

PROSTOR

27 [2019] 1 [57]

ZNANSTVENI ČASOPIS ZA ARHITEKTURU I URBANIZAM
A SCHOLARLY JOURNAL OF ARCHITECTURE AND URBAN PLANNING

SVEUČILIŠTE
U ZAGREBU,
ARHITEKTONSKI
FAKULTET
UNIVERSITY
OF ZAGREB,
FACULTY OF
ARCHITECTURE

ISSN 1330-0652
[https://doi.org/
10.31522/p](https://doi.org/10.31522/p)
UDK | UDC 71/72
CODEN PORREV
27 [2019] 1 [57]
1-190
1-6 [2019]

POSEBNI OTISAK / SEPARAT | OFFPRINT

ZNANSTVENI PRILOZI | SCIENTIFIC PAPERS

152-163 **GIZEM DENIZ GUNERI**

ON VARIETIES OF ARCHITECTURAL
UTOPIANISM

A CRITICAL READING OF THE TWENTIETH
CENTURY UTOPIAN ARCHITECTURE

SCIENTIFIC SUBJECT REVIEW
[HTTPS://DOI.ORG/10.31522/P.27.1\(57\).12](https://doi.org/10.31522/p.27.1(57).12)
UDC 72.01:711.001 "19"

O RAZNOLIKOSTI ARHITEKTONSKOG
UTOPIZMA

KRITIČKA INTERPRETACIJA UTOPIJSKE
ARHITEKTURE 20. STOLJEĆA

PREGLEDNI ZNANSTVENI ČLANAK
[HTTPS://DOI.ORG/10.31522/P.27.1\(57\).12](https://doi.org/10.31522/p.27.1(57).12)
UDK 72.01:711.001 "19"



Af



FIG. 1 DEMOLITION OF PRUITT-IGOE APARTMENT COMPLEX DESIGNED BY MINORU YAMASAKI
SL. 1. RUŠENJE STAMBENOG NASELJA PRUITT-IGOE, PROJEKT: MINORU YAMASAKI



GIZEM DENİZ GUNERİ

MIDDLE EAST TECHNICAL UNIVERSITY
DEPARTMENT OF ARCHITECTURE,
TURKEY – 06800 CANKAYA, ANKARA, DUMLUPINAR BULVARI 1
ggunerı@metu.edu.tr

SCIENTIFIC SUBJECT REVIEW

[https://doi.org/10.31522/p.27.1\(57\).12](https://doi.org/10.31522/p.27.1(57).12)

UDC 72.01:711.001 "19"

TECHNICAL SCIENCES / ARCHITECTURE AND URBAN PLANNING

2.01.04. – HISTORY AND THEORY OF ARCHITECTURE
AND PRESERVATION OF THE BUILT HERITAGE

ARTICLE RECEIVED / ACCEPTED: 4. 5. 2019. / 17. 6. 2019.

TEHNIČKO SVEUČILIŠTE BLISKOG ISTOKA
ODSJEK ZA ARHITEKTURU
TURKEY – 06800 CANKAYA, ANKARA, DUMLUPINAR BULVARI 1
ggunerı@metu.edu.tr

PREGLEDNI ZNANSTVENI ČLANAK

[https://doi.org/10.31522/p.27.1\(57\).12](https://doi.org/10.31522/p.27.1(57).12)

UDK 72.01:711.001 "19"

TEHNIČKE ZNANOSTI / ARHITEKTURA I URBANIZAM

2.01.04. – POVIJEST I TEORIJA ARHITEKTURE
I ZAŠTITA GRADITELJSKOG NASLIJEĐA

ČLANAK PRIMLJEN / PRIHVACEN: 4. 5. 2019. / 17. 6. 2019.

ON VARIETIES OF ARCHITECTURAL UTOPIANISM A CRITICAL READING OF THE TWENTIETH CENTURY UTOPIAN ARCHITECTURE

O RAZNOLIKOSTI ARHITEKTONSKOG UTOPIZMA KRITIČKA INTERPRETACIJA UTOPIJSKE ARHITEKTURE 20. STOLJEĆA

ARCHITECTURAL UTOPIANISM
ARCHITECTURAL UTOPIA
UTOPIA AS METHOD
TWENTIETH CENTURY ARCHITECTURE

ARHITEKTONSKI UTOPIZAM
ARHITEKTONSKA UTOPIJA
UTOPIJA KAO METODA
ARHITEKTURA 20. STOLJEĆA

This text dwells on and manifests the methodological significance of utopianism for the practices of the urban, and specifically architecture, building upon the core definitions made by Ruth Levitas in delineating utopia as method. It surveys various manners of architectural utopianisms – but not architectural utopias themselves – in their broadest sense, to identify the main tendencies of this methodology throughout the twentieth century.

Ovaj se rad bavi prikazom metodološkog značenja utopizma u praksi urbanizma i osobito u arhitekturi polazeći od temeljnih definicija kojima Ruth Levitas opisuje utopiju kao metodu. U radu se daje pregled raznih oblika utopizama u arhitekturi (izuzevši same arhitektonske utopije) u najširem smislu kako bi se identificirale glavne tendencije ove metodologije tijekom 20. stoljeća.

INTRODUCTION

UVOD

Not only utopia as a concept but also its relationship with architecture is archaic. Many eminent scholars, specifically since the beginning of the 20th century, have dwelled on the reciprocal relationship between the two, and the works in the field accrued vastly.

Through the significant contributions of urban theorists such as Lewis Mumford, the author of the founding text *The Story of Utopias* (1922) and *The City in History: Its Origins, Its Transformations, and Its Prospects* (1961), Françoise Choay, author of *L'Urbanisme: Utopies et Realites: Une Anthologie* (1965) and *The Rule and the Model: on the Theory of Architecture and Urbanism* (1980), Manfredo Tafuri with his well-known text *Architecture and Utopia: Design and Capitalist Development* (1976), Mary McLeod with her readings on the relationship between urbanism and utopia (1985), Anthony Vidler with his perspectives on the Ancien Régime (1990), or more recently, Nathaniel Coleman and Reinhold Martin with their analyses of modernism and postmodernism multifarious and yet specific themes, periods, and platforms of this relationship have been opened to in-depth discussion. This has been a rapid and juicy expansion, albeit lacking a systematic structure that would enhance both a developmental and integrative growth of knowledge and a comprehensive understanding of the methodological heftiness of utopianism for the discipline of architecture.

This text, situating itself in this fissure, proposes a novel, systematic, integrative and inclusive method of reading utopianisms from architecture based on Ruth Levitas' conception of "utopia as method".¹ This is, therefore, not a critical review of/limited to architectural *utopias*, per se, but rather an attempt to uncover the abundance of architectural *methods of utopianism*.² This proposed reading departs from the fact that there are various degrees of convergence between the architectural real³ and the architectural imaginary, some of which are under-discussed if not totally dropped beneath the radar.

Utopianism is (re)emerging at the very forefront of contemporary architecture once again, as a potential means through which the long-lost social and ethical charge of the discipline can be revived. It is, therefore, crucial to stress these varieties not only to provide with a common ground for discussion on the relationship between utopia and architecture but also to bring out possibilities. In what follows, the intention is to map the empirical terrain between imaginary and actual production of space in utopian architecture, manifesting the breadth and significance of the *methodological vocations of utopia* which are purposefully refereed to with the term *utopianism* within the scope of this text. This inquiry specifically dwells on cases from the 20th century as the century which staged several defining epochs of engagement between mainstream social, political, and architectural agendas and utopia, and was the era within which connections between planning, ar-

¹ This text is constituted based on the findings of the author's PhD dissertation entitled *A New Conceptual Framework for Architectural Utopia(nism)s* completed under the supervision of Prof. Dr. Suha Ozkan in the Department of Architecture at Middle East Technical University in 2014, funded by The Scientific and Technological Research Council of Turkey.

² It is critical to define what is handled as 'utopic' in relevance to architecture, here. In architectural terminology, there are instances when anything that is unrealizable is called utopic. However, within this work, the contributions that project from the present state of architecture into a different one in the future, those that envisage architecture in different societal, economic, cultural or technological context – not necessarily all at once –, and those which stand as the criticism of the present state of architecture, referring to a better state as the one idealized will be elaborated upon. The architectural imaginings, illustrations and/or products of utopian moments are excluded from this definition unless they depart from agendas specific to the field of architecture.

³ Here the word "real", stripped off from its ontological entailing, refers to the actual state of things as they exist, rather than as they are imagined.

⁴ COLEMAN, 2005

⁵ LEVITAS, 1990

⁶ The search for either dissolved or loosened definitive boundaries for the concept of utopia, in fact, started earlier than Levitas' distinctive contribution. Ernst Bloch's broad definition of utopia as a form of anticipatory consciousness has, for a long time, acted as an inspirational

chitecture and utopia were both established and challenged.

(ARCHITECTURAL) UTOPIA(NISM) AS METHOD

(ARHITEKTONSKA) UTOPIJA / UTOPIZAM KAO METODA

Initially, it is certainly very crucial to clarify to what understanding of utopia and utopianism this text builds upon. Even though there is no consensus on a unitary understanding regarding both within the expanding field of utopian studies, many contemporary theorists recognize that approaches which associate utopian projection solely with an *all-or-nothing* demand flaw its constitutive potential.⁴ In this perspective, the fundamental assumption is that utopia is "not escapist nonsense but a significant part of human culture".⁵

In her now classic text *The Concept of Utopia* (1990), Ruth Levitas dwells on these alternating meanings of utopia and canvasses, chronologically, how expositors and social theorists have used it in different ways.⁶ Her purpose in the book is twofold: Highlighting the areas of divergence and disagreement in definitions based on varied emphasis on different aspects of utopia⁷, and consequently, proposing a new and, in her terms, more flexible and less exclusive, definition of the term.

According to Levitas, all narrow definitions of utopia are undesirable. Those made in terms of content, form and function not only limit the field of study, but also entail defective judgments. It is necessary to comprehensive-

spark for many contemporary social theorists. Infused by Bloch, Fredric Jameson and also Herbert Marcuse's contributions to the field, Tom Moylan may be considered to be the first to contour the emergent discussions around constructing an account of utopian imagination. Moylan, in his book *Demand the Impossible: Science Fiction and the Utopian Imagination*, illustrates a deliberate move towards widening the understanding of the utopian. An awareness of the limitations of the utopian tradition and a scrutiny for new comprehensive understandings of utopianism come to the fore with Moylan. The following decades see Fredric Jameson's return to the theme with his seminal book *Archaeologies of the Future: The Desire called Utopia*, English translations of Bloch's texts and constitution of utopian studies research institutes and programs. All these figures contributed amply to developing a new definition for utopia that will find its place in contemporary culture. However, Levitas marks a critical breaking point. As she comprehensively structures the earlier meanings of utopia and constructs an articulated approach for framing what utopia is in its broadest sense, she, in a way, constructs a new *tabula rasa* for theoretical discussions.

7 Principally, these are: Form, function and content.

8 LEVITAS, 2007a

9 LEVITAS, 2007a: 290

10 COLEMAN et al., 2011

11 COLEMAN et al., 2011

12 LEVITAS, 2007b

13 JAMESON, 2005

14 JAMESON, 2005: 3

15 COLEMAN, 2000: vi

ly accommodate different approaches and questions within a multidimensional approach. To this end, she suggests bringing the concept of utopia to its very roots. This, as she puts it, primarily involves making a more flexible and less problematically exclusive definition of the concept of utopia. This will allow the utopian aspects of a wide range of cultural forms and behaviors to be included, while exploring, in them, "the ways in which form, function and content interact and are conditioned by the social context of utopia".⁸ She, thus, broadly defines utopia as "the expression of the desire for a better way of being".⁹ For her, the effect of this is "to dissolve boundaries, but also to sidestep the question of whether a particular text, plan, building, or musical work is or is not utopian".¹⁰

In so doing, Levitas achieves what might be called an (un)definition of utopianism. This marks a paradigm shift in discussions of utopia from what utopia is towards analytical conceptions of utopia, or *utopianism* in Sargent's words, which this text builds its argument upon.¹¹

According to Levitas, this conception leads to a particular method of analysis she names "utopia as method". Utopia as method implies excavating, from social, political, and, in this case, architectural programs in question, various embedded forms of utopianism.¹² It implies a backward reading from utopian fragments toward the whole, to extract informative examples of how utopia can be exploited as a method of inquiry into the existent.

At its very core, distinguishing between the utopian form and the utopian wish is primary and essential. According to Fredric Jameson, these are the two lines of descendancy from utopia. If the program is what suggests that things should be otherwise, the impulse is the impetus to action and invention with the dream of that other world.¹³

To stage the distinction in more spatial terms: if the city itself is a fundamental image of the program, the building, which cannot be the whole and yet attempts to express it, is one of the impulses.¹⁴ Even though Jameson makes a clear distinction between the two, these two lines of descendancy from utopia are not mutually exclusive, but potentially complimentary. What is expressed with the utopian impulse in the actual world relates to what the utopian program suggests.

This is an imaginary similar to architectural projection, and it guides the "exploration of architects who envision an exemplary architecture as a setting for social life, as utopias envisage wholes made up of interdependent parts" according to Nathaniel Coleman¹⁵. In his conception of exemplary architecture, such works are always a part of some poten-

tial whole that the architect imagines. This whole serves as an organizing model, and the part-whole relationship constituted in these works acts as "a method for the (social) enrichment of architecture."¹⁶

There are various patterns of such methodological vocations of utopian programs. These are complex and ambiguous, not only in their association and confrontation with social and political realities, but also in their manners of addressing issues of closure. They subsume different utopianisms, which are not limited to the absolute, but rather exist in multifarious forms and admixtures of utopian, non-utopian and even counter-utopian.

Most of these experimental manners of architectural thinking are underdiscussed despite the fact that they promise alternatives for radicalizing the objectives and methods of the discipline in (re)addressing political and social concerns. Discussions are limited to those specific to certain periods of architecture (i.e. Modern, Postmodern) and/or specific (figures for their) architectural utopias, per se. Here, however, unbound by any specific period or movement of architecture, the intention is to highlight the very subsistence of distinctive practices of utopian thinking which take utopia as method. The presumption is that they were possible and existent in various periods of the history of architecture and the 20th century is selected as a specific case for representation. Levitas' conception of utopia as method guides this scrutiny that intends to uncover various embedded forms of utopianism within the works of architecture as in that a reading of utopianisms is prioritized rather than one which intends to label what is utopia and what not.

MANIFEST UTOPIANISMS OF THE PROJECT

MANIFESTNI UTOPIZMI PROJEKTA

Many – if not most – of the significant elaborations of architectural utopianisms have been made in reference to Modern Architecture and to its failure. Among the numerous prominent figures on the theme, Tafuri takes the lead. Tafuri defines, through his critical (re)reading of the history of Modern Architecture, architecture and urban design as solidified expressions of ideology. This is an extension of his Marxist critique of capitalism. He claims that architects' insistence on approaching cities as their autonomous fields of intervention and their aims to solve all existing and emergent ills of urban environments through formal means have triggered crisis, both in the city and in the discipline. According to Tafuri, this was because "architecture discovered that the preestablished objectives could be reached only by relating

that sector to the reorganization of the city".¹⁷ This entailed a programming of building production through radically new forms that would be capable of attracting the clientele and incrementally make the realization of the city possible.

Even though these articulated forms were never mere products of architectural fantasy or were intended to be unmediated means to ends, but rather symbols of the new ideals, the new life, and the new man and woman, they became the medium through which Modern architectural utopianisms have been harshly criticized. The failures of their built forms, undressed from all the social and ethical charges, have been forthrightly associated with the failure of utopia.

The public demolition of the Pruitt-Igoe apartment complex designed by Minoru Yamasaki in 1972, turned this belief in the failure of utopia and consequently that of the entire Modernist 'project' of architecture into a myth.¹⁸ The housing complex which was once an award-winning design became the symbol of impotency of the sterile and totalitarian schemes of Modern architecture, and its overly optimistic faith in the virtues of a rational/cartesian approach.

Yamasaki's complex was among the many housing projects of the post-war period which resembled the Unité d'Habitation of Le Corbusier. Those were the years that the Unité became a novel typology for mass housing.¹⁹ As such, being reduced to mere form, it was extracted from its utopian context and isolated from any bonds with *Vers une Architecture*, the grandiose plans of Le Corbusier and the planning principles set forth by CIAM (Congrès Internationaux d'Architecture Moderne) to a great extent, if not totally.

The dramatic failure of Pruitt-Igoe had, however, immediately been blamed on this three, and thus on the Modernist utopia of architecture. This was, precisely, a significant neglect of the fact that utopian schemes that do not find actual bodies in accordance with the author architect's fancy fail to become operational. Even though the scheme pictured by the architect may be utopian, the resultant built form may never become an operational utopia.

Manifest utopianisms within which the constructed ideal acts as a project – those of schemes which are formally absolute and concretely illustrated – very often yield architectures as such. This is – certainly not solely, but to a great extent – a residue of their lan-

¹⁶ COLEMAN, 2013: 26

¹⁷ TAFURI, 1976: 100

¹⁸ BRISTOL, 2015

guage, the way they transmit their message, rather than their content. In these instances, the architectural language is extremely straightforward and very often obviates the conceptual depth of the original construct. Accordingly, each and every detailed and concretely illustrated component of the whole becomes readily available for architectural form-hunters. Components as such are extracted out of their conceptual and theoretical context within that construct and are used anywhere, and even for any purpose, as mere figures. The failures of these figures, then, are almost immediately associated with the failure of the utopian program, and – at worst – the concept of utopia forthwith. The modern movement thereof, with the failures of all those Unité replicas, was deemed as the paragon of utopia's failure.

Be it called the retreat of utopia, or the relocation of its functions, the conceptual space that utopian vision holds in contemporary culture changed radically after the movement became taboo.

The 1960s and early 1970s, through debates on urbanism, saw the intentional rendering of alternative forms of utopianism in response. Those were the years that "visionary architects, especially in France, radically exploited the concept of utopia as a methodology, or something to think with, not as an outcome."²⁰

Utopianisms as such, which shift the emphasis from utopia to utopianism, from the noun to the verb, from the construct to the *method*, from the absolute project to the reflexive dialogue, however, are not limited to those of the period.

LATENT UTOPIANISMS OF REFERENCE

PRIKRIVENI REFERENTNI UTOPIZMI

The quintessence of such reflexive pursuits is latent architectural utopianism, within which utopia – not necessarily construed this time in its complete, concrete and fixed sense – acts as a reference. Embedded in these often overlooked utopianisms is the use of a dialectical language, a specific parlance, speaking only to a targeted group of the audience and through a very deliberate complexity, which evolves through its varied receptions by this audience. The embedded resilience in utopianisms as such lies not only in this very deliberate avoidance of immediacy, but also in its controlled proximity to and companionship with reality. Unlike manifest utopianisms, these are not frozen with representa-

tion, and thus, they continuously evolve as they endure through critical dialogue.

Latent utopianisms carry a different tone of conversation between the imaginary and real spheres of architecture in comparison to those that are manifest. The mode of interference between architectural utopian programs and the utopian impulses they trigger are far more mediate and various. They are defined as latent, not because the utopian tones are undercover, but because the conveyance of the utopian program prohibits any direct formal extractions devoid of reason. They have a different utopian energy which does not directly transform into built form, and thus close up into matter, but one that continuously haunts reality.

These constructs provide frameworks for architectural thinking and imagining, but not ideal spaces. Therefore, their realization is only possible through internalization of the architectural definitions and norms in the broadest sense and by all.

These utopianisms of reference differ from manifest utopianisms of project not in terms of their scale, content, form or function, but in terms of the fact that they refrain from physical determinism and allow for multiple interpretations. They may best be defined as being more placid. They do not put the problem or the theme they dwell on as urgently as manifest utopianisms do. They rather become trainings of the imagination, being either as specific or as comprehensive as can be.

- **The (non-)formal reference** – The variety of utopian impulses triggered by latent architectural utopianisms is considerably rich. On multiple occasions, the constituted ideal is transmitted through a single building, which, this time, is not a formal embodiment of a part of the whole, but rather one which acts like an installation.

In these cases, the whole is never fully concretized into a formally absolute grandiose plan but rather conceptualized through various means of architectural narrative, as Bruno Taut's project for a utopian city in the Alps. In his *Alpine Architektur* (1917), for this utopian city, Taut celebrated the use of glass as a metaphor of new life, and as a means of liberating various socio-cultural values from the rationales and bias of technology through a series of figurative drawings coupled by notes.²¹ These illustrated plates were, however, very parsimonious in terms of formal architectural clarity. They were giving impressions rather than details.

Glass, in Taut's exploration, became the medium through which the literary and materialist meaning of building was challenged. He aimed at a city and an architecture of pure sensual experience. For this, Taut claimed in

¹⁹ URBAN, 2012

²⁰ MODENA, 2011: 132

²¹ BLETTER, 1981

the opening phrase of the visitor's guide to his Glass Pavilion that its purpose was nothing more than an achievement of beauty. Like his illustrations deliberately refraining from any formal determinacy, the building itself also did not act as mere form, an object or a background for display. It offered experiences both psychologically and sensorially rich. Like an installation, it was "immersive", "theatrical", and "experiential".²² It was also site-specific.

Taut, in designing the Glass Pavilion, focused on the experience and the choreographed movement within space which would add up to its spatiality. With such concerns, he actually shifted the focus of architecture from the object as something visual towards a rich and multisensory experience. According to Gutschow, the impulses of this approach still pierce modern installations today.

The Pavilion, as a specific and strategic architectural output, unlike Le Corbusier's Unité, was not an embodiment of a part of the whole, but rather a speculative representation of the whole itself which could only be read by a critical close examination of built form. It was expressive rather than instrumental.

Berthold Lubetkin's Penguin Pool in the London Zoo is very similar in essence. Lubetkin designed a Bauhaus-influenced elliptical penguin pool with two cantilevered helical ramps for unobstructed movement. It was a radically new environment for the penguins rather than a replica of their habitat. The ramps created an almost theatrical setting over which the penguins would parade.

The intention was not only to show that the penguins could survive and live happily in a totally different environment. It was, more importantly, to show that city-dwellers could also do so.

The pool implied a radically new lifestyle for the society. It was "the perfect program by which to demonstrate the modernist solution to a nongeneral audience"²³ and became a unitary interpretation of the rapidly modernizing city and its dwellers. In its implications, the pool was very similar – if not almost identical – to the Unité as it was imagined by Le Corbusier. The parlance of the former, however, was different from that of the latter in its entirety. The pool became a reflexive miniature model of the environmental ideal, rather than a formal exercise in the part, and has been depicted in many circles – not limited to those of architecture – more conceptually and thematically than formally.

This was one of the many conditions in which the architectural object transcended being, and being seen, as mere built form. It became the medium through which the ideal was conceived and manifested.

In conditions as such, the ideal might never – and on many occasions never does – take the form of a utopia in its conventional sense. The sophisticated thinking through which the architectural output is construed, however, is, by all means, utopian. This thinking takes on an absolute autonomy which results in a final moment where the building itself cannot be stripped of either its own criticism of the present state of architecture or the vision of an architecture in a different societal, economic, cultural or technological context, or both.

• **The conceptual reference** – On many occasions, the utopian programs of latent utopianisms find less concrete bodies through theoretical undertakings. The experimental practices of pedagogy and representation are among the most conspicuous of these sorts of ventures.

Utopian thinking, exploited in "radical pedagogies"²⁴ that challenge the traditions of the discipline, intending to destabilize existing norms of theory and practice, is dialectical and reflexive. Like the pedagogical work executed by Ungers between 1965 and 1977, first at the Technical University of Berlin (1963-1969) and then at Cornell University (1968-1986), they are exploratory projects in essence.

Ungers was invited to the Technical University of Berlin by Hans Scharoun in 1963. By that time, the school culture had become highly influenced by Scharoun's practice. Scharoun was against grandiose monumentality and was rather after a decentralized urban landscape. His was an anticity stance. In opposition to this, Ungers worked with the very complexity and uncertainty of the city. For this, the effort to set up a dialectical relationship between the city and its architecture had been investigated through analogical and analytical studies of precedents, methods and ideas. Ungers inoculated design experiments into a systematic reading of the city. Accordingly, West Berlin was taken as a medium of architectural venture. The most decisive circumstances of the milieu were scrutinized so as to drag out possibilities for radical architectural interventions.²⁵

The studios became grounds for manifesting and testing the architectural tools which challenge architecture's relationship to the city based on systematic morphological and geographical surveys. Yet they never constituted utopian schemes. Rather, they developed architectural manners of utopian thinking. This was not only because Ungers was

²² GUTSCHOW, 2006: 63

²³ STEINER, 2003

²⁴ COLOMINA et al., 2012

²⁵ AURELI, 2011: 191

²⁶ HAYS, 2010

against any attempt to realize blueprint plans – to construct utopias – but also, and significantly, because his was rather a critique regarding the assumptions and conducts of the discipline – a manner of utopian thinking. Within his pedagogy, the relationship between thought and form was indirect.

On many occasions, the way this relationship is constituted and the hairline between manifestation and latency is drawn becomes explicit in the vocabulary of architectural representation. Furthermore, discursive representational materials become objects of manifestation in themselves rather than subjects of architectural production. They constitute mediums of thinking and creating which can only be read through critical means.

Strong connections between architectural ideology – and consequently, a post-modern version of utopianism – and representation, as well as the language of form, as mentioned earlier, were consolidated in what Hays calls “the expanded decade of the 1970s” or “the discursive turn”.²⁶ In the period, “ideological-representational engagements of architecture with the expanding consumer society of the 1970s were probed, and various strategies of distortion, resistance, and reappropriation were devised.”²⁷ It was the period within which utopia was both in and out and was visited by scholars as a revised version of criticality.²⁸

Here, however, a figure outside that tradition, Peter Cook, is reflected upon to dwell on referential utopianisms which expand through means of representation. This owes not only to the fact that I intend a discussion of utopianism unbound by any specific moment of architectural history, but also to the fact that my purpose is to extract under-visited approaches which not always can be recaptured by the modern/postmodern division which dominates the 20th century history of architecture.

Peter Cook, in his explorations into the relationship between environment and man, operates in between the private realm of the postmodern agency and the revolutionary autonomy of modernism. On this ground, he experiments with representation, and his profound engagement with the concept of metamorphosis fairly renders how drawing becomes an articulated end in itself for architectural inquiry in his practice.

Not only in his rapturous Archigram days but also throughout his ensuing career, Cook fre-

quently expressed his displeasure about the prevailing conducts of architecture. As a response to this perpetual dissatisfaction, as an extension of the Archigram tradition, he opted for ongoing thematic engagements which evolved through time.

His strong interest in naturalistic forms has been one of the most significant among these. The Mound designed by him marked a significant toehold for his intentions. This was a grass-covered hill holding underneath it a center for various uses. It was basically a shed allowing for endless reconfigurations of activities and services. Conceptually, it was very similar to Cedric Price’s Fun Palace, but formally it was erratic. It was an experiment with and into landscape.²⁹

Peter Cook’s further private investigation headed in this direction with a special concern about landscape. What he started with the Mound “as a separate vein of intellectual therapy”³⁰ evolved into a major preoccupation which nourished his utopian constructs – metamorphosis towards the non-solid.³¹

According to Cook, metamorphosis is a notion that is considerably rich and fruitful, and a key example which set the bases for his experimentations is the Urban Mark he proposed in 1972 – in between the Mound and the Sponge. This was Cook’s first urban challenge with disintegration and metamorphosis. The scheme, as he defines it, started almost like a Plug-in City and very rapidly started decaying. It decayed further and further until it became almost like a moon landscape, and yet the architecture within it subsisted in a much less formalized condition. This was explored, exploited and expressed through drawings.

Cook, quite frequently, elaborated on his survey in this line through sequential illustrations which represented the architectonics of metamorphosis. In certain instances, he took a bit from the whole and massaged it with the concept as in Arcadia Towers (1975-1978) and Veg-house of Veg-village. In others, he worked with silhouettes or plans, as is most significantly visible in Urban Mark and Way Out West Berlin (1988).

For Cook, drawing is the “the motive force of architecture”.³² He states that architectural drawings link statemental notions with visual accompaniments. It is fairly possible to claim that he succeeded in conceiving a language for architectural drawings that reads statementally. To do this, he deliberately distanced himself equally from his motive and from the tectonics of architecture.

Cook has been very deliberate about the tone he uses in his language – something that he calibrates very delicately according to his audience. He claims, with his utopian illustra-

27 HAYS, 2010: 2

28 MARTIN, 2010

29 COOK, 2008

30 SPENS, 2007: 14

31 Cook, 1993

32 COOK, 2008

tions, to speak in many media to architects, and on most occasions, to a certain group of architects. Referring to his Way-Out-West Berlin, for instance, Cook states: "The question ... concerns the nature of the audience. As with the submission drawings for a competition one is talking to other architects, here in Berlin one was talking to a very particular set of architects: with Lebbeus Woods, Daniel Libeskind, Zaha Hadid and Thom Mayne on the list..."³³

Speaking to the Fast Company, Cook very frequently depicts an abstract yet complex language within which he wittingly refrains from drawing everything that is implicit in the very idea. The influential marks of his utopian thinking on his successors' works as well as his very own work, which he not only illustrates in but also develops through his drawings, is hence, substantially non-formal. It is rather intellectual.

This owes to the fact that the latent utopianisms of reference are utopianisms of potentiality rather than fulfilment, and as such they are very much in convergence with what David Harvey defines as 'dialectical utopianism' in his seminal *Spaces of Hope*. In divergence, however, they are not put forth as constituents of a line outside the utopian tradition but, on the contrary, as a significant part of it.

CONCLUSION

ZAKLJUČAK

According to Harvey, the utopian tradition severs space and time and results in two types of utopias: "utopias of spatial form" and "utopias of process".³⁴ In the first, "the imagined geography controls the possibility of social change," and the "temporality of the social process, the dialectics of social change – real history – are excluded".³⁵ Utopias of process, on the other hand, imply temporal processes which never come to a point of closure. De-

parting from this deficient categorization, he looks for and proposes an alternative type of utopianism which relies on dialectics.

Harvey's purpose in this, being a committed Marxist, is to respond extensively to, cope with, and defeat the forces of global capitalism. For this, in Levitas's highlights, "rather than rejecting utopianism on classical Marxist grounds", he "suggests that utopianism is particularly necessary and appropriate."³⁶ On this basis, he proposes dialectical utopianism as a way to engage with the possibilities of real time and space.

Dialectical utopianism involves both space and process, and is defined as spatiotemporal. It is about responding both to the materialist problems of *authority* and *closure* within utopias of spatial form – to the "static spatial form" – and a dangerous evasion of both in utopias of process – to "some perfected emancipatory process".³⁷

Harvey's perspective, however, has significant deficiencies. His approach departs from a conventional and rigid descriptive schema, which mainly depends on distinguishing between utopias of spatial form and utopias of process. In so doing, he reads the histories of the former and the latter separately and exclusively. Furthermore, he introduces his discussion on dialectical utopianism "as outside the utopian tradition, and essentially separate".³⁸

This text, on the contrary, asserts that the utopian tradition is not limited to any specific form, definition or category of utopia, and is not exclusive. It, rather, subsumes, without the necessary entailing of utopias, various and multifold forms of *utopianism* ranging between those which are loudly *manifested* and groundbreaking, and those that are *latent* and "passed around among the few, very much under the radar" as an "ultimate secret weapon".³⁹

Consequently, this text does not argue for a comprehensive framework for architectural

33 COOK, 2008: 50-51

34 HARVEY, 2000

35 LEVITAS, 2003: 140

36 LEVITAS, 2003: 137

37 HARVEY, 2000: 196

38 LEVITAS, 2003: 142-143

39 LOHRMANN, 2014

40 LOHRMANN, 2014

utopias, but rather for one which enables a unitary interpretation of utopian thinking and architecture. In its intentions, it is not different from Harvey's. In its method, however, it differs radically, as, rather than working with definitions, it proposes a means of comparative and critical analysis of utopianisms exploiting utopia as method.

This discussion intends to accentuate the potentialities of possible reconfigurations of the relationship between architecture and utopia in addressing the complex milieu of urban problems. To this end, utopianism is defined not exclusively as an act of constituting alternatives to the existing, but as an act of critical representation and conceptual challenge regarding the existing state of affairs, many underestimated and underdiscussed varieties of which exist throughout the 20th century history of architecture.

Any aim to invigorate the utopian artery of architectural thinking and production should certainly consider "how and with what consequences it has worked as both a constructive and destructive force for change in our historical geography".³⁶ It should also consider the reasons for failure in transforming utopian ideals into real world practices. As a means, this scrutiny proposes a method, if not a systematic manner of approach, to achieve a comprehensive and non-reductive understanding of the varieties of relationship between architectural utopianism and architectural production. This is to equip contemporary architectural thinking with means – useful elements from the utopian genre – to span the gap between the protectionist, the small-scale, the introverted and the grand, the complex, and the extroverted.

[Written in English by the autor,
proof-read by BETH ELAINE DOGAN,
Instructor, Middle East Technical University,
Ankara, Turkey]

BIBLIOGRAPHY

LITERATURA

1. AURELI, P. V. (2011), *The City within the City: O. M. Ungers, OMA, and The Project of the City as Archipelago*, in *The Possibility of an Absolute Architecture*, The MIT Press, 177-228, Cambridge
2. BLETTER, R. H. (1981), *The Interpretation of the Glass Dream-Expressionist Architecture and the History of the Crystal Metaphor*, "Journal of the Society of Architectural Historians", 40 (1): 20-43, University of California Press; <https://doi.org/10.2307/989612>
3. BLOCH, E. (1995), *The Principle of Hope*, The MIT Press, Cambridge
4. BLOCH, E. (2000), *The Spirit of Utopia*, Stanford University Press, Stanford
5. BRISTOL, K. C. (2015), *The Pruitt-Igoe Myth*, "Journal of Architectural Education", 44 (3): 163-171; <https://doi.org/10.1080/10464883.1991.11102687>
6. CHOAY, F. (1965), *L'urbanisme: utopies et réalités. Une anthologie*, Editions du Seuil, Paris
7. CHOAY, F.; BRATTON, D. (1997), *The Rule and the Model on the Theory of Architecture and Urbanism*, The MIT Press, Cambridge
8. COLEMAN, N. (2000), *Inventing an Exemplary Architecture: The Function of Utopia in Architectural Imagination*, dissertation, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia
9. COLEMAN, N. (2005), *Utopias and Architecture*, Routledge, Abingdon
10. COLEMAN, N.; LEVITAS, R.; SARGENT, L. T. (2011), *Dialogue*, in: *Imagining and Making the World* [ed. COLEMAN, N.], Peter Lang: 289-306, Bern; <https://doi.org/10.3726/978-3-0353-0173-1>
11. COLEMAN, N. (2013), *Recovering Utopia*, "Journal of Architectural Education", 67 (1): 24-26; <https://doi.org/10.1080/10464883.2013.767117>
12. COLOMINA, B., and others (2012), *Radical Pedagogies in Architectural Education*, The Architectural Review, <https://www.architectural-review.com/today/radical-pedagogies-in-architectural-education/8636066.article> [1.1.2019]
13. COOK, P. (1993), *Six Conversations*, Academy Editions, London
14. COOK, P. (2008), *Drawing: The Motive Force of Architecture*, John Wiley and Sons Ltd., West Sussex
15. GUNERI, G. D. (2014), *A New Conceptual Framework for Architectural Utopia(nism)s*, dissertation, Middle East Technical University, Ankara
16. GUTSCHOW, K. (2006), *From Object to Installation in Bruno Taut's Exhibit Pavilions*, "Journal of Architectural Education", 59: 63; <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1531-314X.2006.00055.x>
17. HARVEY, D. (2000), *Spaces of Hope*, University of California Press, Berkeley
18. HAYS, K. M. (2010), *Architecture's desire: reading the late avant-garde*, The MIT Press, Cambridge
19. JAMESON, F. (2005), *Archaeologies of the Future: The Desire Called Utopia and Other Science Fictions*, Perso, London
20. LEVITAS, R. (1990), *The Concept of Utopia*, Philip Allan, Hertfordshire
21. LEVITAS, R. (2003), *On Dialectical Utopianism*, "History of the Human Sciences", 16: 137-150; <https://doi.org/10.1177/0952695103016001011>
22. LEVITAS, R. (2007a), *Looking for the blue: The necessity of utopia*, "Journal of Political Ideologies", 12 (3): 289-306; <https://doi.org/10.1080/13569310701622184>
23. LEVITAS, R. (2007b), *The Imaginary Reconstruction of Society*, in: *Utopia Method Vision: The Use Value of Social Dreaming* [ed. MOYLAN, T.; BACCOLINI, R.], Peter Lang: 47-68, Bern
24. LOHRMANN, K. *Book Review: "The City in the City - Berlin: A Green Archipelago. A manifesto*, <https://architect.com/features/article/105250588/book-review-the-city-in-the-city-berlin-a-green-archipelago-a-manifesto> [10.12.2018]
25. MARCUSE, H. (1967), *The End of Utopia*, Psychoanalyse und Politik, Berlin
26. MARTIN, R. (2010), *Utopia's Ghost: Architecture and Postmodernism, Again*, University of Minnesota Press, Minneapolis; <https://doi.org/10.5749/minnesota/9780816669622.001.0001>
27. MCLEOD, M. C. (1985), *Urbanism and utopia: Le Corbusier from regional syndicalism to Vichy*, dissertation, Princeton University, Princeton
28. MODENA, L. (2011), *Italo Calvino's Architecture of Lightness: The Utopian Imagination in an Age of Urban Crisis*, Routledge, New York
29. MOYLAN, T. (2014), *Demand the Impossible. Science Fiction and the Utopian Imagination*, Peter Lang, Oxford; <https://doi.org/10.3726/978-3-0353-0610-1>
30. MUMFORD, L. (1922), *The Story of Utopias*, Boni and Liveright Inc., New York
31. STEINER, H. (2003), *For the Birds*, "Grey Room", 13: 5-31; <https://doi.org/10.1162/152638103322751047>
32. SPENS, M. (2007), *From Mound to Sponge: How Peter Cook Explores Landscape Buildings*, "Architectural Design", 77 (2): 12-15; <https://doi.org/10.1002/ad.419>
33. TAFURI, M. (1976), *Architecture and Utopia: Design and Capitalist Development*, The MIT Press, Cambridge
34. TAUT, B. (1972), *Glass Architecture: And Alpine Architecture*, Praeger, New York
35. URBAN, F. (2012), *Tower and Slab: Histories of Global Mass Housing*, Routledge, London
36. VIDLER, A. (1990), *Claude-Nicolas Ledoux: architecture and social reform at the end of the Ancien Regime*, The MIT Press, Cambridge
37. *** (1961), *The City in History: Its Origins, Its Transformations, and Its Prospects*, Harcourt Books, Orlando
38. *** (2011), *Imagining and Making the World* [ed. COLEMAN, N.] Peter Lang, Bern

SUMMARY

SAŽETAK

O RAZNOLIKOSTI ARHITEKTONSKOG UTOPIZMA

KRITIČKA INTERPRETACIJA UTOPIJSKE ARHITEKTURE 20. STOLJEĆA

Unatoč širokoj lepezi radova koji se bave recipročnim odnosom utopija i arhitekture, o utopizmu kao činu idealiziranja nečega boljšega i kao stanju uma u arhitektonskom promišljanju nije se mnogo razmatralo u stručnoj literaturi. Ovaj tekst namjerava popuniti tu prazninu razmatranjem i ukazivanjem na metodološko značenje utopizma u praksi urbanizma i osobito arhitekture polazeći od temeljnih definicija Ruth Levitas.

Prema ovoj autorici sve uske definicije utopije nedostatan definiraju njezin potencijal. Levitas predlaže da se krene od temelja koncepta utopije i vrlo široko definira utopiju kao „izraz želje za boljim načinom bivanja” [LEVITAS, 2007.a: 290]. Time se mijenja naglasak od toga što utopija stvarno jest prema analitičkim koncepcijama utopije, što vodi do određene metode analize koju ona naziva „utopija kao metoda”. Utopija kao metoda implicira iskapanje različitih zakopanih oblika utopizma iz društvenih, političkih i, u ovome slučaju, arhitektonskih programa [LEVITAS, 2007.b]. U skladu s time ovaj rad namjerava izložiti različite načine eksploatairanja utopijskog mišljenja u arhitekturi.

Mnogi – ako ne većina – oblici razrade arhitektonskih utopizama sagledavaju se u odnosu na modernu arhitekturu i njezin neuspjeh. Oni su uglavnom utemeljeni na nedostatcima artikuliranih formi koje zagovaraju modernisti i koje ih cine ‘projektima’. Drugim riječima, neuspjesi izgrađenih eksperimentalnih formi svaljuju se na pojam utopije.

Primjeri Le Corbusiera [Ville Contemporaine /1922./, Ville Radieuse /1924./, Plan Voisin /1925./ i njegovi prijedlozi za Alzir između 1931. i 1940. te za Nemours - višestambeni blokovi Unité - 1933.] jasni su primjeri utopizama unutar kojih konstruirani ideal djeluje kao projekt koji je formalno vidljiv. Manifestni utopizmi kao ovi formalno su apsolutni i konkretno ilustrirani. U njima je arhitektonski jezik ekstremno di-

rektna, a svaka komponenta formalno detaljizirana. To eliminira konceptualnu dubinu originalnoga konstrukta. Neuspjesi samih brojki koje su ekstremne redukcije ovih komponenata gotovo su odmah povezane s neuspjehom utopije. Metodološke vokacije arhitektonskog utopizma ipak nisu ograničene samo na manifestne utopizme.

Za razliku od manifestnih utopizama prikriveni arhitektonski utopizmi ne konstruiraju nužno utopije u njihovu potpunom, konkretnom i konačnom smislu, već prije djeluju kao reference. Unutar ovih često previdenih utopizama koristi se dijalektički jezik kojim se obraca samo ciljanoj publici putem namjerne složenosti koja se razvija kroz raznolike recepcije od strane toga slušateljstva. Uklopljena elastičnost u utopizmima kao takva leži ne samo u namjernom izbjegavanju neposrednosti nego i u kontroliranoj blizini i u suglasju s realnošću. Oni osiguravaju okvire za arhitektonsko razmišljanje i zamišljanje, ali ne idealne prostore. Stoga njihova realizacija nije moguća samo kroz internalizaciju arhitektonskih definicija i normi u najširem smislu. Raznolikost utopijskih impulsa, potaknuta prikrivenim arhitektonskim utopizmima, značajna je. U brojnim se slučajevima konstituirani ideal prenosi kroz jednu jedinu zgradu koja ovoga puta nije formalno utjelovljenje dijela cjeline, već ona koja djeluje kao instalacija. Stakleni je paviljon (Bruno Taut), primjerice, za razliku od Unité (Le Corbusier), prije spekulativni primjer cjeline koja jedino može biti interpretirana kritičkom detaljnom analizom izgrađene forme. Slično i bazen za pingvine (Berthold Lubetkin) kao njihov novi okoliš implicira radikalno nov životni stil društva. Postao je refleksivni minijurni model ideala okoliša i opisan je u mnogim krugovima – ne samo arhitektonskim – više konceptualno i tematski nego formalno. U mnogim slučajevima utopijski programi prikrivenih

utopizama pronalaze manje konkretne primjere kroz teorijske pothvate. Eksperimentalna pedagoška praksa i predstavljanja najuočljiviji su tipovi takvih pothvata.

Utopijsko razmišljanje korišteno u radikalnim pedagozijama, koje izazivaju tradiciju same discipline nastojeći destabilizirati postojeće norme teorije i prakse, dijalektičko je i refleksivno. Kao i Ungero- vi radovi u ateljeru između 1965. i 1977. koji postaju temelj za manifestaciju i testiranje arhitektonskih alata, oni su u osnovi istraživački projekti.

Odnos između misli i forme indirektan je u diskurzivnim reprezentacijskim materijalima koji umjesto da postaju subjekti arhitektonske produkcije, postaju objekti prikazivanja sami po sebi. Eksperimenti Petera Cooka s crtežom kao sredstvom tkanja iskaznih pojmova i vizualnih priloga i također kao sredstvo oslobađanja arhitektonske misli od ograničenja stvarnoga – tektonike – tretirajući nekoliko tema, iščitava se kao utopijski u tome smislu.

Prikriveni utopizmi su utopizmi potencijala više nego ispunjenja i kao takvi konvergiraju s onim što David Harvey definira kao ‘dijalektički utopizam’ u *Spaces of Hope*. Ipak, oni nisu sastavni dio neke tendencije izvan utopijske tradicije, već, naprotiv, njihov značajan dio. To je zbog pretpostavke da utopijska tradicija obuhvata, a da nužno ne povlači za sobom utopije, raznolike i mnogostruke forme utopizma - od onih koji su naglašeno manifestni i revolucionarni do onih koji su prikriveni i koji prolaze „ispod radara” kao „krajnje tajno oružje” [LOHRMANN, 2014.].

Metodološko istraživanje ovih metoda u svjetlu diskusija u sklopu ovoga rada potencijalno obećava da će arhitekt 21. stoljeća biti opremljen korisnim elementima iz utopijskog znanja kako bi premostio jaz između zaštitničkog, malog, introvertiranog i velikog, složenog i ekstrovertiranog.

BIOGRAPHY

BIOGRAFIJA

GIZEM DENIZ GUNERI, PhD, holds a professional degree in architecture. She completed a Masters in Architecture and Urban Design at Columbia University as a Fulbright scholar and a PhD in Architecture at Middle East Technical University. She has recently completed her studies as a research fellow at Harvard University Graduate School of Design. Her major interests include architectural utopias, collective urban form, landscape and urban design.

Dr.sc. **GIZEM DENIZ GUNERI** diplomirala je arhitekturu. Magistrirala je u području arhitekture i urbanog dizajna na Sveučilištu Columbia kao Fulbrightova stipendistica, a doktorirala u području arhitekture na Tehničkom sveučilištu Bliskog istoka. Nedavno je završila svoj studij u svojstvu istraživača na Sveučilištu Harvard (Graduate School of Design). Njezini interesi usmjereni su prema utopijama u arhitekturi, kolektivnoj urbanoj formi, krajobrazu i urbanom dizajnu.

