SPEAKEASY

An Architecture of Animal Spirits:
Contemporary Architecture and the Condition of the Avant-Garde Promise

Charissa N. Terranova

Even apart from the instability due to speculation, there is the instability due to the characteristic of human nature that a

> *large proportion of our positive activities depend on spontaneous optimism rather than on a mathematical expectation, whether moral or hedonistic or economic. Most, probably...our decisions to do something positive...can only be taken as a result of* animal spirits—of a spontaneous urge to action rather than inaction, and not as the outcome of a weighted average of quantitative benefits multiplied by quantitative probabilities.

—John Maynard Keynes[1]

New spirits are among us in the world of architecture today, ideological energies taking on a glossy sheen by way of their shift in position, the move from deep within to the surface, revealed and celebrated rather than repressed and denied. Not new in and of themselves, they are rather those forces constitutive of architecture immemorial: the immaterial lines of power converging in space to make matter out of abstraction, those elements that have always defined architecture. And here I mean the latest technology, urbanism and, more centrally, capitalism and the marketplace. No longer haunting or hovering like yesterday's *Zeitgeist* or specter of communism, they are Keynesian animal spirits running nimble-footed along planes of space and time, shaping and informing contemporary design pedagogies and practices, leaving them unencumbered by questions of moral responsibility, dogma or manifesto and happily shorn of concern for architecture's origin and future. Common to every human body, or so explained the English economist Keynes, animal spirits animate the individual in spontaneous economic decision, spurring the investor to take risk in the face of market uncertainty. In raw form it is the gambler's instinct; in architecture it is the cognizant and unrepentant will to design for a free market landscape. Pulsions giving rise to the new in architecture, these spirits transfigure any commitment to politics architecture may have once had, all but leaving in their wake the carrion of the avant-garde's threefold promise, that of critique, class consciousness and revolution.

Taking its form from data, such as demographic information from population profiles and consumer trends, the architecture of such spirits is willfully forgetful of history and thus defiant of traditional categories. It is multifarious, often taking form and appearance with little historic precedent beyond the most immediate project of the Office of Metropolitan Architecture; and it is hybrid, re-inventing "landscape" as an architectural trope, employed through undulating datums, both green and concrete, that manifest inside, around and atop vertical and horizontal architectural programs. And as such, it occupies well that fallen other of urban form, the predominant false-copy landscape of the decentralized city, known in its North American materialization as "urban sprawl," which, similarly difficult to categorize, has so challengingly called upon designers, theorists and historians to recalibrate the collective language of form and invention. The architecture of this landscape, at least by intention of its makers and users, harbors no promise, no political plan for a better tomorrow, no overt civic duty, and little or no collective concern. Blobs given infrastructure, landscape-cum-architecture, low-slung horizontality: it is architecture for the frontiers of big-box discount retailing; architecture that would, given the chance, blithely usurp the space of building; architecture of a certain individualism run amuck, each project an entity unto itself as though generated from schizophrenic machines of typology. It is an architecture born of pragmatism without apology or, in so many words, "functionalism without the dogma."[2]

Its fashion is new, but does it constitute an avant-garde? If we comprehend contemporary architecture's nonchalant rejection of past modes of resistance and ideological dogma as tantamount to choosing and taking a position, then, indeed, we enter the realm of avant-gardist practice. Yet the sense of "critique" in architecture, a politics of traditional leftist positions, has given way today to another stance, a position without conventional variables, or for that matter any such sense of critique. In point of fact, however, new design may provide a possibility for a new realm of criticality, arbitration of architecture's theoretical position premised on absence. Absent from the criticality of an architecture of economic flows is the moralism of past so-called leftist architectures: the highly regulated boundaries of what constitutes "proper" architecture, from histories of nationhood to cultural

traditions and institutional pedigree to the even more arbitrary notion of beauty. Shearing architecture of the avant-gardist political promise has thus been cause for emancipation, architecture's freedom from moral dogma and the strictures of history. Contemporary architecture, or, more precisely, what certain critics are calling architecture's current "avant-garde"[3] (and here I refer to design strategies emerging from the Netherlands), has been transformed by the marketplace yet again, seemingly shedding confrontation for ironic complaisance, resistance for wily capitulation. But this most recent configuration has proven to be its most radical, in its transformation well-nigh leaving behind those elements that had once seemed so integral to any such avant-garde, namely the aforementioned promise of political awakening mobilized by social collectivity. Further empowered by a certain Nietzschean free spirit, contemporary architecture gains on the spiritual front while losing its critical ballast: profiting from new market charges while leaving behind, or so it would seem, what in the recent past constituted architecture's claim to political engagement and criticality.[4] The ambiguity of this position indeed begs the question of both an avant-gardist and leftist architecture. Can there truly be avant-gardist architecture without a program for critique? Can there be a political architecture, moreover a politics of architecture, without the left? What follows is an attempt to articulate not only this new architecture, its design tactics, political positioning and whether it is in fact an avant-garde, but also the standing of politics in general within architecture, what in the past took form as "criticality" and "leftist" politics in architectural theory and practice.

The twentieth century was host to at least three moments of avant-garde play: the first occurring roughly between 1914 and 1933, what is now categorically called the "historic avant-garde;" second, the decade of the 1960s, the epoch of the so-called "neo-avant-garde;" and third, the protracted revolution of semiotics within architecture, emerging on the heals of those failed revolutionary attempts of the 1960s and reiterating itself through Post-Structuralism and Deconstruction into the 1990s. This third and final avant-garde – architectural theory in its latest and now canonized incarnation – signaled the first truly palpable intimations of a decline in the once grand expectations of the historic avant-garde, replacing once and for all *physique* with *morale* and, instead of revolution in the streets, opting for a polemics of the *boudoir*, that is, of language and the imagination. In short, semiotics promised to architecture a space of critical thinking and resistance, thereby marking a turn in avant-garde design practices, rather counter-intuitively, away from art's union with everyday life toward its autonomy and separation. While each of these appearances took on a different corpus, they share in common an adherence to belief: all three awaiting in earnest anticipation an

architecture conceived beyond the building singly, or, in so many words, the coming to fruition of a prescriptive world-view of which architecture was an integral part, from that elemental yet totalizing concept of "building" within the Bauhaus curriculum to the utopianism of nomadic living rampant in the design of the 1960s to the most oddly classical and humanist endeavor of all, the promise of silent critique offered by language and the individual mind during the 1980s and 90s, *logos* seen as architecture's last refuge. While the strategies of the avant-garde are by now well-known, it is helpful to return to them in the context of this trajectory, as what is revealed in passage is its incremental decline, or more succinctly, the slow withering away of the avant-garde promise.

To begin, there was the original promise of the historic avant-garde, activated by the tactic of Brechtian shock and resulting in the collapse, the proverbial *Aufhebung*, of art into life. This twofold strategy, what is in more general terms a praxis of "self-criticism," offered in return a series of greater transformations, beginning with the consciousness of class difference and division and ending with an engagement across this division, or ultimately a more totalizing sublation of international class revolution.[5] Yet it is with the former sublation, the devolution of art's position from high to low, from sacred and separate to integrated into everyday life, that we are witnesses to a pivotal shift in architecture's status. Architecture moved from being the subordinate "utilitarian" art among the Fine Arts to the *a priori* necessity of any artistic praxis within the avant-garde. From new uses of sidewalks and the cityscape to the colonization of space by sculpture and painting, architecture became the mise-en-scène of the avant-garde, at once art's new armature and defining element. This transfiguration found varying forms, in urban context with Russian agit-prop and the politics of art as lived event, through sculpture's inhabitation of architecture's residual space in Tatlin's corner reliefs, and with the advent of an altogether new genre, painting-becoming-sculpture-becoming-architecture in Lissitzsky's famous Proun room. Indeed this shift motivated many provocative and radically inventive new forms of art. More importantly, though, it revealed architecture's preeminent position as a vehicle of everyday life in classical avant-gardist strategies. Avant-gardist injunction has thus always been coeval with the primacy of architecture. In addition to this umbrella shift of, quite simply put, art into architecture, there were also those elemental changes within architecture proper, that is, the invention of new typologies and tweaking of classical typologies decidedly in the name of collectivity. And, once again, the list of avant-gardist invention is long and elaborate, from Moisei Ginzberg's early "social condenser," the Narkomfin apartment block, to Le Corbusier's creatively lucrative mimesis of Ginzberg, the *Unité d'habitation*, to a series of avant-garde theaters by Hans Poelzig, the

Vesnin Brothers, and Walter Gropius each of which, in very Brechtian fashion, reconfigures the stage from hierarchical proscenium to a centralized arena in which the stage and audience form a seamless continuity in space.

The revolution never came as promised and neither did class consciousness or the habituation en masse of self-critique. Instead, the practices of the European avant-garde were followed by the rise of a combined totalitarian front of fascism in Germany and Italy and communism in the Soviet Union and, later, years of stalemate Cold War politics and the institutionalization of avant-garde modernism as the International Style. All that remained of the historic avant-garde were a collection of dogmatic tracts, memories of the future, and objects once feral now recuperated as works of art by the museum. Yet for Hal Foster the ensuing political nightmare of World War II and the malaise of critical art practices characteristic of the post-war era are not evidence of the avant-garde's failure. Rather, this period marks but a prolonged gestation of the avant-garde, time that would climax in the birthing of a new, truer avant-garde: the neo-avant-garde of the 1960s. It would thus be with the neo-avant-garde that the avant-garde, following Foster's argument, "enacts its project for the first time." [6] The central concern of this new, acute and perhaps even more potent avant-garde, would be the criticism of art's institutions, the structures through which art is shot, allowing it to be conceived, made and seen. Once again, but now with even greater vengeance, the very definition of art came under fire as part of avant-garde strategy, further giving rise to a certain iconoclasm that conveniently proffered a many-sided critique, bringing into question everything from capitalism and the marketplace to the hegemony of curatorial expertise and the sense of vision. It would be from this vantage point, from within the hallowed space of the gallery, that the neo-avant-garde would stand against the grain, forming the latest embodiment of art disembodied, that is to say, an anti-art movement. The unraveling of art's physical object and critique of its institutional structures began with theater, both in the streets with happenings and in the gallery with minimalism's early incarnation as "primary structures." The turn to theatricality, much like the axiomatic avant-gardist turn to architecture, was constituted once again by art's sublation into those spaces contaminated by the functions of everyday life, each Aufhebung creating a separate and distinct form of art, from Richard Serra's early verbal works of "tearing" and "scattering" to Daniel Buren's decree to only do stripes in the gallery and on the street.

While this new avant-garde willfully focused on the gallery and museum in its critique, architecture, its spaces and form, once again became the linchpin of avant-garde strategy. Architecture's primacy within the neo-avant-garde manifested itself in and through the newfound importance of horizontality, in terms of art-as-event, assemblage, and both minimalist and pop sculpture, employing what Leo Steinberg called the "flat-bed picture plane." [7] Such horizontality made its presence felt in architecture proper, with the fantasy nomadism of Archigram, Archizoom, and SuperStudio, resistant architectural practices that designed purposefully impossible projects that were nevertheless reflective of the very real needs of new suburban landscapes, those areas of urban growth defined according to new speeds of obsolescence and rapid horizontal development. This transition from the vertical to horizontal plane was accompanied by a host of further shifts: from art conceived according to the primacy of rumination before painting hung on the wall to the lived event experienced in urban space; and from an autonomous art willfully deprived of politics to new situated practices that took part in a world of collective demonstration in the streets.

What ultimately did this second phase of the avant-garde promise? Like its forebear, using the same dialectical approach of the appropriation of the everyday and resistance to capitalism, it promised emancipation of the individual through the rejection of tradition, in this instance the institution and its marketplace trappings. And like its forebear, it was followed not by revolution but rather recuperation, assimilation and well-nigh reaction, the student demonstrations followed by a backlash of political conservatism and the fantastic architectural projects followed by a restoration of history as the antidote to crises within practice and pedagogy. Already here within this second phase of the avant-garde, there is evidence of its decline, the demobilization of the avant-garde program as a result of its marked focus on institutional critique, arguably a subtle means of fortifying the boundaries of art, its autonomy, while claiming to do precisely the opposite. The proposed push to integrate art into "everyday" life is one ideology among many, bestowing legitimacy upon the lowness of the everyday world by raising it to the level of art, rather than the inverse, as it is an object's or experience's status of "art" that makes it desirable and ultimately consumable. In a bizarre turn, sublation ultimately reveals its true colors as assimilation into the market place. A pattern is clearly emerging here, one that reveals the dialectical nature of the avant-garde, that it has internal to it a logic of self-destruction rooted in the very thing it seeks to resist, that is, the reification of resistance movements by way of that double-edged sword of recuperation, namely fashion and trend. [8]

The last attempt to resist such reification came in the form of words, by way of an architecture of the text. This most recent life of the avant-garde, while itself the result of a cross-pollination between various literary disciplines, was concerned with architecture alone, making no claims for the other media of the arts and shedding once and for all the dream of the Gesamtkuntswerk. Here I describe archi-

tectural theory's most recent chapter, now inscribed for us by the march of history according to the passing of those glory days of semiotics and the end of the language craze. In many ways following the lead of Conceptual Art with its dematerialized object, the discourse of architectural theory after 1968 marked the emergence of architecture without an object. Yet this new form of practice appeared without its object markedly *not* in the tradition of visionary architecture, as the latter phrase connotes architecture's unbuilt and unbuildable fantasies of a better world, its penchant for utopian projects from Ledoux and the so-called "revolutionary architects" to Constant and the dawning of the dream of the mega-structure. Rather, architectural theory was dystopian, instead of looking to the classical writings of reformist modernity, such as those of Fourier and Bentham, taking an alternative intellectual path beaten by Adorno's negative dialectics and hewn by a program of semiotics. Replacing the totalizing programs of past avant-gardes were thus the subtleties of critique: the imagination made passive yet militant, equipped with a fusillade of banter for an armchair revolution that signified the coming end of any such "critique."

It was semiotics that singularly offered to architecture a shortcut to criticism, the fast path to the dyadic critique of architectural modernism and its most forceful rhetorical tool, functionalism. The semiotic "death of the author" allowed new architecture, what would eventually be known as "postmodern design," to not only undermine the authority of modernism's creative genius but, furthermore, to disavow modernism's failed promise to deliver a better world through radically new form and collective living. Postmodern design displaced modernism by treating it merely as "style" shorn of concept and transformative value, using a combined tactic of seriality and mimesis, mocking modernism through repetition of its fragmented form. While the Saussurian thrust of synchrony in postmodern architecture fostered the displacement of modernism's primacy, toppling its position as original and authentic, semiotics oddly gave rise to a certain fanaticism over the diachronic, or what was within architecture the preoccupation with history and its convenient vehicle, typology.

In his pivotal 1969 introduction to *Five Architects*, Colin Rowe described the work of a new generation of architects, Peter Eisenman, Michael Graves, Charles Gwathmey, John Hejduk, and Richard Meier, announcing the irreparable schism between *physique* and *morale*, the split between avant-garde form and its rhetorical promise.[9] Emerging through this *décalage*, Rowe explained, was a series of new practices that, unlike their modernist predecessors, unabashedly looked to the past for formal precedent, the past in this instance generating a formal game based on semiotics and modernism's great "works." In the work of the "five architects," functionalist form constituted a

new batch of historicist fragments that, in a *jeu de mots* of architectural idiom and syntax, could be chosen either randomly or according to "deep structure" in order to construct the formal enunciations of a new generation. Markedly bereft from this new syntactic game of form making was architecture's promise of a better future. The promise of the architectural avant-garde, or rather its last vestige, located itself instead in the separate discourse of theory, in the autonomous realm of *morale*. It would be there that architecture's last stake in so-called criticism, its investment in critical practice, a politics of resistance and the morals of a proper architecture would be articulated. The diatribe of critical architecture lasted for some twenty-five years, from Alan Colquhoun's reasoned and pedantic call for "historicity" rooted in typological reference, evolving through Bernard Tschumi's hold-out for sensuous spaces of resistance within architecture's "paradoxes," to the twofold haunting of Deconstruction and representation so eloquently outlined for us by Mark Wigley.[10] What remains of this last avant-garde is but a faint haze of promise on the horizon, the crepuscular glow of piety and moralism in their final setting.

While the feeble glint of the promise flickers barely alight, a new architecture has sparked forth, a movement made cohesive by a series of qualities held in common. And here I refer to what might be called the Dutch "school" of design. To begin, and to reiterate a primary theme of this essay, the architects of this new form share a lack of interest in architecture's past promise to transform the world, on the whole assuming a position of silence, a stance made radical by way of its marked departure from architecture's moral volubility of the past. They make no claims to transform the world through the classical avant-gardist gesture of sublation, no longer relishing architecture's inherent embeddedness in the world. In a world where yesterday's questions of hierarchical validity – the battles between high and low art, avant-garde and kitsch – seem woefully obsolete, this architecture gleefully emerges from a plenum of the banal in which everything is already sublated and, in a rather ironic twist, crafts statistical information, that is, fashion and trend quantified into data, into often dazzling form.[11] Architecture's natural integration into the "lived world," its constituent "everyday" reality, warrant no commentary from designers today since all artistic practices emerge from the same abundance of the bland. To these new architects, everydayness makes no difference, whether political or not, and neither do questions of recuperation and selling-out. Everydayness constitutes reality, meaningful or not. As an architecture that refuses to position itself vis-à-vis the traditional parameters of the avant-garde, it announces not so much the "theory-death" of the avant-garde, a term that signifies the dialectical tension of self-criticism and destruction through recuperation characteristic of the historic and neo-

avant-gardes, but rather a moving beyond such past conceptions, thereby begging for an entirely new theory of the avant-garde.[12] If we have made the transition into a new world where the nation and the state cease to carry the authority they once did and in which the old terminology of class struggle, such as "proletariat" and "bourgeoisie," is no longer valid, then we have similarly arrived at the moment in which there should be a retooling of the very idea of the avant-garde.[13]

This is not to say that the new so-called avant-garde in architecture comes to us ex nihilo, without a genealogy specific to architecture. Rather this new "entrepreneurial-managerial" avant-garde forces a re-reading of modernism, a scrutiny that reveals to us architecture's other inherent quality, namely its birthing from the age-old promiscuity of commerce and design.[14] Furthermore, designating a correction of Colin Rowe's other pivotal essay, "The Chicago Frame," in which he located the origins of modern architecture's rarefied business ethos distinctly in North America, in the work of turn-of-the-century Chicago architects, the current economic ways of design, its capacity to go with the flows, have been bequeathed to today's architecture by a very European list of designers. In tracing the genealogy of the current avant-garde, I return first of all to the modernist idea of the "type," what was for Gropius and Mies *Typisierung* and for Le Corbusier the *objet-type*. Indeed, it is now clear to us that the development of the modernist type was but a manner to naturalize the standardized and machine-made component, thereby making it easier to negotiate in and palatable to the world of architecture, a space colonized for far too long by ideologies of handicraft and medieval guild organization. As such, it was architecture's manner of staking out a position in a new world of business and industry defined according to mass-production. The idea of "type" was itself inherited from the slightly earlier latent commodity fetishism of the German Werkbund, what was for Hermann Muthesius an instrument for the realization of his vision of art united with industry, a system of production in which every artist becomes a manager, every architect a technocrat. The seedbed for all such modernisms was planted and cultivated by the combined efforts of two European polemicists, Gottfried Semper and Viollet-le-Duc, the former in his re-reading of architecture's origins in terms of the applied arts, a convenient place indeed to find architecture's roots especially in light of an emergent industry of mass-produced art objects, and the latter in his advocacy of "structural honesty," another way of demanding forthright pragmatism, that quality so prevalent in contemporary practice. And finally, none of this would have been possible without the overarching ideas of Hegel, his philosophy that simultaneously made normative the new market place and spiritualized historical change in the industrial era through the invention of *Geist*, a term serving to obfus-

cate the real thrust of nominal "historic" change, namely technology. We see thus that there is nothing so radically new, at least ideologically speaking, about the pullulation of a new type of form in contemporary architecture based on the uncritical participation in the marketplace. But how this architecture begins to constitute an avant-garde is indeed another, much more difficult question to answer.

Coming primarily out of the Netherlands, the current school of progressive design articulates a new avant-gardist practice by way of two themes, urbanism and morality, the link further connecting them being pedagogy. In proffering a design strategy that does not merely take heed of contemporary decentralized urbanism, but generates new form from its very matter, through mimicry of its cheap material and an ironic contamination with its basic box, contemporary avant-gardist architecture assumes a new place in relationship to the traditional city and new forms of urban living. As a result the urban landscape of the decentralized city has become a legitimate topography on which to base design and in which to build architecture. This newfound legitimacy marks the displacement of the hegemony of historic typology based solely on European precedents, emerging from the idealization of the Italian city-republic, the English town and the nineteenth-century industrial center. Debunked in this displacement is the moral will to power that lay at the core of this hegemony, the castigation of landscapes of suburban sprawl as counterfeit urbanism. This new attitude toward such landscapes has introduced a concomitant amoralism into the spaces of pedagogy: the removal of limits inscribed by postmodernist historicism and the morals of typology and the emergence of a Dionysian profundity of production in which typology is reborn limitless and ad infinitum. In a related fashion we are witnesses to new approaches to making architecture at the earliest levels of instruction in studio, from basic mapping exercises rooted in the spatial possibilities of Elias Canetti's *The Crowd* to the more challenging programming of ornament, transforming the flat façade into three-dimensional inhabitable space, to a renaissance of process constituted by conceptual permutation, a turn toward data coupled with the refusal to make a building until the last moment possible.

Creating a funambulist architecture, the designers of this emergent avant-garde walk a fine line between cynical reason, or what Peter Sloterdijk calls "enlightened false consciousness," and kynicism, the practice of ironic laughter and, in a very proto-Nietzschean sense, resistance to the herd mentality modeled after the disposition of the ancient cynic, Diogenes. To elaborate, the advent of cynical reason marks the end of the hermeneutics of ideology critique. Classical ideology critique is structured according to a logic of surface and depth reading wherein "truth" may be disinterred from the ground of a false reality through an incisive critique, or deconstruction, of

the facades of power. For the first phase of the avant-garde, revolution was the vehicle of such ideology critique. Various bastions of the historic avant-garde offered emancipation through a critique of capital, such freedom being the ultimate truth gained from the transferal of power from the bourgeoisie to the proletariat and the ensuing transformation of capitalism to communism. Later, with the neo-avant-garde, we see Guy Debord developing a similar critique of capitalism that, while focusing on the new "commodity spectacle," was premised on a similar logic of ideology critique in that the spectacle was a false reality from which people could only be unleashed by way of messianic revolution. And finally the semiotic revolution in architecture purported to bring with it a certain hygienics of criticism: a preservation of those "critical" spaces of contemplation and freedom through the antisepsis of thought, criticism being the antidote to the corruption and corrosiveness of capitalism. In short, ideology critique proffers an economy of authenticity rooted in the conception of a metaphysical real that exists outside and beyond the grasps of our contaminated capitalist reality. From the classical avant-garde perspective, to live in a world of capitalism is to live an inauthentic and unreal life.

In contrast to these claims, practitioners of what Sloterdijk calls cynical reason, in this case, members of the proposed new architectural avant-garde, pose no resistance to the marketplace, instead willfully participating in the expansion of capital. They are indifferent to architectural meaning and representation traditionally conceived, that is, as they were once premised on the same depth-surface model as ideology critique. Theirs is an existence experienced through "enlightened false consciousness" because they know what they do and they do it anyway, without apology or compunction.[15] Cynicism is, however, not to be confused with kynicism, the ancient Greek prototype from which cynical reason grew. With kynicism we come full circle, arriving in conclusion at the place of animal spirits once again as the term "kynic" comes from the Greek word for dog, "kyon," and refers to the spirit of the philosopher Diogenes, who so indifferent to the concerns of his peers, wandered dirty and unshaven, urinating and masturbating in the public sphere as a mode of resistance to public 'decorum'. While sharing with the practitioners of cynical reason a certain indifference to the world, kynics are inherently resistant and questioning, taking as their model the "dog philosopher," Diogenes, challenging the public sphere "because it is the only space in which the overcoming of idealist arrogance can be meaningfully demonstrated."[16]

I would argue that the contemporary avant-garde negotiates the world of architecture through this prism, avant-garde designers practicing architecture according to the monstrous hybridity of cynical reason and kynical dirty materialism. In pedagogy and practice

this odd positioning habituates a surmounting of the metaphysics, or an "overcoming of idealist arrogance," of past avant-gardes and within former modes of pedagogy. And when practiced in the field, such architecture uses laughter to trump bad faith, kynicism to fool cynical reason. It is through the art of trumping that this architecture says nothing rhetorically and everything formally, commenting through *physique* rather than *morale*: through its artful appropriation of the banal box, corporate adjacency, and landscape references. While polished, endlessly new and even beautiful in appearance, this architecture is driven by the characteristically in-your-face raw stuff of animal spirits: what Keynes described as a "delicate balance of spontaneous optimism" that is animated by "the nerves and hysteria and even the digestions."[17] It is design that challenges that other, fallen public realm of the supposed non-city, sites of a post-civil society, making architecture in landscapes reserved for mere building, boldly drawing attention to the ugliness of what it is not.

WORKS CITED

Peter Bürger. *Theory of the Avant-Garde*. Trans. Michael Shaw. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1984.

Valéry Didelon. "The Netherlands – An Avant-Garde for Better or for Worse." *Werk Bauen Wohnen*. Vol. 10 (2001) 70-72.

Hal Foster. *The Return of the Real: The Avant-Garde at the End of the Century*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1996.

Sigfried Giedion. *Walter Gropius: Work and Teamwork*. New York: Reinhold Publishing Corporation,1954.

Hans Ibelings, Ed. *The Artificial Landscape: Contemporary Architecture, Urbanism and Landscape Architecture in the Netherlands*. Rotterdam, The Netherlands: NAi Publishers, 2000.

John Maynard Keynes. *The General Theory of Employment, Interest, and Money*. Amherst, NY: Prometheus Books, 1997.

Bart Lootsma. *Superdutch: New Architecture in the Netherlands*. New York: Princeton Architectural Press, 2000.

Paul Mann. *The Theory-Death of the Avant-Garde*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1991.

Roberto Marchionatti. "On Keynes' *Animal Spirits*." *Kyklos*. Vol. 52, 3 (1999) 415-440.

R.C.O. Matthews. "Animal Spirits." *Proceedings of the British Academy*. Vol. 70 (1984) 209-229.

Friedrich Nietzsche. *Human, All Too Human: A Book for Free Spirits*. Trans. R. J. Hollingdale. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 1986.

—————. *Philosophical Writings*. Eds. Reinhold Grimm and Caroline Molina y Vedia. New York: Continuum Publishing, 1995.

Wayne Parsons. *Keynes and the Quest for a Moral Science: A Study of Economics and Alchemy*. Cheltenham, UK: Edward Elgar Publishing, 1997.

Colin Rowe. "Introduction." *Five Architects*. New York: Wittenborn & Company, 1972. 3-6.

Andreas Ruby. "From the Avant-Garde to the Arrière-Garde and Back Again." *Werk Bauen Wohnen*. Vol. 10 (2001) 72-76.

O. A. Shvidkokvsky, Ed. *Building in the USSR, 1917-1932*. London: Blue Star House, 1971.

Peter Sloterdijk. *Critique of Cynical Reason*. Trans. Michael Eldred. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1987.

Michael Speaks. "Tales from the Avant-Garde: How the New Economy is Transforming Theory and Practice." *Architectural Record*. Vol. 188, 12 (Dec. 2000) 74-77.

NOTES

[1]Keynes, John Maynard, *The General Theory of Employment, Interest, and Money* (New York: Prometheus Books, 1997) 161.

[2]See Bart Lootsma, *Superdutch: New Architecture in the Netherlands* (New York: Princeton Architectural Press, 2000) and Hans Ibelings, *The Artificial Landscape: Contemporary Architecture, Urbanism, and Landscape Architecture in the Netherlands* (Rotterdam: NAi Publishers, 2000).

[3]See Michael Speaks, "Tales from the Avant-Garde: How the Economy is Transforming Theory and Practice," *Architectural Record*, Vol. 188, 12 (Dec. 2000) 74-77 and Valéry Didelon, "The Netherlands – An Avant-Garde for Better or for Worse," *Werk Bauen Wohnen*, Vol. 10 (2001) 70-72.

[4]Nietzsche, Friedrich, *Human, All Too Human: A Book for Free Spirits*, trans. R. J. Hollingdale (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1986) 393.

[5]Bürger, Peter, *Theory of the Avant-Garde*, trans. Michael Shaw (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1984) 20-27.

[6]Foster, Hal, *The Return of the Real: The Avant-Garde at the End of the Century* (Cambridge: MIT Press, 1996) 20.

[7]Steinberg, Leo, *Other Criteria: Confrontations with Twentieth-Century Art* (London: Oxford University Press, 1975) 82-91.

[8]Mann, Paul, *The Theory-Death of the Avant-Garde* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1991) 20-21.

[9]Rowe, Colin, "Introduction," *Five Architects* (New York: Wittenborn & Company, 1972) 6.

[10]See Alan Colquhoun, "Introduction: Modern Architecture and Historicity" and "Typology and Design Method," *Essays in Architectural Criticism: Modern Architecture and Historical Change* (Cambridge: MIT Press, 1983) 11-19; 43-50; Bernard Tschumi, "The Architectural Paradox" in K. Michael Hays, ed. *Architectural Theory Since 1968* (Cambridge: MIT Press, 1999) 218-228; and Mark Wigley, *Derrida's Haunt* (Cambridge: MIT Press, 1993).

[11]Speaks, 76-77; Didelon, 71-72; Ruby, Andreas, "From the Avant-Garde to the Arrière-Garde and Back Again," *Werk Bauen Wohnen*, Vol. 10 (2001) 74.

[12]Mann, 92-109.

[13]See Ulrich, Beck, Anthony Giddens, Scott Lash, et. al., *Reflexive Modernization: Politics, Tradition and Aesthetics in the Modern Social Order* (Cambridge: Oxford University Press, 1994).

[14]Speaks, 77.

[15]Sloterdijk, 5.

[16]Sloterdijk, 105.

[17]Keynes, 162.