

# Critical Positions in Search of Postmodernity

Gabrielle Schaad  
and Torsten Lange

The journal *archithese* may have started as the modest mouthpiece of a professional association with headquarters in central Switzerland. But already with its first issues it was able to attract an impressive range of international contributors. Moreover, it quickly achieved critical acclaim beyond national borders. Running from 1971 to 1976 under its founding editor, Stanislaus von Moos, the periodical drew, on the one hand, from the tradition of little magazines of the 1920s and 1930s avant-garde. On the other hand, it departed from the speculative outlook of late 1960s radical architecture magazines.<sup>1</sup> In doing so, it prepared the ground for a more substantial shift of focus in architectural discourse: from criticizing technocratic visions (e.g., of modernist urban planning) to revisiting and mining modern concepts with an astute sensibility for the historicity of form and meaning. In this vein, the magazine featured articles that tackled topics from the seventeenth to the twentieth centuries and covered politically relevant topics from architectural pedagogy to the impact of grassroots movements on urban planning. In its visual aesthetic, the magazine's layout differed from the provocative, comic, and pop aesthetic of its radical precursors in Italy and the United Kingdom, like *Casabella* and *Architectural Design*. Still, the collisions between different sets of typographies and the deployment of images as argumentative evidence rather than glossy project illustrations gave *archithese* a fresh and playful appeal.

Well before postmodernism crystallized into a set of clearly distinguishable architectural gestures in the 1980s, the positions laid out on the magazine's pages responded to the (post-)1968 condition. They each wrestled with the consequences of postwar socioeconomic and political upheaval: urbanization and environmental crisis, social diversification, and the questioning of welfare state interventionism, as well as Cold War politics and decolonization, to name but a few. Rather than drawing on a common theoretical basis, most featured authors shared an interest in the polysemy of architectural form. Their readings of buildings and cities as layered cultural expressions drew from established and novel interpretive frameworks, ranging from history to aesthetics, phenomenology, literary theory, politics, and sociology. The new sociological approach, in particular, was applied not only to "high" architecture but also to the less spectacular everyday phenomena that make up the built environment.

### **Postmodernism vs. Postmodernity**

In this publication, we deliberately use the term *postmodernity* instead of *postmodernism*. In recent years, historians, curators, and architects have begun to critically interrogate and historicize postmodernism both as style and concept. In their far-ranging review exhibition cutting across the arts, design, and popular culture, *Postmodernism: Style and Subversion, 1970–1990* (Victoria and Albert Museum, September 2011–January 2012), curators Glenn Adamson and Jane Pavitt abridge postmodernism as a set of "gestures [that] marked a moment in the long trajectory of dissatisfaction, beginning in the early 1960s, with the commercial and institutional mainstreaming of the Modern Movement."<sup>2</sup> Answering Hal Foster's question from 1985, whether postmodernism was "a matter of local style or a whole new period or economic phase," they argue that it is best understood as a contested territory, hybrid style, and peripheral practice.<sup>3</sup> While they present interiors and furniture of late-1970s Italian radical design as one of postmodernism's multiple points of origin, they also see its rapid global spread beyond such regional manifestations in the ability to forge new

relations between “late capitalist, post-Fordist service culture” and “localized, specialist and traditional forms of production,” establishing the “subversive entrepreneur” as a type of (un)disciplined practitioner.<sup>4</sup> Moreover, the dissatisfaction with a (techno-)utopian spirit that underpinned many modernist — and even some of the radical — projects further propelled the “unthinking of utopia” that Reinhold Martin deems one of the characteristics of postmodernism.<sup>5</sup>

Especially on this last point, *archithese* takes a slightly different angle. While its thematic plurality and semiological approach place it squarely within postmodernism’s interest in difference and meaning, the periodical’s take on modernity and modernism appears far less clear. Of course, such generalizations are inherently tricky, given the distributed nature of the magazine’s production and, thus, the lack of a unified editorial line. Nevertheless, instead of simply denouncing twentieth-century modernist utopias, many of the contributors turned to their (pre)history to unearth overlooked potentials in all too easily dismissed projects. At the same time, they also addressed problematic aspects such as these projects’ universal claims, their polemic (at times bombastic) tone, technocratic gestures, political opportunism, and links to colonial violence.

In its early years, the editors and authors of *archithese* were thus less intent on setting a specific formal agenda or promoting a postmodern style out of discontent with modernism. Rather than focus solely on present-day architectural production, they sought to establish a forum that would allow them to reflect critically on the historical and theoretical dimensions of recent sociospatial developments. This differed from viewing history as a precedent for creative practice (e.g., by establishing historical, formal, programmatic, or typological references). Instead, architectural history and iconography were often mobilized in *archithese* to comment on the architectural output of the time. As a result, difference and repetition came into play not only when authors turned to questions of historic preservation and reconstruction but also in the transfer and translation of North American discourse — for example, regarding the aesthetics of the everyday, pop culture, or suburban sprawl — to the context

of Switzerland, with its diverging geographic scale and cultural traditions. Because of this critical-inquisitive rather than polemical-assertive character, we have chosen the term *postmodernity* instead of *postmodernism* as a header for this reader.

Thinkers like Jean-François Lyotard, Fredric Jameson, and Zygmunt Bauman view the postmodern as a discursive formation and an economic and geopolitical condition that collapses familiar notions of historical time and geographically distinct locations. Egyptian literary theorist Ihab Hassan further defines *postmodernity* “as a world process, by no means identical everywhere yet global nonetheless.” “The term,” he continues, acts “as a vast umbrella under which stand various phenomena: postmodernism in the arts, poststructuralism in philosophy, feminism in social discourse, postcolonial and cultural studies in academe, but also multinational capitalism, cybertechnologies, international terrorism, assorted separatist, ethnic, nationalist, and religious movements.”<sup>6</sup> This world process follows a “cultural logic,” as Jameson would say, and leads to a situation where the logic of capital pervades all aspects of life and thought.<sup>7</sup> However, while Jameson’s totalizing critique of postmodernism emphasizes the dystopia of presentness, with its hollowing out of the past and total commodification of historical traces, Hassan’s use of the term *postmodernity* strikes a less pessimistic chord by embracing difference. When we adopt Hassan’s notion here, we deem it more inclusive by shifting the frame from the cultural sphere — postmodernism’s connection to technologically advanced and media-driven consumer societies — to the realm of geopolitics, where conflict-laden processes of globalization and localization play out simultaneously. The contemporary world in flux, with its crisis of cultural and personal identities mirrored in its infancy on the pages of *archithese*, contributes to historical introspection and epistemic self-reflexivity. Hence, postmodernity is connected to the ethicopolitical challenge of working with and from difference, even at the risk of conflict, of recognizing distinctions, and “cultivat[ing] a keener, livelier, more dialogical sense of ourselves in relation to diverse cultures, diverse natures, the whole universe itself.”<sup>8</sup>

## Critical Positions

*archithese* was founded in 1971 as a more discourse-oriented version of the already existing bulletin of the Fédération Suisse des architectes indépendants (Association of Independent Swiss Architects, FSAI) on the initiative of the association's president, Hans Reinhard. His motivation was to cultivate current architectural and planning debate instead of primarily reflecting professional politics and concerns. In contrast to the more academically oriented Bund Schweizer Architekten (Union of Swiss Architects), the FSAI represented the interests of smaller architectural practices without an explicit cultural agenda. The founding editorial team of the bilingual German-French journal consisted of the art historian von Moos, who had been a casual friend of Reinhard's; von Moos's wife, Irène von Moos, as a translator; and the French-Swiss architecture journalist Jean-Claude Widmer. The association provided a modest budget; hence, hiring the professional designer Paul Diethelm and working with a large printing press (Imprimeries Réunies Lausanne) quickly broke the cost ceiling. The *archithese* experiment thus almost failed within a year due to a lack of funding.

In its first year of publication, *archithese* with its four thematically open issues met with a certain skepticism, if not resistance—the political thrust of contributions challenged the sensibilities of many architects in “neutral” Switzerland. Thanks to Reinhard's mediation and persuasion efforts, however, a “relaunch” succeeded in 1972 under changed auspices. The journal redefined itself as a “publication series,” with each issue highlighting a specific topic from multiple angles. In the second issue of the original run, Reinhard, the president of the FSAI, had defined the journal's mission as pluralistic. The “neutrality” of the association was thus transferred to *archithese* by Reinhard as a mission of openness to diversity of opinion, an approach persistently followed in the journal's subsequent years by the editor-in-chief von Moos. This was also the moment when Niggli Verlag, Teufen, known for its architecture and typography books, entered the stage. To redefine the journal as a publication series had been Arthur Niggli's idea. Through 1976, the Niggli/

von Moos team produced twenty issues in the handy brochure format that would become the trademark of the journal's formative years under Diethelm's initial graphic lowercase "archithese." Von Moos, in dialogue with Niggli, more or less single-handedly managed the magazine for five years, overseeing not only the editorial work but also the graphic design. In 1977, the merger with the long-established magazine *werk*, whose editor-in-chief, Lucius Burckhardt, had left, offered the opportunity to enlarge *archithese's* readership and overcome its financial hardships. *werk.archithese* was coedited with Diego Peverelli from 1977 to 1979. Since 1980, the journal has existed under its original name with changing editors.<sup>9</sup>

In its founding phase, *archithese* held a unique position in the European landscape of architectural publications due to its focus on an often sociologically informed architectural criticism that drew from historical and theoretical scholarship — as opposed to dry professional debate, architects' self-promotion, or pure scholarly writing. From today's perspective, the field of architectural criticism of the time appears more heterogeneous. The magazine presented a plurality of voices, all of whom were, in different ways, "in search of postmodernity." Among these were architects Gian Piero Frassinelli of Superstudio, Rem Koolhaas, Bruno Reichlin, and Denise Scott Brown; sociologists such as Henri Lefebvre and Eliane Perrin; and architectural historians and critics including Rosemarie Bletter, Franziska Bollerey, André Corboz, Charles Jencks, and Manfredo Tafuri.

### **Establishing a Transatlantic Dialogue**

Architectural historian Léa-Cathrine Szacka writes that by 1980 the "distant realities" that European and American traditions still represented in the 1970s had "converged into a global architectural culture."<sup>10</sup> We deem *archithese* one of the means and media producing this transatlantic dialogue; it was a "medium on the move." Among its "material conditions" of production, we may count, for example, increased mobility through transatlantic flight, job opportunities in the United

States, and emerging friendships and professional networks between scholars and architects — notably, the connection between von Moos and Venturi, Scott Brown. Articles that testify to this were written, for example, by Swiss architects and historians who either worked or held teaching positions in North America, including von Moos himself, as well as Corboz, Kurt W. Forster, and Niklaus Morgenthaler. Furthermore, the global spread of American pop and consumer culture, as well as petro-modernity, across all scales of the built environment meant that familiar models of the “old” and “new” world were becoming increasingly obsolete. Thus, recent spatial phenomena and their architectural manifestations — suburbanization, urban sprawl, shopping malls, etc.— visible on both sides of the big pond could be brought into productive dialogue. The cross-fertilizing effects of personal mobility surface in similar lines of thought and features when comparing *archithese* to the later-founded *Oppositions* (1973–1984). If *archithese* was not imbedded in an institutional context, *Oppositions* famously emerged from the discursive constellations at Peter Eisenman’s Institute for Architecture and Urban Studies in New York. Both periodicals shared a “provenance being neither academic nor professional.”<sup>11</sup> *Oppositions*’ orientation could be termed “strongly European” because it covered “several major currents of contemporary European discourse, mainly the ideological, Marxist oriented Frankfurt school and the more linguistically oriented French structuralist school.”<sup>12</sup> *archithese* had ventured into similar terrain a few years earlier. Thus, we might call it the European “cousin” thanks to its orientation toward U.S. architecture culture.

Another context was that of Italy. During his research stays at the Istituto Svizzero di Roma, von Moos was exposed to publications produced and distributed between Venice, Florence, and Rome and established contacts with colleagues — among them Tafuri. From the mid-1970s, the outspoken Marxist architectural historian contributed several articles to *archithese*. Before that, Tafuri was strongly associated with the short-lived Italian *Contropiano: Materiali Marxistici* (1968–1971), which had escaped von Moos’s attention. It was founded by Alberto Asor Rosa, Massimo Cacciari, and Antonio Negri. The journal’s editors

treated architecture and the city as a field of political *operaist* analysis, among other theoretical (or perhaps better, dialectical) dissections of literature and film. The journal was an important outlet for members of the newly formed Institute of History at the Istituto Universitario di Architettura di Venezia, Venice's architecture school. Its decidedly political stance stands in sharp contrast to the pluralist approach of *archithese*. Yet, this did not stop authors like Tafuri, Giusi Rapisarda, and Francesco Dal Co from presenting their views on its pages.

Apart from *Contropiano*, there were other periodicals whose thematic focus resonates with that of *archithese* but with whom direct exchange cannot be tracked. Briefly looking at these examples strengthens the argument that the discursive affinities were transatlantic, while the vicinity of the European publishing context yielded surprisingly fewer intersections.

In Germany, assistants and students at Stuttgart University's Institute for the Foundations of Modern Architecture and Design (Institut für Grundlagen der modernen Architektur und Entwerfen), founded in 1967 by Jürgen Joedicke, kickstarted the journal *ARCH+*. Its initial objective was to ground architecture in scientific criteria. In the 1970s, the agendas of *ARCH+* and *archithese* grew close, as *ARCH+* based its systems thinking approach on the cybernetically underpinned semiotics of Max Bense, Horst Rittel, and Christopher Alexander. The attention to social movements in architecture and urbanism pops up in several monographic issues of *archithese*. However, for *ARCH+*, its sociopolitical agenda, bolstered by Marxist theory, became an increasingly defining characteristic that eventually differentiated it once again from *archithese*'s pluralist stance.

Because *archithese* appeared throughout its run in a bilingual format (French and German), its lack of reception in the French architectural discourse of the time — prominently featured in the journal *utopie* — is equally surprising. Other than Henri Lefebvre's early contribution in conversation with *archithese*'s Lausanne-based founding coeditor Widmer, we search in vain for overlaps among the two journal's contributors. In terms of topics, the historical approach to utopia as a "no-place" (*ou-topos*) rather than a "good place" (*eu-topos*), which Craig



Buckley describes as characteristic of the “cautionary tales” presented in the French periodical’s first issue (1968), could be considered a point of intersection.<sup>13</sup> Examples from *archithese* that resonate with this reading are Martin Fröhlich and Martin Steinmann’s article dealing with Karl Moser’s 1930s plan for a modernist rebuilding of Zurich’s old town or Franziska Bollerey and Kristiana Hartmann’s discussion of socialist utopias (e.g., by Charles Fourier).<sup>14</sup>

When we consider *archithese* against its immediate backdrop of the discursive landscape within Switzerland, a similar tendency for dissociation can be observed. This is most noticeable in the (non)relationship between *archithese* and the Institute for the History and Theory of Architecture (gta) within the architecture school of the Swiss Federal Institute of Technology, ETH Zurich, founded four years before the journal in 1967.<sup>15</sup> While some of its members contributed and later even became coeditors of the journal, *archithese* always remained independent of, and coexisting with, the gta Institute. The latter distinguished itself through its “rainbow series” of publications issued by Birkhäuser Verlag. In 1970, von Moos criticized the institute’s series of publications as a medium whose contemporary graphic design surpassed the modernity of the methods and academic style it represented.<sup>16</sup> *archithese* can be understood as an unconscious commentary on these gta publications. With its iconographic and monographic features, it complemented and occasionally countered the more formalist approaches to architectural theory and the historical topics championed by scholars from the architecture department.<sup>17</sup> Perhaps it was precisely this original attitude that turned *archithese* into a compass for interested architecture students at ETH, as Ruth Hanish has noted.<sup>18</sup>

At times, *archithese* also consciously held up a mirror to Switzerland’s leading architecture school. For example, it published an issue dedicated to the politics of higher education. Moreover, in 1971, it offered a platform to the collective formed around the infamously expelled guest lecturer Jörn Janssen to present the sociological and anti-capitalist thrust of their bottom-up seminar analyzing the operations of Swiss general contractor Goehner.

## Thematic Axes

The articles chosen for translation and republication in *archithese reader: Critical Positions in Search of Postmodernity* were selected from the four issues of the first series in 1971 and from issues one to twenty of the “magazine in the form of a publication series” published by Niggli from 1972 to 1976. Several among these miniature monographs were curated by guest editors who drew on their scholarly and professional networks. The monographs form a series of relatively hermetically themed issues. However, specific topics such as history and preservation, housing, American architecture and planning, urbanism, realism, and the metropolis feature across multiple issues. Recontextualizing the articles by combining them under a series of contemporary keywords opens the arguments in the source material to readings in the present, allowing us not only to assemble a digest of the periodical and point to thematic strands but also to acknowledge the farsightedness of the selected contributions, highlighting their continued relevance without overlooking their areas of weakness.

From today’s perspective, the difference in vocabulary and tone—the audacity of the arguments—in the translated sources assembled here is immediately apparent. In a few instances, the originals presented challenges to the translator, but overcoming them granted additional insight into their historicity. Our argument that *archithese* had, in many ways, a visionary character is supported by the fact that several featured articles or early versions of them grew into volumes that became milestones in architectural historiography and criticism. Examples include Koolhaas’s article “Roxy, Noah, and Radio City Music Hall,” published in issue 18 (1976) and later turned into a chapter in *Delirious New York* (1978), or Tafuri’s contribution to issue 20 (1976) titled “New Babylon,” which was later revised and extended for his *La sfera e il labirinto* (1980; translated into English as *The Sphere and the Labyrinth* in 1987). Where (partial) translations existed, we carefully integrated them with the earlier versions’ not-yet-translated parts. The book highlights these textual hybrids by referencing the sources.

To highlight texts whose approach to crucial questions in postmodernist discourse is relevant to present-day analysis,

we introduced new thematic axes. They are reflected in the section titles, offering a lens onto discursive arenas, as suggested by the specific case studies in this section. Five critical historiographic essays contextualize the reprinted articles, considering and reflecting on their continued relevance.

The first section, “Historicity and Meaning,” dissects the multiple ways *archithese* engaged the past and the practice of history. As Marie Theres Stauffer points out, during the second half of the twentieth century, history gained significance within international architectural debates. Yet, despite forming a common reference point, no consensus was achieved around this new appreciation of historicity. In fact, how the past was mobilized depended on an author’s disciplinary and cultural background. Debates about the relationship between old and new stood side-by-side with the embrace of heritage protection and calls for preserving historic buildings, neighborhoods, and old towns. These were paralleled by criticism of the modern movement’s alleged ahistoricism and break with history—even if those critiques followed a similar logic of historical cycles to argue for a postmodern rupture. The articles presented in this section share the architectural interest, especially among those following Rossi, in the permanence of autonomous form.

This thread is taken up in section two, “Realism and Autonomy.” Just as *archithese*’s authors shared no single definition of history, the much-discussed notion of realism also eluded stable meaning. As Irina Davidovici stresses in her introductory essay, any appeal to a universal notion of “reality” has been eclipsed by the recognition of (epistemic) difference and the embrace of multiple perspectives, an approach that germinated in the 1970s with thinkers like Lyotard. Post- and decolonial scholars in the humanities, such as Dipesh Chakrabarty and Walter D. Mignolo, have since expanded this position. These pluriversal realities can no longer be contained within the synthetic notion of “realism” championed by the editors of *archithese* in issues dedicated to the theme. The divergent realities and, hence, competing notions of realism upheld on either side of the Atlantic—represented in the journal through figures such as Scott Brown and Venturi versus Rossi—were a harbinger of this fractured

perspective. Moreover, revisiting this discourse exposes a paradox: a shared and constitutive aspect of the various appeals to realism in architecture is its idealism, the very thing realism claims to counter.<sup>19</sup>

The third section, “Urbanism and Consumption,” charts and unpacks the intense, multidisciplinary debates concerning the city and urban planning from the early to mid-1970s. The array of positions assembled in *archithese* testifies to the palpable sense of crisis that large-scale modernist planning had encountered since the mid-1960s and to which these new perspectives — ranging from sociology to critical theory, history, economics, psychology, and literature/fiction — sought to respond. Using various means, from critical historical analysis to design speculation, the new perspectives confronted a perception that utopian ideals had been exhausted and that the underlying myths of modernity needed to be deconstructed. In hindsight, the articles furthermore reveal the late capitalist shift from the modern industrial metropolis to the postmodern global city and its role in novel forms of flexible accumulation, linked foremost to cities’ increasing culturalization during the past fifty years, a process having two dimensions: first, a transition to new forms of production, with culture and immaterial labor at their heart; second, the city as a cultural object — visible, for instance, in the revitalization of historical inner cities or the blending of past and present in urban image making and place marketing.

The commentary on the texts assembled in “Use and Agency” assesses the various ways authors evaluated a transition from the imagined, normed, and relatively passive figure of the unmarked user of buildings and urban infrastructures to active “citizen participation” in architecture — at a time when large-scale social housing projects were, despite their social agenda, being criticized primarily for their reductive molding of everyday routines. Recall Jencks’s preface to *The Language of Postmodern Architecture* (1977), conflating the “death of modern architecture” with the destruction of the social housing complex Pruitt Igoe in St. Louis, Missouri, in 1972.<sup>20</sup> The section illuminates the potentials and pitfalls of emancipatory initiatives,

open-process planning, participation, and citizen activism. It shows that the *archithese* authors not only destabilized the position of architects as prescient planners but even questioned their ability to shape the use and adaptation of buildings. The social criticism of the time covered a wide range of differing, if not dissonant positions, from open criticism of the capitalist (building) economy on the one hand to the celebration of the everyday that the work of Venturi and Scott Brown represented on the other. Acknowledging the expansion of architectural discourse today—that is, architecture becoming an increasingly transdisciplinary, diverse, and inclusive field—this section critically renders the question of “agency” in architecture against the backdrop of larger emancipatory struggles and initiatives around and after 1968.

“Territory and Shelter” testifies to geopolitical aspects in the debates around housing in various cultural and climatic settings and characterizes the spatial discrimination and violence ingrained in modern architecture. Critically situating the early 1970s texts and their contents, Samia Henni argues that coloniality went hand in hand with modernity as a project of spatial expansion and domination. She goes on to question whether *postmodernity* amounted to *postcoloniality*, especially when looking, for example, at the establishment of the United Nations Human Settlements Program (UN-Habitat). In her commentary, Henni draws connections among the disparate phenomena explored by the sources in this final section, from “informal settlements” over immigrant worker housing to the architecture of military fortifications. She shows how architecture, buildings, and other constructed environments could be weaponized against people who were otherwise praised for their nonspecialized constructions or worked as subaltern minorities in the building industry during the explosion of urban renewal projects in the 1970s across many countries globally.

This book is the work of many minds and hands. After picking up the threads laid out in journal articles historicizing *archithese*, we began to consider the seminal role of *archithese* as a critical medium within the Swiss architectural landscape,

particularly within the frame of the “Critical Issues” seminar we cotaught at the gta Institute, ETH Zurich in 2018.<sup>21</sup> Our thanks go to the students who contributed to this course and whose ideas helped shape the inquiries that led to this publication. From the outset, we were lucky enough to have the journal’s founding editor, von Moos, at reach for questions and advice on the project. From this close collaboration sprang an extensive conversation about the early years of the journal, which is also included in this volume. The content and selection of source material took shape in a joint workshop with contributing authors Davidovici, Henni, and Stauffer in the summer of 2019. We thank them for their invaluable work. The workshop itself was conducted with the support of Blanka Major, Lisa Maillard, and Ina Stammberger. Later, Erich Scháli helped research and prepare the original texts for translation. Tracing and reconstructing the publication histories of the twenty-five original articles would have been impossible without their help. We also thank Sara Finzi-Longo and Michael Gnehm for their assistance. The final manuscript was reviewed by Ákos Moravánszky, whom we thank for his generous feedback and suggestions. Nina Paim and Eliot Gisel were key partners in the making of the book, thanks to their sensitive graphic concept. Finally, our thanks go to Andrea Wiegelmann of Triest Verlag, our publisher, who has supported and guided the project from day one.

- 1 See *CLIP/STAMP/FOLD: The Radical Architecture of Little Magazines, 196X to 197X* (New York: Actar; Princeton, NJ: Media and Modernity Program, Princeton University, 2010).
- 2 See *Postmodernism: Style and Subversion, 1970–1990*, exh. cat., ed. by Glenn Adamson and Jane Pavitt (London: V & A Publishing, 2011), 15.
- 3 *Ibid.*, 13.
- 4 *Ibid.*, 14.
- 5 Reinhold Martin, *Utopia's Ghost: Architecture and Postmodernism, Again* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2010).
- 6 Inhab Habib Hassan, "From Postmodernism to Postmodernity: The Local/Global Context," *Philosophy and Literature* 25, 1 (2001): 1–13, here 3.
- 7 Fredric Jameson, *Postmodernism, or, the Cultural Logic of Late Capitalism* (London: Verso, 1991).
- 8 Hassan, "From Postmodernism to Postmodernity" (see note 6), 13.
- 9 Hubertus Adam, "40 JAHRE ARCHITHESE," *archithese* 4 (2011): 38–43.
- 10 Léa-Catherine Szacka, *Exhibiting the Postmodern: The 1980 Venice Architecture Biennale* (Venice: Marsilio, 2016), 83.
- 11 Joan Ockman, "Resurrecting the Avant-Garde: The History and Program of Oppositions," in *EAV—Enseignement architecture ville 10* (Versailles: École d'architecture Versailles, 2004/2005), 31–44.
- 12 *Ibid.*
- 13 See Craig Buckley, "Introduction: The Echo of Utopia," in *utopia: Texts and Projects 1967–1978*, ed. Craig Buckley, Jean-Louis Violeau, and Jean-Marie Clark, 9–21 (New York: Semiotext(e); Random House, 2011), 16.
- 14 Martin Fröhlich and Martin Steinmann, "Zürich, das nicht gebaut wurde," *archithese* 3 (1972): 25–33; Franziska Bollerey and Kristiana Hartmann, "Collective Housing: Theories and Experiments of the Utopian Socialist Robert Owen (1771–1851) and Charles Fourier (1772–1837)," 252–71 in this publication, first published *archithese* 8 (1973): 15–26.
- 15 According to Sylvia Claus, the founding of the gta Institute is emblematic of a more significant trend to establish research centers for history and theory within schools of architecture in Italy, Germany, and the United States circa 1967–1968. See Sylvia Claus, "Phantom Theory: The gta Institute in Postmodernist Architectural Discourse," *gta papers* 3 (2019): 121–35, here 121.
- 16 Stanislaus von Moos, "Schriftenreihe des Instituts für Geschichte und Theorie der Architektur an der ETH Zürich," *Zeitschrift für Schweizerische Archäologie und Kunstgeschichte* 27, 4 (1970): 236–43, here 236.
- 17 See Adolf Max Vogt, "Die französische Revolutionsarchitektur und der Newtonismus," *SD, aus: Stil und Ueberlieferung in der Kunst des Abendlandes I* (1967): 229–32; Colin Rowe and Robert Slutzky, *Transparenz*, trans. Bernhard Hoesli (Basel: Birkhäuser, 1968).
- 18 Ruth Hanisch and Steven Spier, "History Is Not the Past but Another Mightier Presence: The Founding of the Institute for the History and Theory of Architecture (gta) at the Eidgenössische Technische Hochschule (ETH) Zurich and Its effects on Swiss Architecture," *The Journal of Architecture* 14, 6 (2009): 655–686, here 669.
- 19 In 1977, von Moos had already made forays into this topic in *werk.archithese*. Stanislaus von Moos, "Zweierlei Realismus," *werk.archithese* 7–8 (1977): 58–62.
- 20 Charles Jencks, *The Language of Postmodern Architecture* (New York: Rizzoli, 1977).
- 21 See Marie Theres Stauffer, "Geschichte der Archithese: Kontexte der neueren Schweizer Architektur," *Kunst + Architektur in der Schweiz*, 55, 4 (2004): 6–14; Stanislaus von Moos interviewed by Hubertus Adam and Hannes Mayer, "Architektur und Architekturkritik," *archithese* 4 (2011): 48–51.

# Acknowledgments

The publisher and editors thank Verein pro archithese, in particular Christoph Schuepp, for the generous permission to print the facsimile pages and the covers of the issues of *archithese* between 1971–1976.

The editors and the publisher would like to express their sincere thanks to all institutions and foundations for their support, without which the realization of this publication would not have been possible.

Swiss National Science Foundation (SNSF)

Department of Architecture, ETH Zurich

Institute for the History and Theory of Architecture (gta),  
ETH Zurich

Lucerne School of Engineering and Architecture,  
HSLU Lucerne

HSLU Foundation

Pro Helvetia

Dr. Adolf Streuli-Stiftung

Kulturstiftung Kanton Luzern

Kulturstiftung Kanton Nidwalden



## DARCH

Departement Architektur

## gta

**HSLU** Lucerne University  
of Applied Sciences  
and Arts

**HSLU** Foundation

swiss arts council  
**prohelvetia**

KANTON LUZERN  
Kulturförderung  
**SWISSLOS**

**SWISSLOS**  
KULTURFÖRDERUNG  
NIDWALDEN

# Imprint

This chapter is part of:

Gabrielle Schaad, Torsten Lange (Eds.) *archithese reader. Critical Positions in Search of Postmodernity, 1971–1976*, Zurich 2024.

Editors

Gabrielle Schaad, Torsten Lange

Authors (essays)

Irina Davidovici, Samia Henni, Torsten Lange,  
Gabrielle Schaad, Marie Theres Stauffer

Translation

German → English, Steven Lindberg

French → English, Brett Petzer

Italian → English, Shanti Evans

Editing

Gabrielle Schaad, Torsten Lange

Copy-editing and proofreading

Chris Davey

Design concept, layout, and typesetting

Eliot Gisel and common-interest (Nina Paim, Mariachiara De Leo)

Lithography

Carsten Humme, Frank Berger

Printing and binding

DZA Druckerei zu Altenburg

Fonts

CoFo Robert, Univers Next

© 2024 Triest Verlag für Architektur, Design und Typografie, Zürich and the authors.

[www.triest-verlag.ch](http://www.triest-verlag.ch)

For all images of pages and covers from *archithese* printed in this publication: © *archithese*, Verein pro *archithese*.

All rights reserved; no part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording, or otherwise, without the prior written consent of the publisher. Published with the support of the Swiss National Science Foundation. Triest Verlag receives a grant for the years 2021 to 2024 from the Federal Office of Culture as part of the Swiss publishers' subsidies.

ISBN 978-3-03863-059-3

Set	DOI: 10.61037/TVA00010
Introduction	DOI: 10.61037/TVA00011
Section I	DOI: 10.61037/TVA00012
Section II	DOI: 10.61037/TVA00013
Section III	DOI: 10.61037/TVA00014
Section IV	DOI: 10.61037/TVA00015
Section V	DOI: 10.61037/TVA00016
Conversation	DOI: 10.61037/TVA00017

This work is licensed under a Creative Commons

Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives 4.0 International License.

