FROM PLURALISM TO POPULISM
ARCHITECTURAL CRITICISM IN TIMES OF THE INTERNET

A B S T R A C T

Architecture has changed from a discipline in service of the larger part of the population through public housing, public buildings, public spaces, urban planning and design to a particular and already in itself disparate niche market of the real estate business that has more to do with the media industry than with public tasks. Architectural criticism has become part of this media industry as well. Thus, Postmodern architecture could flourish as the bastard child of political and cultural populist strategies. Today, architectural criticism finds itself in a deep crisis due to new developments in publishing and it's financing. This also affects Critical Theory. With its background of ideas rooted in Marxism and Enlightenment, Critical Theory seems to have great difficulty with not only the speed of new developments and the unpredictability of their directions, but also with the increasingly dominant irrational but powerful aspects of marketing and propaganda in which it's voice seems no longer heard beyond the walls of the academic ghetto.

Bart Lootsma
University of Innsbruck - Institute of Architectural Theory, History and Landmark Preservation

Writing about architectural criticism and critical theory today is not an easy thing to do. Architecture has changed from a discipline in service of the larger part of the population through public housing, public buildings, public spaces, urban planning and design to a particular and already in itself disparate niche market of the real estate business that has more to do with the media industry than with public tasks. Architectural criticism finds itself in a deep crisis due to new developments in publishing and its financing. Critical Theory, with its background of ideas rooted in Marxism and Enlightenment, seems to have great difficulty with not only the speed of new developments and the unpredictability of their directions but also with the increasingly dominant irrational but powerful aspects of marketing and propaganda in which its voice seems no longer heard beyond the walls of the academic ghetto.

TAFURI

In the late 1970s and 1980s the target of architectural criticism seemed so clear. It was supposedly Modern(ist) Architecture that had produced a monotonous and dumb living environment in which there seemed no place for unfolding of the individual and no place for cultural expression. Critical Theory played a crucial role in this verdict. As Michael Hays writes in his introduction to Manfredo Tafuri's essay 'Toward a Critique of Architectural Ideology': "Gathering up the threads that link the sociology of Georg Simmel and Max Weber, the critical theory of George Lukács, Walter Benjamin and Theodor Adorno, the structuralism of Louis Althusser and Roland Barthes, and the negative thought of Massimo Cacciari, Tafuri identifies what for him is contemporary architecture's only condition of possibility: to collapse into the very system that assures its demise or retreat into hypnotic solitude."[1]

As in all major arts and sciences, under influence of 'The Linguistic Turn', from the early 1960s on, there were all kinds of attempts to see and design architecture as a language again. Initially, most of these attempts tried to make architecture speak again. But, by lack of success, in the course of time it seemed as if the architects and theoreticians involved only indulged in highly intellectual and artistic experiments, which were only possible in the protected environment of Ivy-League universities, galleries and obscure magazines. Manfredo Tafuri spoke of withdrawal of architecture in the boudoir. ""The disenchanted avant-garde", completely absorbed in exploring from the comfort of its charming *boudoirs* the profundities of the philosophy of the unexpected writes down, over and over again, its own reactions under the influence of drugs prudently administered. Its use of hashish is certainly a conscious one:

but it makes of this "consciousness" a barrier, a defence. Of the "perfidious enchantment" of the products that come out of the new laboratories of the imaginary it is good to be distrustful. With a smile, we have to catalogue them in the imaginary museum of bad conscience of our "small age", to be used as rear-view mirrors by whoever recognizes himself to be caught in the midst of a crisis that obliges himself to be caught in the midst of a crisis that obliges him to remain stuck in the minefield of the "evil present".[2]

PUNK

Architecture, which had been so daring and innovative in the 1960s, had lost its innocence. In the late 1970s and 1980s, in a polarizing political climate torn between the RAF, Brigate Rosse and other revolutionary movements and the unprecedented, tangible and steadily increasing oppression they triggered from the governments, it seemed as if there were no alternatives between joining the squatters' movement, which meant distancing oneself from architecture as a cultural discipline, and a position of withdrawal and refusal in academia or the art world. The latter seemed the only possible way to at least save architecture (and its protagonists) to be compromised by an increasingly cynical society. Proclaiming architecture as an intellectual art form, at best to be realized on paper and in installations in galleries seemed a valid protest. There was a clear awareness of bad conscience, however. There was a clear difference however between the bad conscience of the generation Tafuri wrote about, for whom the Second World War and its atrocities remained a lifelong point of reference, and a younger generation, which grew up and studied in the 1970s and 1980s. For the latter, bad conscience took the form of the Punk movement, which made clear by all means that "No one is innocent" and that there was "No future".[3] Their work and actions were rooted in Dadaist and Situationist critique and consisted of installations, performances and magazines. There was no real work anyway. Examples can be found among others in the early work of Bernard Tschumi and the British NATO group around Nigel Coates. In this work, everyday cynicism was countered by what Peter Sloterdijk, returning to the origins of cynicism and the original root of the word in his 'Critique of Cynical Reason', calls 'Kynicism': provocative punctual actions that give an insight in a larger context of power.[4]

POST-MODERN ARCHITECTURE

In the very same year Punk broke out, in 1977, Charles Jencks brought all attempts to produce a language-driven architecture together in a book,

proclaimed the death of Modern Architecture and at the same time the birth of Post-Modern Architecture, a movement that, even if not immediately, proved incredibly successful.[5] The 1980 Venice Biennale, titled "The Presence of the Past" presented the most important protagonists characteristically with installations of their work. Already in 1984, the first retrospective was held in the DAM, the German architecture museum in Frankfurt, under the title "Revision of the Modern", a title that made clear that the original critical potential of Post-Modern architecture had been lost. "Let us define our terms," Heinrich Klotz wrote in an article published on the occasion of the exhibition: "revisionism is a tendency in general politics that exists alongside the tendency to conserve what once existed and alongside the tendency that aims at violent and radical change in the present system. Revisionism is a path between revolution and conservatism. We may claim it as the route of postmodernism."[6]

The fact that Post-Modern architecture had until than appeared in the art world and in the seclusion of academia, was now presented by Klotz to turn architecture into fiction: "Not just function, but fiction."[7] In 1988, Klotz could already praise the disparate pluralism in architecture, in which 'anything goes' as an example of Jürgen Habermas' 'new obscurity', the result of a radical pluralism in which "anything goes".[8] By compromising Habermas, as a representative of the Frankfurt School, in the project of Post-Modern architecture, it almost seemed as if Post-Modernism was the realization of the secret wet dream of Critical Theory. In reality, the result was more a radical atomization than pluralism. This is one of the reasons critical theory has such enormous difficulty in dealing with architecture today when the aesthetics are concerned. Critique – in magazines, books, exhibitions and even state architecture policies – became limited to the presentation of individual 'best practices'.

Indeed this is the situation we find ourselves in today and which we do not seem to be able to escape. Post-Modern Architecture became so successful, that already in 1995, Rem Koolhaas could write in 'Generic City' that: "The style of choice is post-modern, and will always remain so. Postmodernism is the only movement that has succeeded in connecting the practice of architecture with the practice of panic. Postmodernism is not a doctrine based on a highly civilized reading of architectural history but a method, a mutation in professional architecture that produces results fast enough to keep pace with the Generic City's development. Instead of consciousness, as its original inventors may have hoped, it creates a new unconscious. It is modernization's little helper. Anyone can do it – a skyscraper based on the Chinese pagoda and/

or a Tuscan hill town." Koolhaas continues: "All resistance to postmodernism is anti-democratic. It creates a "stealth" wrapping around architecture that makes it irresistible, like a Christmas present from a charity."[9]

POPULISM

In retrospect, the success of Postmodernism is not surprising. Apart from its initial experimental and intellectual phase, Postmodernism had a strong populist overtone from the beginning and became increasingly entangled with political populism. Modern architecture, although maybe not in the sense of exceptional architectural masterpieces but as housing and urbanism, is one of the main issues for populist politicians. The issue is primarily about financing, ownership and shifting large flows of money from the government to the private sector. Populist arguments are largely about these issues too. They are about the possibility to own and invest in one's own house and about the freedom the owner may have to shape it to fit his or her individual needs and desires. Therefore, this issue is not so much about architectural style, as it is about the freedom to live the way one wants and to design his or her own property. This is central to populist arguments. But the rhetoric of postmodernism may in some cases be helpful for populist politicians and in the end, the results of populist politics may be largely post-modern or historicised in a confused way. Populists and postmodernists may not necessarily share the same enemy but they at least share a common symbol of an enemy: the large pre- and post-war modernist housing estates. For populists this symbol represents the state, for postmodernists it represents Modernism in its most alienated form. As such, the rise of Postmodernism goes hand in hand with the rise of populism in Europe and with the Crisis of the welfare state and representative democracy.

PRIVATIZATION AND DEREGULATION

Processes leading to the privatisation and deregulation of the housing market are not new. More in general, they are part of the process that we recognize today as financialisation, in which profit making is increasingly dependent of financial channels instead of traditional production and trade. This led to the 2007 financial crisis, which still continues today. Processes of privatisation and deregulation started already in the 1970s in Thatcherist England and the United States in the Reagan era. They were sped up in the 1990s and the first years of this century under the politics of the Third Way in the Netherlands, Great Britain, Germany and Austria, and under the pressure of budgetary conditions for European countries to participate in the Euro. In a relatively short period of

time compared to the period it took to build up systems of public housing, this has already led to considerable shifts in financing the built-up environment. As the building industry was until recently responsible for a large part of a nation's economy, these shifts led to shifts in power as well and paved the way for new forms of populist politics. Real estate firms largely financed the late Dutch populist Pim Fortuyn and his political parties. This is perhaps not so different from the way Silvio Berlusconi's political success was largely enabled by his control over the media industry in Italy.

CORE OF THE WELFARE STATE

Together with health care and education, providing public housing has been at the core of the welfare state from the beginning. Over the last century, in most European countries, in order to deal with housing shortage – caused by large-scale migration from the countryside to the industrialised cities, war and the post-Second World War baby boom – and its consequences – speculation, unhygienic living conditions and an uncontrollable growth of several metropolises – different systems of housing corporations were built up that develop, build and today manage enormous estates of affordable housing. These corporations were financed by rents, state-guaranteed loans and subsidies and employed large numbers of people. Today, the housing stocks and land by themselves represent a considerable amount of capital.

After periods of great success in the 1920s, 1930s, 1950s and 1960s, from the early 1970s on there is a growing dissatisfaction with the housing these corporations provide. Particularly in the reconstruction period after the Second World War and the economic and technological growth of that period, housing production became largely industrialised and standardised to be able to cope with the massive demand – which it did extremely successfully. The monotony, anonymity and mono-functionality of these quarters became appreciated less and less. In the same period, nineteenth-century quarters and city centres had been neglected or torn down. Housing corporations and architects came up with new concepts of housing, which succeeded each other rapidly. However, they could not do whatever they wanted because important parts of the system are also complex laws, rules, norms and regulations that form the conditional framework for subsidies and further financing. These notably limit the amount of square metres and typologies in relation to price. Most of this legal and financial framework was developed in the 1930s and 1950s, in a period in which Western societies were still defined by class distinctions. Public housing was developed for the masses that, in a representative democracy, would serve

their interests. Representative democracy and industrial production, by their nature, are both very suitable for handling issues that relate to large quantities and statistical data. Within the enclosed space of the nation-state, prognoses based on population surveys were still reliable. For example the predictions about the growth of a city like Amsterdam from 1929, stating that the city would have between 800.000 and 1.2 million inhabitants in the year 2000, were quickly reacted upon and enabled the city to work with the famous Algemeen Uitbreidingsplan (General Extension Plan) by Van Eesteren and Van Lohuizen until recently with only minor interpretational changes.

INDIVIDUALIZATION

Today, such predictions would be almost impossible as cities are globally related in such complex ways that local surveys, even in combination with comparisons to other cites, would never be enough. On top of that, from the 1960s on, a process of individualisation developed in Western welfare states. Paradoxically, individualisation is also largely a consequence of the success of the welfare states. While individualisation may have first appeared as something to fight for, today we realise more and more that it is something that is forced upon us – be it by the soft seductive strategies of the media industry and politicians or by the economic and political forces that create migration. Paradoxically, the basis of individualisation is formed by both the eternal desires for the dream world of freedom and the fear of poverty, starvation and war. It is produced by prosperity and high levels of education that make people able to choose and to decide for themselves, just as much as by the economic deprivation that tears people away from their traditional bonds, families and communities.[10] All of this challenges the way the welfare state traditionally takes care of housing and urbanism. People, with all their individual biographies and desires, demand individual solutions for their lives.

260

MARKET POPULISM

Now, if we take populism as 'a rhetorical style that holds that the common person is oppressed by the "elite" in society, which only exists to serve its own interests, and therefore, the instruments of the State need to be grasped from this self-serving elite and instead used for the benefit and advancement of the people as a whole' and if we see populists as reaching out 'to ordinary people, talking about their economic and social concerns', appealing 'to their common sense', then it is obvious that the systems and organisations that were developed to provide public housing are ideal targets for populists from

both the left and the right and any direction or route in between.[11] And indeed, almost all political parties are guilty of it. It has, in reaction to the success of the populists, even become normal and acceptable.

The most worrying and unfortunately predominant form of populism in Europe today is not a grass-roots phenomenon. It is a specific form of what Thomas Frank calls 'Market Populism'.[12] Frank describes the 1990s as an era of 'many and spectacular avant-gardes, of loud and highly visible youth cultures, of emphatic multiculturalism, of extreme sports, extreme diets and extreme investing'. But even if we 'marvelled at the infinite variety of the Internet and celebrated our ethnic diversity' we have probably hardly ever seen such an amount of intellectual consensus about the role of businesses in society. Even the leaders of the left parties accommodated themselves to free market faith and the 'New Economy'. Frank analyses how politicians throughout the political spectrum started to believe that markets are a populist system, which is more democratic than democratically elected governments. 'With their mechanisms of supply and demand, poll and focus group, superstore and Internet, markets manage to express the popular will more articulately and meaningfully than do mere elections. By their very nature markets confer democratic legitimacy, markets bring down the pompous and the snooty, markets look out for the interests of the little guy, markets give us what we want.'

'Many of the individual components of the market-populist consensus have been part of the cultural-economic wallpaper for years', Frank writes. 'Hollywood and Madison Avenue have always insisted that their job is simply to mirror the public's wishes, and that movies and ad campaigns succeed or fail depending on how accurately they conform to public tastes. Similarly, spokesmen for the New York Stock exchange have long argued that stock prices reflect popular enthusiasm, that public trading of stocks is a basic component of democracy. And ever since Randolph Hearst, newspaper tycoons have imagined themselves defenders of the common man.'[13]

THE CENTURY OF THE SELF

Still it remains surprising how populism, originally a rebellion against the corporate order and a political tongue reserved by definition for the non-rich and non-powerful, has now become the tongue of the wealthy. This may have to do with the fact that market populism is strongly based on new marketing techniques. In his impressive BBC4 documentary series 'The Century of the Self', Adam Curtis shows how in the course of the twentieth century the

ideas of Sigmund Freud became influential in the United States through his nephew Edward Bernays and his daughter Anna Freud.[14] Bernays was not only the founder of public relations; he was also instrumental in shifting America from a needs- to a desires-culture. "He was fascinated by his uncle's theories that human behaviour was driven by unconscious and sexual drives. Many of Bernays' clients were large American corporations. He was the first person to show them that they could sell many more products if they linked them through images and symbols to those unconscious desires that Freud had identified." Bernays' ideas lead to the growth of a whole industry in the United States that was trained to read the most inner desires of the public. "At the heart of it was the technique of the focus group. It allowed consumers to express their inner feelings and needs just as patients did in psychoanalysis. The information was then used to design new products that would fulfil those desires."[15] Politicians also increasingly used Bernays' ideas in their election campaigns, investigating in focus groups what kind of issues could seduce the electorate. Europe proved long resistant to these strategies, relying on the now traditional statistical surveys. Only larger corporations used the technique of the focus group, which was independent of class but approached the individual. Politicians and broadcasting organizations distrusted the idea of pandering to the masses. This changed with the rise of Ronald Reagan in the United States and Margaret Thatcher in Great Britain. Their political programs were new in that they did not present their ideas as ideologically driven, rational solutions to collective problems, but largely prioritized not necessarily related issues that came out of focus groups and addressed individual fears and desires. Their methods were taken over by a new generation of politicians from liberal and former social democratic parties, like Bill Clinton and Tony Blair that had to admit that this was the only way to gain power and sustain it. From then on, the new marketing techniques gradually spread throughout the complete spectrum of political parties. From here, the step to the rise of a new kind of political parties that almost completely relied on focus groups was only a small one. Increasingly, media strategies, to trigger fears and desires and test the audiences' response became powerful means to bind the voters. This replaced the idea that if the masses would be educated and informed as well as possible, they would understand and support more rational policies and vote for them.

With the shift from financing of (public and social) housing by the government to the market, a similar change took place in architecture. Developers increasingly design projects to satisfy the desires for specific different lifestyles that are discovered with the latest marketing techniques. The traditional idea of the architect as someone working for and being paid by a client, but with

a responsibility towards the public domain is thereby under threat. The public domain, as something defined by and for the majority of us seems to have ended to exist. As Margaret Thatcher famously said "There is no such thing as society. There is living tapestry of men and women and people and the beauty of that tapestry and the quality of our lives will depend upon how much each of us is prepared to take responsibility for ourselves and each of us prepared to turn round and help by our own efforts those who are unfortunate."[16]

ADVERTISEMENTS FOR ARCHITECTURE

The changes in architectural publishing over the last decades mirror the changing conditions under which architecture is produced. This does not only reflect in the booming of lifestyle magazines. In the 1970s and the 1980s, the success of Postmodernism went hand in hand with the falling prices for full colour printing. The marvellous pastel coloured drawings of many post-modern architects could only become such wide attention because they could suddenly be printed in full colour. This was an enormous change in comparison to the way architecture was published before: in grainy black and white illustrations that made brutalist, concrete buildings even more greyish; made us forget that modernist architecture was originally coloured instead of just white and turned articles on urban renewal projects into coverages on war zones, with exaggerated dark and cloudy skies above them.

With their new, colourful appearance and emphasis on the cultural aspect or architecture, in the 1980s architectural magazines emancipated from professional magazines with an emphasis on technological and social issues to a special category, somewhere to be found between professional magazines and cultural or art magazines. For the publishers, they became the flagships of their product palette. Advertisements, usually in colour, enabled to print larger and larger sections of the magazines to be printed in colour as well. Criticism changed in the sense that architectural magazines saw their task in the first place in promoting what they regarded as best practice examples rather than criticizing projects. They became, as Bernard Tschumi analyzed 'Advertisements for Architecture': "After all, architectural drawings and photographs are just paper spaces. There is no way to "perform" real architecture in a magazine or through a drawing. The only way is to make believe. So, just as ads for architectural products (or cigarettes or whiskey) are made to trigger desire for something beyond the glossy illustration, these ads have the same purpose: to trigger the desire for architecture."[17] Tschumi's own advertisements still tried to raise attention for architectural issues – experience, decay – that were normally not

on the agenda but for the largest part of architectural production this was soon not the case any longer.

From now on, everything stood in the service of a critique of modern architecture and the production of desire for more specific, sometimes even quite weird cultural positions. A generation of architects had appeared on the scene that, having done little built work or even none whatsoever, from its appearance in magazines, conferences, exhibitions and universities suddenly competed for large, prestigious commissions worldwide.

PUBLISHING

In the 1990s, this situation proliferated. Increasingly, architects took control over the publication of their work. Magazines became increasingly dependent on the drawings and photographs the offices made available. To be able to compete on the market, they needed to publish the latest work of a limited group of stars as quickly as possible. Architects increasingly initiated, financed and edited books about their work themselves. This was not only cheaper than the regular colour copied or printed portfolios they did, they also found an audience that was increasingly interested in the specific work of a specific architect. At the same time, the exceptional position of architectural magazines within publishing companies came under thread. For a long time, the architectural magazines, as flagships, were not really obliged to make a profit as long as the publishing company made a profit. Now groups of magazines that shared the same overhead, in particular the department that sold advertisements, were obliged to make profits. Soon, computerized bookkeeping made it possible to look more specifically into each title. And suddenly it came out that architectural magazines, how luxuriously and chic they appeared, were not necessarily the most profitable. The position of architectural magazines as a special category between professional magazines (as they exist for doctors, car mechanics, nurses and farmers) and cultural magazines, which attracted a wide culturally interested audience, became problematic. Even if the magazines attracted seemingly enough readers and subscribers, these readers were not necessarily the ones who decided on buying the products (building parts and materials) that made it attractive to advertise in them. Life style and fashion magazines were much better in triggering the desire to buy products like furniture and even to seduce an audience to hire a specific architect to design a house or interior. Technical magazines, like 'Detail' for example, could guarantee that their audience was the same that decided on buying building products that were advertised in them. Because of the increase in advertisements they were

more profitable and could print more colour pages. This went at the cost of more culturally orientated architectural magazines.

In this situation, it was unavoidable that architectural magazines and architectural criticism landed in a severe crisis. Many editors, believing in the sophistication of their product and their cultural responsibility, tried to improve the quality of the magazines by producing thematic issues, be it around abstract themes or in monographic issues on one particular architect. Thereby, they entered into competition with the book market, with the disadvantage that a magazine has strict deadlines and cannot wait until the desired quality of an issue is achieved. It many cases, it also caused a loss of identity of the magazines. In most cases, this lead to a loss in subscriptions and an increase in sale of individual issues. A new type of publication was born: the bookazine, which relied more on the sale of separate issues dedicated to specific themes than on subscriptions. In general, we can witness demise in subscriptions of the classical architectural magazines. The market for architecture magazines seems to become divided between few remaining larger magazines, technical magazines and the appearance of many small academic magazines financed and produced by universities.

A more recent phenomenon is architecture blogs. There are so many of them, however, that already 2007 International Listings had no problem coming up with a Top-100.[18] This explosion of blogs urgently needs a more profound analysis, as they come in many guises. Some are the work of just one author or editor, presenting his or her specific view on matters; others are professionally made web magazines again, others seem to automatically crawl for the latest web contributions on other sites, sharing them in seconds to even wider audiences. Two effects are clear though. Following the general trend on the Web, blogs are image-based and increasingly movie-based. With the exception of some highly sophisticated blogs, text comes second and is usually limited to the project description the architects provide themselves. The Internet brings us definitively and unavoidably in a world of simulacra Jean Baudrillard could not even have dreamt of.

This does not mean that the Internet is superficial. Of course, one can find almost all important architecture treatises on the web as well, many of them for free as complete PDF's, and more recent books as EBooks, paid or for free as illegal downloads. It means however that the production of desire for contemporary architecture just as well as criticism is increasingly fragmented in many niche products. This inevitably means that the role of the individual

critic, with the exception of a few known authors, has become minimized, just as the cultural role of the publishers. The power to decide on what themes and issues are published is increasingly in the hands of the architects themselves and the editors. Negative criticism is not popular. It does not sell. Thus, large part of architectural criticism is doomed to be as the 'Like'-button on Facebook. Negative criticism can only be implicit, as nobody knows what jobs individual critics refuse, and nobody, except for the editors, knows what themes and issues they propose.

CRITICAL THEORY

Apart from the fact that 'Critical Theory', being at its origins, has imploded or dissolved in the pluralism of Postmodernism, at the same time it has become atomized itself. Certainly, it has become the dominant form of theory in the academic world in the field of social, political and cultural sciences, with an influence on 'everyday criticism' in newspapers, magazines and politics that can hardly be overestimated. It is no wonder then, that critical theory still has a great impact on the architectural discourse. The multidisciplinary approach of critical theory fits a field that is multidisciplinary by nature. But at the same time, critical theory has become an extremely broad field that seems to encompass anything written by or inspired by from Theodor Adorno to Slavoj Žižek. As Rem Koolhaas sarcastically remarked: "Our amalgamated wisdom can be easily caricatured: according to Derrida, we cannot be *Whole*, according to Baudrillard we cannot be *Real*, according to Virilio we cannot be *There*."[19] The problem of most critical theory is, to paraphrase Jean Baudrillard in 'Forget Foucault'[20], "that it is a mirror of the powers it describes." "It is there that its strength and its seduction lie, and not at all in its "truth index", which is only its leitmotiv: these procedures of truth are of no importance, for Foucault's (or Critical Theory's, B.L.) discourse is no truer than any other." "Foucault's is not therefore a discourse of truth but a mythic discourse in the strong sense of the word, and I secretly believe that it has no illusions about the effect of truth it produces. That, by the way," Baudrillard casually remarks", is what is missing in those who follow in Foucault's footsteps and pass right by this mythic arrangement to end up with the truth, nothing but the truth."[21] But beyond Foucault, truth is lost in the polite pluralism of our time, in which every political party, action committee or individual can hire his or her experts for a second, third or fourth opinion to scientifically prove this or that point. It is exactly in this climate that new marketing techniques and populism can flourish.

NOTES

1   Michael Hays in *Architecture Theory since 1968*, ed. Michael Hays (Cambridge (Mass.)/London, England : Columbia Books on Architecture, MIT Press, 1998), 2.

2   Manfredo Tafuri, ''L'Architecture dans le Boudoir,'' in *Architecture Theory since 1968*, ed. Michael Hays (Cambridge (Mass.)/London, England : Columbia Books on Architecture, MIT Press, 1998), 167.

3   Gerald Matt, *Punk, No One Is Innocent, Kunst-Stil-Revolte* (Wien: Kunsthalle, Nürnberg :Verlag für moderne Kunst, 2008).

4   Peter Sloterdijk, *Kritik der zynischen Vernunft, zwei Bänder* (Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp Verlag, 1983).

5   Charles Jencks, *The Language of Post-Modern Architecture* (London: Academy Editions, 1977).

6   Heinrich Klotz, ''The Revision of Modernism,'' in *The Revision of Modernism*, ed. Heinrich Klotz (London: Architectural Design, Frankfurt am Main: DAM, 1984).

7   Idem.

8   Heinrich Klotz, ''Pluralism and Fiction,'' in *De Collectie/The Collection, Veen/Reflex*, ed. Reyn van der Lugt (Rotterdam: 1988), 19.

9	Rem Koolhaas, ''The Generic City,'' in *S,M,L,XL*, ed. Jennifer Sigler (Rotterdam: 010 Publishers, 1995), 1267.
10	Bart Lootsma, Individualization, ao. on: http://www.architecturaltheory.eu/archive/download/241/individualization%20definitive.pdf
11	Thomas Frank, ''The Rise of Market Populism: America's New Secular Religion,'' *The Nation*, October 30, 2000, from: www.thenation.com
12	Idem.
13	Idem.
14	Adam Curtis, The Century of the Self, BBC Four, 2002, 240 Minutes. DVD 235 Minutes.
15	Idem.
16	Margaret Thatcher, 1987. http://en.wikiquote.org/wiki/Margaret_Thatcher
17	Bernard Tschumi, ''Advertisements for Architecture,'' *SD*, February (1978).
18	http://www.intlistings.com/articles/2007/top-100-architecture-blogs
19	Rem Koolhaas, ''What Ever Happened to Urbanism?,'' in *S,M,L,XL*, ed. Jennifer Sigler (Rotterdam: 010 Publishers, 1995), 967.
20	Jean Baudrillard, *Forget Foucault, Semiotext(e)* (Los Angeles: MIT Press, 2007), 30.
21	Idem.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Baudrillard, Jean. *Forget Foucault, Semiotext(e)*. Los Angeles: MIT Press, 2007.

Curtis, Adam. The Century of the Self, BBC Four, 2002, 240 Minutes. DVD 235 Minutes.

Frank, Thomas. ''The Rise of Market Populism: America's New Secular Religion.'' *The Nation*, October 30, 2000. www.thenation.com

Hays, Michael ed. *Architecture Theory since 1968*, Cambridge (Mass.)/London, England: Columbia Books on Architecture, MIT Press, 1998.

Jencks, Charles. *The Language of Post-Modern Architecture*. London: Academy Editions, 1977.

Klotz, Heinrich ed. *The Revision of Modernism*. Frankfurt am Main: DAM, 1984.

Klotz, Heinrich. ''Pluralism and Fiction.'' In *De Collectie/The Collection, Veen/Reflex*, ed. Reyn van der Lugt . Rotterdam, 1988.

Koolhaas, Rem and Bruce Mau. In *S,M,L,XL*, ed. Jennifer Sigler. Rotterdam: 010 Publishers, 1995.

Lootsma, Bart. Individualization, ao. on: http://www.architecturaltheory.eu/archive/download/241/individualization%20definitive.pdf

Lootsma, Bart. The Paradoxes of Contemporary Populism, ao. on: http://www.architecturaltheory.eu/?archive_id=99&PHPSESSID=568151f1838c9ddf65816133165d3439

Matt, Gerald, ed. *Punk, No One Is Innocent, Kunst-Stil-Revolte*. Wien/ Nürnberg: Kunsthalle Wien/Verlag für moderne Kunst, 2008.

Sloterdijk, Peter. Kritik der zynischen Vernunft, zwei Bänder. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp Verlag, 1983.