' (a.k.a. 'the client'). The academy holds the profession responsible for the senselessness of the mind numbing production lines churning out buildings that provide no sense of place for 'the public' (a.k.a. 'the collective'). This finger pointing is drastically reductive and clearly unproductive.

This paper investigates the significance of late modern conditions for our discipline. This is essential for understanding why the practice/education or conservative/progressive face-offs are no longer productive frameworks for debate. Dialectical frameworks, in general, are becoming increasingly less effective paradigms for reasoning in late modern culture. We must consider alternative frameworks that acknowledge the increasingly complex nature of the late modern world.

Johan Fornas's text, *Cultural Theory & Late Modernity*, guides this examination. It provides an overview of significant contributions to defining and studying late modern cultural phenomena. It also proposes 'a poly-dimensional sphere-related resistance theory' as an appropriate late modern cultural response. Fornas's advocacy for reflexive differentiation over de-differentiation, and his interest in both the social and spatial aspects of culture are important contributions. His third chapter, "Spheres," deals with the institutional

aspects of his study and addresses a widespread phenomenon — increasing disciplinary crises of 'legitimation and motivation'.[3]

II. LATE MODERN PROCESSES AND THE NATURE OF 'INSTITUTION'

Fornas identifies and discusses 3 characteristics of processes of change that combine to form modernization. These are:[4]

1. Irreversible dynamization:

Modernization processes 'are intense and cannot be easily reversed, even if they might take different forms.' This problematizes tradition — nothing can ever be repeated in quite the same way. Any relationship to tradition is thus seen as 'not a necessary but a desired continuity.'

2. Ambivalent rationalization:

Modernization processes 'promote a two-sided rationality with both positive (creative and emancipatory) and negative (destructive and oppressional) potentials.' Processes of rationalization are ambivalent towards their positive and negative outcomes.

3. Differentiating universalization:

Modernization processes are 'increasingly general and global in their capacity to create new pluralities by separating social and individual life-spheres.' Once a unity is separated into its differentiated, autonomous components, new means of establishing relationships between these components becomes part of constituting any subsequent entity.

We should not underestimate the unsettling effects of these processes. Fornas tells us, "Normality is being denaturalized in a world where few traditions or values are experienced as self-evident. The resulting norm-crisis of insecurity and confusion...breeds nostalgic longing for a world of clear-cut shared norms."[5] Relating the now differentiated and autonomous components, deciding if and how to repeat traditional patterns, and forming judgments of normal or deviant results requires constant, critical, reflexive thought.

These processes of modernization further exacerbate the norm-crisis confusion because they appear as 'exterior', as 'given'.[6] Assumptions of exteriority exist wherever criteria of validity exist—and criteria today include efficiency, truth, and normative righteousness. Institutions also appear exterior because they make recourse to these criteria as part of their processes of legitimation and motivation.

This exterior world is itself differentiated into the autonomous components of natural, social, and cultural forces, each with specific directives. Social market forces guide the movement of capital. Social state forces guide the movement of administrative power. Lifeworld forces guide the processes of the reproduction of traditions, social integration, and socialization.[7] (*See Figure 1.*)

Figure 1: Summary of Fornas's Essential Elements of the Objective World.

Every institution, regardless of which element it aligns most closely with, must deal with all of these forces in their formation and continuation. As institutions work to recombine state, market, and lifeworld forces within their structures ('there are no pure systemic organs'[8]), they engage in acts which proportionally combine fusioning with fissioning, or uniting with separating. Every act 'which transgresses boundaries and creates communities, simultaneously 'marks differences and boundaries that deepen social rifts."[9]

Fornas sees institutions as 'spheres', which he defines in this way:

Spheres constitute a (physically or socially) spatial dimension, a network of ordering structures that the temporal streams of modernization unavoidably break against, but also gain momentum from. Temporal processes are framed by the spatial boundaries of spheres, but they are also given speed and direction by them... Structures are both obstacles to and prerequisites of changes. And conversely, it is movements that create and reproduce boundaries.[10]

This follows from his definition of culture as symbolic communication,[12] which includes spatial production. Fornas says, "By collectively shaping such symbolic patterns we construct a world and give ourselves specific positions in it."[13]

The process of positioning includes inevitable experiences of 'disharmony' that emerge as we move between the conflicting demands of the spheres we encounter in daily life — work, school, family, friends, etc. This disharmony means we must make difficult choices as we negotiate the boundaries between spheres. This experience of disharmony thus serves to introduce a more or less conscious struggle between power and resistance.

Fornas's investigation of spheres and experiences of disharmony requires clarification of basic terms and concepts. He identifies what we might call 'typologies' of social and spatial relations — between general, conceptual terms (spheres) and concrete, physical terms (spaces). The summaries of these (*See Figures 2-4.*) fol-

low from his arguments, although certain leaps are made to obtain and maintain clarity.[14] Analyses of these forces, combined with understandings reached through the social and spatial typologies, might provide a more productive starting point for examining the disharmony we experience within our discipline and in our discipline's relation to the world.

Figure 2: Summary of Fornas's General. Conceptual Terms

general, conceptual - spheres, fields, and arenas

Spheres:
- are both social institutions and power structures
- are a globe or a ball (a three-dimensional space of enclosure)
- have a center and a periphery, establishing an inside and outside
- 2 types of spheres:
    - periphery established by enclosing envelope
    - periphery established by sustaining nucleus

Fields:
- areas or spaces with a specific order or direction
- 2 types of fields:
    - cattle-field: a bounded area that does not have a clear center
    - battle-field: two separate but mutually dependent, opposite centers

Arenas:
- there are actors acting to audiences
- there are visible places of performance and hidden rooms of preparation
- scrutinizing glances, self-representation, and role playing add an aesthetic dimension
- combine both sphere and field aspects; a shared center side loads two separated fields

'Crucial aspects of spheres' deal with the visibility of fields of power relations in spheres.
1. *area:* originally refers to vacant ground; an area is a space that has been staked out and demarcated, and is thus at least mentally mastered through knowledge and surveillance
2. *domain:* implies ownership of a master
3. *territory:* a piece of land that is occupied, demarcated and guarded by someone

Figure 2: Summary of Fornas's General. Conceptual Terms

Figure 3: Summary of Fornas's Concrete, Physical Terms

concrete, physical - space, place, and room

Space:
- a stretch or an extension of something; the most general concept for three-dimensional expanses

Place:
- originally a flat area; today refers to a particular location

Room:
- an enclosed place or three-dimensional area

'Crucial aspects of spaces' also deal with viewing, for purposes of navigating fields of power.
1. an *aspect* is a way to look at something in a certain *direction* or from a certain *perspective*
2. a *perspective* is a *position* from which spaces and things are viewed
3. some spaces have discernible *levels* - up/down polarities

Figure 3: Summary of Fornas's Concrete, Physical Terms

ending on the clarity or diffuseness of forces at play
es 4 kinds of forces:

en, confine, order and separate

wer (hierarchy) and opposition
nposed of several pieces, are delimited, autonomous, and

ng
to offspring, concrete realizations of oneself
ved or taken from tradition
nothing

ually determined by an individual's status in a society
ans or stratagems towards a goal
is to accomplish an end

Figure 4: Summary of Fornas's Shaping Forces

Processes of modernization and differentiation of 'external' forces have clearly unsettled our disciplinary foundations. Our once unified discipline has been differentiated into the essential activities (provisionally defined) of criticism, design, history, professional practice, technology, and theory — each now becoming increasingly rational, systemic, and autonomous in nature. It is this disciplinary complexity that the practice/academy face-off does not adequately address.

The dialectic framework is causing major problems on all fronts. It privileges design, technology, and professional practice concerns while marginalizing history to some extent, theory even more, and criticism the most. Cross-curriculum exercises, when they do occur, usually involve one aspect from another area being included as a component of 'studio'. The dialectical battle currently privileges reductive notions of 'doing' and marginalizes reductive notions of 'thinking'. Architects are not learning to communicate effectively or develop the adequate thinking skills necessary for negotiating the multiple overlapping spheres that constitute our everyday world.

Demands to specialize, required for obtaining work in practice or obtaining tenure in the university, complicate this problem. We work in increasingly specialized contexts that are becoming more interdisciplinary in nature. This in itself is a good thing, but our difficulty in moving between different uses of language and thought constructs, compromises our ability to effectively talk to anyone outside our immediate context. We must learn to speak to each other before the valuable lessons learned from interdisciplinary ventures are lost to the discipline. Thomas Fisher reminds us:

> If we are to change the fragmented and adversarial nature of our relationships with each other and turn around the public's perception of our worth and value, we must become more vigilant of the language we use and the tacit messages we transmit. We spend much of our time designing and constructing the physical artifacts of communities... We now need to spend time building community within the industry, among colleagues and former adversaries alike. That must begin with the bricks and mortar of language, the words we choose and the way we use them.[15]

There are schools working to counter the marginalization of history, theory and criticism, often to much criticism. History, theory, and criticism are practical matters if we hope to effectively initiate both the interdisciplinary and intradisciplinary discourses required to negotiate between the multiplicity of voices emerging in our rapidly changing world.

III. NEGOTIATION AND RESISTANCE

Fornas presents the concept of negotiation as, "a kind of metadiscourse where the rules for interaction are reflexively discussed and adjusted. They are often inseparably united with the social acts themselves, so that regular interaction successively redefines social relations."[16] Negotiation is 'a reflexive form of communicative action,' with two important associated opportunities and responsibilities.

First, these discourses take place through cultural expressions that are responsible for the investigation of emancipatory propositions through critique and the development of 'utopian potentials'. These utopias answer to what is lacking or inadequate in daily life. They oppose through posing alternative notions of lifeforms or patterns of interaction. Fornas thus delimits the ethical as well as critical and creative potential of cultural expressions.

This underpins negotiation's second opportunity and responsibility. He identifies aesthetic practices as particularly effective negotiation practices. Symbolic communication and media are incredibly successful means for marking status and identity, both within and between individuals, groups, and institutions. This explains the increasing reflexivity, mediaization, and aestheticization of new social movements and counter-institutions.[17]

The understanding of negotiation taking place through cultural expressions implicates ethics and aesthetics as co-conspirators in late modern discourse. The focus of 'practice' versus 'academy' fades from view when we realize the significant potential of the ethics/aesthetics partnership. It creates a space where 'Other(s)' voices can speak. This dialogue is necessary if one expects to move beyond the privileged terms of the reductive dialectic and initiate a more expansive notion of equality and participation.

Wherever any institution exists, there are terms of inclusion and exclusion set. Resistances emerge, movements develop, utopias imagine, and reflexive communication tests alternative patterns. Emancipation, the move towards equality, is not a simple question. Fornas reminds us:

> It is essential to distinguish between equality and similarity: equal rights are only possible if differences are respected. Studies of youth, women, and ethnicity have emphasized the need to separate justice from standardization, and to avoid being stuck between separateness and likeness. ... There is a general need for learning to endure the insight that one's own way of life is far from the only legitimate one.[18]

Our discipline must learn to endure the thought that all our different disciplinary activities are equally significant. Otherwise the possibility of ethical, aesthetic architectural contributions to the formation of late modern culture remains unrealized. Such contributions assume that the power/resistance struggle, inherent in negotiation processes, will be confronted with some level of consciousness and commitment. Fornas identifies resistance as a significant productive force in late modern cultural production. He states:

> Power/resistance is an asymmetrical relation, associated with tensions between centers and peripheries in spatial and social spaces, where places, territories and borders are crossed by various flows and movements. In the complex global network of such center/periphery relations, various centers exert dominance across distance over multiple peripheries.[19]

Fornas assigns to resistance a productive role in the formation of knowledge. Centers have more power than peripheries, but there are more peripheries than centers. Also, that which flows from center to periphery is different than what flows from periphery to centers. Fornas links resistance to Foucault's contention that the will to knowledge is the will to power. The nature of the periphery is therefore significant.

> These peripheries cannot be reduced to the single function of being margins of some center. There are a multitude of margins...which have similar relations to some norm that institutes a center, but these margins are mutually very different and cannot be collapsed into just faces of a constant Other, though that is what the One center strives for.[20]

It is this recognition of Others that is at the heart of the ethics/aesthetics partnership. The ethical goal of equality, which acknowledges difference, allows new, creative avenues for identity formation. Ethics and aesthetics are not new to such partnerships. If one traces the origins of either of these discourses, one finds themselves back at Plato and Aristotle. These discourses are both, by their natures, philosophical matters. Philosophical thinking is necessary if we are to develop new strategies for a productive ethics/aesthetics recombination. Alberto Perez-Gomez notes the problem related to the removal of philosophy from theoretical architectural considerations:

> A simplistic view of human experience, derived from the projection of scientific models onto human reality, exemplified by certain aspects of behaviorism and positivistic psychology, has hampered our understanding of the essential continuity between thought and action, between mind and body. Because architectural theory is assumed to imply absolute rationality, it has been considered capable of standing on its own, free of all relations to fundamental philosophical questions.[21]

Philosophy must be given a central place within any late modern discourse seeking to combine ethics and aesthetics. It is the only means for creating an effective conduit between thinking and making, between both our interdisciplinary and intradisciplinary discourses. It is the best hope our discipline has for rebuilding a sense of itself and its purpose within the late modern context. This also requires that we follow Perez-Gomez's challenge to notions that reduce theory to prescriptive rules of operation.

IV. RETHINKING DISCIPLINARY IDENTITIES

For late modern inhabitants, the release from traditional norms, the resulting necessity of negotiation to establish norms, and the increasing cultural reflexivity requires, "a model of identity that is mobile, open, composite and impure which is more appropriate to late modernity than some other models of petrified rootedness."[22] Fornas introduces diaspora, migration, and immigration as models of cultural identities formed outside bounded territories. Characteristics of these identity models include:

1. an absent source of historical inheritance;

2. connections with dominating host cultures occurring through painful hybridization processes.

They result from both 'a transgression of borders and as montage-like mixes of various elements.'

Fornas maintains the notion of a once pure origin to support reflexive differentiation over de-differentiation in the theory of resistance. De-differentiation, the loss of specialized form, 'results in an undifferentiated homogeneity where all are equally peripheral'. Reflexive differentiation, though, acknowledges that as some boundaries are transgressed, others are established. Orientation and belonging result from a series of interlacing webs not bound by static center and periphery relations.

It is in this context that he introduces Gramsci's concept of hegemony (a governing power winning consent to rule). Flexible alliances are key to maintaining power since the concerns of both power and resistance are involved in the negotiation of consent. Resistance makes margins and peripheries visible in this discourse. Resistance, when it reaches some state of critical mass, can result in the establishment of counter-institutions, objectively testing alternative patterns of interaction.

It is clear that a singular understanding of our discipline, or of its essential activities, does not address an adequate understanding of this cultural complexity. The criticisms of design culture, communicated as the session's theme, must be reexamined. It reduces all margins into a constant Other, and the multiplicity of centers to just one center. We must value open identity formation processes developed through acts of resistance, the formation of movements, and in the building of counter-institutions. We must consider these resistances in relation to power, especially in relation to the apparently objective forces of modernization. These forces may seem inhuman, but they are human creations and subject to human intervention, should the Other(s) be given a voice.

Cultural relevancy is the goal of Fornas's proposal for 'a poly-dimensional sphere-related resistance theory.' Since the result of globalization is not homogenization, but rather increasing universal differentiation, a prismatic cultural understanding results. It includes three theoretical concerns:[23]

1. increasing mobility, flexibility, dynamics, historicization, and modernization processes;

2. the problematizing of symbolic forms, language, communication, and the whole cultural dimension;

3. the necessity of differentiation, diversity, distinctions, and polydimensionality in late modern complex society, politics, and theory.

Resistances are particularly important for addressing these, since they are potentially 'transformative rather than just reproductive.'[24] They occur both within physical, temporal boundaries, as well as outside of them. Resistances first appear as localized emergences of alternative interaction patterns, established on various scales, through face to face interactions. The second takes place through mass media. This type of intersubjective interaction assists the

formation of communities over distance, uniting those who would otherwise, in some way, be isolated.

The increase of mass media communications is a general cultural trend. (It is not theory's fault.) Clearly mass media exacerbate the differentiation of our disciplinary activities, but it also provides benefits as well. On the one hand, mass media provide a way for many of us to find communities where we see ourselves and our concerns reflected. The sense of comfort created outside space and time, though, enables a continuing shutting down and isolation between the intradisciplinary activities occurring in place and time.

We need to acknowledge the importance of both kinds of work if our discipline is to form more productive strategies of resistance, with transformative potentials productively reaching both inside and outside our discipline. It is essential for combating the isolation that many of us find in our daily disciplinary experiences. We urgently need alternative ways of relating criticism, design, history, professional practice, technology, and theory through thoughtful acts of recombination that might actually enable, if even for just brief moments, glimpses of rich, disciplinary possibilities. Both local architectural communities, and mediated ones, need to attempt these connections.

Fornas helps us imagine how that might work:

> The new emphasis on dynamics, openness, crossings and hybridity as a normal identity condition implies that the social world consists of a series of interlacing webs, each with its center and peripheries. These networks are superimposed on each other, shaping intricate interference patterns. When one pattern hides another, critical reflection is needed to disclose the concealed domination forms.[25]

V. MEDIATION AND THE REDEFINITION OF 'THEORY'

The poly-dimensional nature of late modern culture does not fit the model of dialectical crises whose resolutions are closed and composite by nature. The source of crisis today is in something other than the dialectical terms themselves; it is 'exterior' to the terms that delimit their domain. Resolution of a multiplicity of oppositions requires something that mediates tensions within late modern cultural conditions. It must allow for resistance, so that this mediation might be transformative and contribute to the disciplinary knowledge base.

In order to consider this kind of mediation, we must set aside the word 'theory', as it is conventionally used in disciplinary bickering. Fornas presents a more appropriate notion of 'theory', which provides a provisional step towards understanding this mediation. He says:

> Theorizing starts from a pain or a want: an experienced pain which propels it forward, and lack of knowing which wants to be filled. Culture, society, subjectivity and nature all produce plenty of suffering in human life. A lack of happiness or meaning may find relief in the magic construction of models that

open up new worlds of imagination where existence is recharged with fascinating significance: fantasizing about what exists also creates visions of what does not exist, pointing at what hitherto prevents it from becoming and thus starts a movement towards it. The lack of community forces people to invent their own imagined worlds by practices of writing, and these are no mere illusions but function as means of communication with others in interpretive communities: in theory you can develop being alone into meetings with others at a distance.[26]

This notion of theory, as a mediating force, is an effective response to late modern processes. It is autonomous and capable of operating according to its own internal and systemic logic. It creates time-space compression in its ability to separate and reconnect traditions. It generates and directs evolutionary movement. Its deployment requires both intentionality and critical depth if tradition, the 'problematized reproduction of intersubjective patterns,' is to be acknowledged and addressed. Fornas's proposal for a theory of resistance is thus a theory for theory. We must recognize theory at work when judgments concerning ethics, morals, or aesthetic well-formedness are entered into any discussion.

It is significant that this notion of theory insists on an experiential dimension. The sensual, emotional and intellectual, clearly differentiated in late modern life, are simultaneously called into play and recombined through this kind of mediation. It enables reflexive, symbolic communication that includes production of the material, spatial cultural domain. It is theory that salvages that necessity of the production of place, constituted through intradisciplinary acts of recombination, as essential for confronting the unsettling effects of late modern processes. Fornas tells us:

The temporal dimension may be contrasted with aspects of culture that are usually conceived in spatialized terms: the social spheres which simultaneously frame and enable cultural activities. The time-flows of modernization run into spatial spheres formed by order structures in the physical and social spaces of modernity: relatively fixed structures and institutions which, like sluices, delimit which human actions are possible. ...Cultural practices and communicative actions also move and transform the objectivized spatial frames within which they are born...[27]

It was a turn to cultural theory over 30 years ago that instilled self doubt into the legitimacy of our discipline's work in the world. It is a return to cultural theory today, that serves to remind us not only of the absolute, unequivocal necessity of architecture in the late modern world, but also begins to establish its primacy among cultural activities.

There are similar notions of theory making their way into architectural discourse. These need to be examined more closely if we are to truly rethink what we all really need to survive in this late modern world, where knowledge increases daily at dizzying speeds, and where alliances and entities, emerge, transform, and disappear,

sometimes in the blink of an eye. Michael Hay proposes one such notion of architectural theory:

Architecture theory's mediatory function releases unnoticed complicities and commonalities between different realities that were thought to remain singular, divergent, and differently constituted... The world is a totality, it is an essential and essentially practical problem of theory to rearticulate that totality, to produce concepts that relate the architectural fact with the social, historical and ideological subtexts from which it was never really separate to begin with.[28]

NOTES

[1]Sanford Kwinter, "La Citta Nuova: Modernity and Continuity," in Michael Hays, ed.. *Architecture Theory Since 1968* (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press), p. 607.

[2]Johan Fornas. *Cultural Theory & Late Modernity* (London: Sage Publications, 1995), p. 34.

[3]Ibid., p. 76.

[4]Ibid., pp. 18-31. See this section for his extensive discussion of these characteristics and their implications.

[5]Ibid., p. 57.

[6]Ibid., pp. 55-56.

[7]Ibid., pp. 56-57, 66-71.

[8]Ibid.. pp. 74-76.

[9]Ibid., p. 57.

[10]Ibid., p. 50.

[11]Ibid., p.136. Geertz, Clifford, *The Interpretation of Cultures*, p. 5.

[12]Ibid., p. 43. He states: "On the one hand there is a social modernization of norms, groups, relations and actual interaction forms. On the other hand, there is a cultural modernization of meaningful symbolic forms, both in everyday aesthetics and artistic practices."

[13]Ibid., p. 1.

[14]Ibid., pp. 50-55. See this section for his attempt at term clarification.

[15]Thomas R. Fisher. *In the Scheme of Things: Alternative Thinking on the Practice of Architecture*, p. 112-113.

[16]Fornas, p. 58.

[17]Ibid., p. 79. He states: "New social movements do not function like unitary subjects - they converge and crystallize as collective actions out of a plurality of different motives, perspectives and relations. New movements are more than ever giving attention to information and culture, as an expression of general late modern tendencies towards reflexivity, mediaization and aestheticization of politics, economy and daily life."

[18]Ibid., p. 74.

[19]Ibid., p. 61.

[20]Ibid., p. 61.

[21]Alberto Perez-Gomez, Architecture and the Crisis of Modern Science. Cambridge, Mass: MIT Press, p. 8.

[22]Fornas, p. 62.

[23]Ibid., p. 124.

[24]Ibid., p. 126.

[25]Ibid., p. 124.

[26]Ibid., p. 15.

[27]Ibid., p. 49.

[28]Michael Hays, "Introduction," *Architecture Theory Since 1968.* Cambridge, Mass: MIT Press, p. xi.