Re-visiting the Political Context of Manfredo Tafuri's "Toward a Critique of Architectural Ideology": 'Having Corpses in our Mouths'

Emre Özyetiş
B.Arch.

2013
RMIT

Re-visiting the Political Context of Manfredo Tafuri's "Toward a Critique of Architectural Ideology": 'Having Corpses in our Mouths'

A thesis submitted in fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree of
Master of Architecture

Emre Özyetiş
B.Arch.

School of Architecture and Design
Design and Social Context Portfolio
RMIT University
March 2013

DECLARATION

I certify that except where due acknowledgements has been made, the work is that of the author alone; the work has not been submitted previously, in whole or in part, to qualify for any other academic award; the content of the thesis is the result of work which has been carried out since the official commencement date of the approved research program; and, any editorial work, paid or unpaid, carried out by a third party is acknowledged.

Emre Özyetiş

March 31, 2013

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I wrote this thesis on the occupied land of Wurundjeri people of the Kulin Nations. I acknowledge the traditional Custodians of the Land and pay my respect to Elders past and present. As an international student from Turkey, I am compelled to state that I support the ongoing struggle of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people for land rights, self-determination, and justice.

I am grateful and indebted for their generous advice, patience and support to Andrew Leach, Juliette Peers, Damian Grenfell and Steve Wright.

I do not have words to express my gratitude for the continuing support, guidance as well as tremendous efforts to help transforming my work into a comprehensible text by my supervisor Jane Burry.

Hellen Sky, Mike Hornblow, Naman Thakar, Peta Carlin and fellow colleagues at SIAL had contributed to my research with their comments, feedback and companionship. I would also like to thank to Niccolo Palandri for sharing his over-the-top linguistic skills with me.

Without the financial support from the Ministry of Education of Turkey and Mardin Artuklu University, Turkey, I would have not been able to conduct my research at all. Thanks for the kind assistance provided by Mahmut Ayhan and Mükerrem Yahyaoğlu for facilitating this support.

I would not have considered doing this research without the help and motivation from Zeynep Mennan. I am grateful to her and her support which made this research possible in the first place.

Ani T. Superstar, Alice Goddard, Biddy Boudislayer, Burak Acıl, Ceren Özyetiş, Dosta Dyareah, Elvan Aynal, Gülten Özyetiş, Hellen Sky, James J. Bonger, Kayle Goddard, Lucy Berglund, Nejat Özyetiş, Orr Guilat, Özlem Arslan and Steph Wogton D. Ago have supported me in numerous ways in the last two years. I love them.

CONTENTS

Abstract 1

1. Introduction 5

1.1 Document Structure 11

Section I: Presenting the problem and the work

2. Problem - Prelude 17

2.1 The role of the architect in the contemporary socio political framework 17
2.1.1 Architecture as a profession 17
2.2 Confronting the Contemporary Role of the Architects 25
2.3 Understanding the Contemporary Circumstances with the Aid of Post-1968 Discourse 31
2.4 Manfredo Tafuri Haunts (Again) 34

3. "Toward a Critique of Architectural Ideology" 41

3.1 Introduction to Chapter Three 41
3.2 A Cross-section of "Toward a Critique of Architectural Ideology" 43
3.3 Problems with Approaching the Essay 47
3.3.1 Problems with approaching the essay via Architecture and Utopia 50
3.3.2 Problems with approaching the essay via Manfredo Tafuri 55
3.3.3 Problems with approaching the essay via Tafuri's audience 75
3.4 Conclusion to Chapter Three 85

Section II: Examining the Relevance of the Work in the Context

4. Political Framework of "Toward a Critique of Architectural Ideology" 93

4.1 Introduction to Chapter Four 93
4.1.1 A note on autonomist-Marxism and *operaismo* 96
4.2 *Operaismo* as a Political Project in Italy 101
4.2.1 The new left and the *operaisti* 103
4.2.2 *Quaderni rossi* 106
4.2.3 *Classe operaia* 114
4.2.4 *Contropiano* 118
4.2.5 Italy 1967-1970 133
4.3 Conclusion to Chapter Four 143

5. Writing that Returns to the Political Framework of the Essay 147

5.1 Introduction to Chapter Five 147
5.2 Pier Vittorio Aureli and his narration of 1960s and 1970s Italy 149
5.3 Gail Day and her take on Tafuri 166
5.4 Conclusion to Chapter Five 172

Section III: Recapitulation

6. Conclusions 181

Epilogue 189

Bibliography 193

ABSTRACT

In this thesis I revisit Manfredo Tafuri's 1969 article "Per una critica dell'ideologia architettonica" (Toward a Critique of Architectural Ideology) within the political context of Italy in the 1960s. I address the research question: what is the contemporary relevance of the essay read in this context? I suggest that testing the arguments in Tafuri's 1969 essay against his complete oeuvre and his subsequent career as a critic or a historian obfuscates and misconstrues the context and the essay.

I argue that the essay was published in a moment when *operaisti* protagonists were processing the implications of the *operaisti* discourse they constructed in relation to the intensification of the social conflict in Italy in the late 1960s and the 1970s. This provides a convincing context for Tafuri's application of this discourse as a total rejection of the possibility of the existence of an architectural profession outside participation in capitalist development. I conclude that, located with precision within the context of the journal *Contropiano*, where his essay was first published,"Toward a Critique of Architectural Ideology" is more likely to agitate intellectuals and architects than it has previously.

It is important for the generation who has not yet acquired professional autonomy, such as architectural students or interns, to be reminded of Tafuri's critique within its context as they assume their social vocation. Thus this is my target readership for this thesis. It is particularly important to revisit Tafuri and his 1969 essay at a time when there is a growing discussion around a social vocation or discourse on sustainability, participatory design, radical architecture and such. The social agenda still makes the art and the profession of architecture resilient to transforming political, economic and social structures. In this light, it is not only necessary but

also relevant to revisit the nature of the social vocation of architects as it had been criticized in Tafuri's 1969 essay within the intellectual debates Italian *operaisti* project initiated.

Intellectuals and architects writing following Tafuri's death point to the past misinterpretation of the radical threads they attribute to Tafuri in *Progetto e utopia*. Since then, and predominantly in the twenty-first century, a group of writers such as Asor Rosa, Ghirardo, Day, Aureli and Leach identify this admission of past misappropriation of Tafuri's project. Among these architectural historians and theoreticians, Asor Rosa, Day and Ghirardo have shown that Tafuri's arguments have frequently been too hastily dismissed for being too apocalyptic and/or too nihilistic: an interpretation that they do not accept. I argue that to counter this interpretation they have also obfuscated the arguments in Tafuri's essay by making reference to his other works in order to prove that he was not really attacking architectural practice and theory. Similar to works that overlook the political context of Tafuri's essay, the recent attempts to include it also fail to confront the implications of the arguments raised in the essay.

In twenty-first century architectural discourse, Aureli and Day are arguably the authors who pay most attention to the political framework for Tafuri's essay. They look for the relevance of the political projects initiated by *operaismo* and *autonomia* to contemporary architectural discourse. They return to the context for one of two objectives. Aureli returns to the historical political context in order to dismiss the relevance of the autonomist arguments to today. Day returns to the context to neutralize both the context and the arguments by writing a defense from the perspective of the intellectual and the architect who is criticized in Tafuri's article. These contemporary attempts that do re-visit Tafuri within the economic, political and social context of 1960s and 1970s Italy fail to move beyond certain post-1960s rhetoric that justifies the apathy of intellectuals and an impasse in relation to social conflicts. This is encapsulated in the mood: "If you can't beat them, join them." The arguments present in the 1969 essay were expanded and elaborated by Tafuri in 1973. The affinity between the 1969 essay and the 1973 volume in which the impact of the 1968 political agenda was less extreme, eases architects, intellectuals and Tafuri scholars into a position where they do not need to confront the implications of the essay and its political framework.

In response to the research question I address, I conclude that if we can approach "Toward a Critique of Architectural Ideology" in the precise moment it occupies within the context of Italy in the 1960s and the ongoing debates amongst *operaisti* – affiliated intellectuals, we can embrace the essay as a critique of the limits of intellectuals and professionals in

social conflicts, that is indeed nihilistic and apocalyptic for those who insist on their role as architects or academics. I find this a relevant and important gesture as it may make us more open to be agitated, for us to question our own participation in capitalist development in order to confront the post 1960s as well as contemporary architectural discourse and practice.

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

In 1969 Manfredo Tafuri (Rome 1935-Venice 1994) raised one of the most influential and radical critiques of architecture with his essay "Per una critica dell'ideologia architettonica" in the Italian journal *Contropiano*.[1] In 1973 he published the pamphlet *Progetto e utopia* that was based on his 1969 essay.[2] His critique shaped his reputation amongst his audience as a Marxist historiographer. Arguing for the incapacity of architecture to challenge capitalist development due to its inherent and necessary relationship with capitalist structures, Tafuri's inquiry set the lens through which his project was perceived especially in English-speaking architectural discourse. Apart from Tafuri's own critique of his audience, his contemporaneous generation of architects, architectural historians and theoreticians as well as a subsequent generation of architectural theoreticians and historians after his death in 1994 have subjected conflicting and problematic interpretations of Tafuri's works to criticism.[3]

In twenty-first century architectural discourse, the return to Tafuri's works, especially by Andrew Leach catalyzed the establishment of the recognition of his oeuvre as a whole.[4] With the publication *Manfredo Tafuri: Choosing History*, Tafuri's contribution

---

1 Manfredo Tafuri, "Per una critica dell'ideologia architettonica," in *Contropiano: Materiali marxisti* 1 (1969): 31-79. Translated into English by Stephen Sartorelli as "Toward a Critique of Architectural Ideology," in *Architecture Theory since 1968*, ed. K. Michael Hays (Cambridge and London: MIT Press, 1998): 6-35.

2 Manfredo Tafuri, *Progetto e utopia: Architettura e sviluppo capitalistico* (Bari: Laterza, 1973). Translated into English by Barbara Luigia La Penta as *Architecture and Utopia: Design and Capitalist Development* (Cambridge & London: MIT Press, 1976).

3 Vittorio Gregotti, ed. "Il progetto storico di Manfredo Tafuri" / "The Historical Project of Manfredo Tafuri," special issue *Casabella*, nos. 619-620 (1995); Ignasi de Solà-Morales, ed., "Being Manfredo Tafuri," special issue *Architecture New York (ANY)*, nos. 25-26 (2000). Those two monographic issues which were published on Manfredo Tafuri after Tafuri's death in 1994 at the age of 58.

4 Andrew Leach, *Manfredo Tafuri: Choosing History* (Ghent: A&S Books, 2007). In his PhD Dissertation, which constituted the basis of his book, Leach provides a more articulated account of this reading. See Andrew Leach, "Choosing History: A Study of Manfredo Tafuri's Theorisation of Architectural History and Architectural History Research," (PhD diss., University of Ghent, 2006). Leach's 2006 PhD dissertation on Manfredo Tafuri is preceded by his publications, such as: "'Everything we do is but the larva of our intentions': Manfredo Tafuri and Storia dell'architettura italiana 1944-1985," in *Additions to Architectural History: XIXth Annual Conference of the Society of Architectural Historians, Australia and New Zealand*, ed. John Macarthur and Antony Moulis (Brisbane: SAHANZ, 2002): 1-12; "Death in Venice: Tafuri's Life in the Project," in *Architectural Theory Review* 8, no.1 (2003): 235-244; "Inoperative Criticism: Tafuri and the Discipline of History," in *Architectural Theory Review* 8, no.2 (2003): 85-93; as well as his contribution to 2004 meeting of "Critical Architecture" conference organized by the Architectural Humanities Research Association, that is published later as "Criticality and Operativity," in *Critical Architecture*, ed. Mark Dorrian, Murray Fraser, Jonathan Hill and Jane

to the history of architecture is acknowledged instead of clinging to the political persona of Tafuri that was created by his critique of architectural ideology and his first book that was translated into English: *Architecture and Utopia*.[5] Regardless, Tafuri's works are still being revisited to re-establish the context and political framework of his works in order to deliver a more appropriate understanding of Tafuri in response to the generation of architects, theoreticians and historians who seemed to misconstrue Tafuri's intentions. These are contemporary inquiries into a more accurate understanding of Tafuri, which are important as they confront a generation of architects, historians and theoreticians for constructing various *Tafuris*.[6]

However, with this thesis I argue that such inquiries are still inclined to fail to address the particularity of the political framework of "Toward a Critique of Architectural Ideology," and can not go beyond the already existing debates around Tafuri and his

---

Rendell (London and New York: Routledge, 2007): 14-21.

5 Tafuri's first work that appeared in English was "Design and Technological Utopia," in *Italy: The New Domestic Landscape, Achievements and Problems of Italian Design*, ed., Emilio Ambasz (New York: Museum of Modern Art, 1972): 388-404.

6 In 2006, at Columbia University and Cooper Union, New York, a conference titled "The Critical Legacies of Manfredo Tafuri" was organized by Daniel Sherer, who is also the English translator of *Interpreting the Renaissance: Princes, Cities, Architectures* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 2006): Tafuri's last book that had been released at this event 14 years later than its original publication in Italian. In this gathering, "the elite of the international scene of architecture history and theory," referred by Teresa Stoppani, addressed:

> Tafuri's trajectory both on the historiographical and the theoretical levels and in terms of the complexities of his reception in Europe and the United States [...] to move beyond reductive characterizations that have tended to impede the understanding of his work - the end of architecture, nihilism, political and economic determinism, and a nostalgic disconnection from the present - in order to renew the dialogue Tafuri opened between architecture and history. (see Teresa Stoppani, "The Building of Tension - Manfredo Tafuri's Legacy: from Operative Criticism to Historical Project, Between Critical Practices and Material Practices in Architecture," in *Reflections on Creativity: Exploring the Role of Theory in Creative Practices, 21 and 22 April 2006*, ed. Hamid van Koten (Dundee: Duncan of Jordanstone College, 2007).

As Jon Goodbun reports: "now-aging generation of theorists and critics, including Anthony Vidler, Kenneth Frampton, Diana Agrest and Joan Ockman [...] all concluded with the idea that it might be Tafuri's very indigestibility within consumer culture that keeps this project critical, as well as obscure." Suspicious about the commitment of this group to what extent Tafuri's project is relevant to their own tasks, Goodbun mentions contributions by Sherer, Andrew Leach, Marco de Michelis, Carla Keyvanian, Marco Biraghi Mark Rakatansky, Beatriz Colomina, Alessandra Ponte, Jean-Louis Cohen and James Ackerman's contributions as rather different or memorable scholarly works. Yet, Goodwin suggests that in this conference what was significantly omitted was the trans-disciplinary aspects of Tafuri's reception by authors such as Gail Day and David Cunningham (See Jon Goodbun, "The Assasin: The Critical Legacies of Manfredo Tafuri, Columbia University, New York, 20-21 April 2006," in *Radical Philosophy* 138 (July/August 2006).

project.[7]

7 Alberto Asor Rosa, with his article "Manfredo Tafuri, or, Humanism Revisited," calls to revisit Tafuri and his *Architecture and Utopia* with reference to the roles played by the "Marxist 'political theory." Alberto Asor Rosa, "Manfredo Tafuri, or, Humanism Revisited," trans. Ruth Taylor with Daniele Pisani and Manuel Orazi in *Log* 9 (Winter/Spring 2007): 29-38, 29. This is not the call that lays the foundations of such a project though. Asor Rosa himself raised the relevance of the political context of 1960s and 1970s Italy to Tafuri's project as a historian in 1995 with his contribution to the monographic issue of *Casabella* on Tafuri, see Alberto Asor Rosa, "Critica dell'ideologica ed esercizio storico" / "Critique of Ideology and Historical Practice," trans. Sebastiano Brandolini in "Il progetto strocio di Manfredo Tafuri" / The Historical Project of Manfredo Tafuri," ed. Vittorio Gregotti, special issue, *Casabella* nos. 619-620 (1995): 28-33. I will elaborate more on the progression of attempts to bring Tafuri's works' political dimensions into the discourse. However at this stage it is worthy mentioning that; in the twenty-first century, there appears what seems to be a reiteration of what Mark Wigley and his writing on the legacy of Tafuri. He depicts this legacy as haunted by Tafuri's "ghost" and "remystified" by the "Continentals" and "Anglo Saxons." See Mark Wigley, "Post-Operative History" in "Being Manfredo Tafuri," ed. Ignasi de Sola-Morales, *ANY,* nos. 25-26 (February 2000) 47-53. Diane Ghirardo and Gail Day are English-speaking theoreticians who study Manfredo Tafuri in the light of the critique Mark Wigley and Alberto Asor Rosa address. Their critique is shaped with reference to Tafuri's audience who overlook the political project Tafuri can be located within. Apart from those authors who I pay most attention to; Teresa Stoppani, David Cunningham and Hilde Heynen are figures who acknowledge Tafuri in their inquiries with their contributions in Mark Dorrian, Murray Fraser, Jonathan Hill and Jane Rendell, eds., *Critical Architecture* (London and New York: Routledge, 2007).

At first sight, Pier Vittorio Aureli might give the impression he is infatuated with Tafuri and *operaismo* to his readers who also engage with Tafuri. To some extent, this hasty judgment is concreted in the form of a relation drawn between the two, most evidently, in his essay "Intellectual Work and Capitalist Development: Origins and Context of Manfredo Tafuri's Critique of Architectural Ideology," on the internet portal *The City as a Project* (2011), which had been published in 2009 at the Swedish Journal *SITE*. See Pier Vittorio Aureli, "Intellectual Work and Capitalist Development: Origins and Context of Manfredo Tafuri's Critique of Architectural Ideology" in *SITE* 26-27 (2009): 18-23. However, to some extent diverging from the other writers who study Tafuri in relation to his works' political dimensions, he is not convinced that returning to this context is relevant nor Tafuri's project should be limited within this context merely as his publications The *Project of Autonomy* (2008) and T*he Possibility of an Absolute Architecture* (2011) suggest. See Pier Vittorio Aureli, *The Project of Autonomy: Politics and Architecture within and against Capitalism* (New York: Princeton Architectural Press, 2008); Pier Vittorio Aureli, *The Possibility of an Absolute Architecture* (Cambridge, London: MIT Press, 2011).

Apart from the relevance of Tafuri's works' political context to Tafuri's complete oeuvre, there are inquiries on this context, that can be roughly identified as *operaismo,* within the domain of design and architecture which do extend beyond debates on Tafuri: and probably Aureli's The *Project of Autonomy* can be located more precisely amongst such attempts. Alexandra Brown's recent research project at the University of Queensland on "Radical Restructuring: Aesthetic and Political Autonomy in Italian Architecture & Design, 1963-73" is another example which we can have an idea about via "*Operaismo*, Architecture & Design in Ambasz's New Domestic Landscape: Issues of Redefinition and Refusal in 1960s Italy," in *Imagining: Proceedings of the 27th International SAHANZ Conference,* ed. Michael Chapman and Michael Ostwald (New Castle: SAHANZ, 2010): 52-57. Through Alexandra Brown, I became aware of Jacopo Galimberti's research on "Collectivism: Politics and Authorship in the Art of the 1960s," which is accompanied by his publications such as "The Intellectual and the Fool: Piero Manzoni between the Milanese Art Scene and the Land of Cockaigne," in *Oxford Art Journal* 35, no.1 (2012): 75-94; "The N Group

Contemporary inquiries into Tafuri's work do not necessairly problematize with the forced relationship of the 1969 essay to later works of Tafuri. This may suggest a better understanding of the work if we believe it is a necessary, or even as the only way to understand a work by contextualising the work within an author's career. However, I argue that if we isolate Tafuri's 1969 essay from Tafuri's later works, including the essay's later edition in 1976, then the pessimistic and apolcalyptical implications of the essay can be acknowledged and even embraced. By returning to the essay and its specific chronological and political context, motivated by a critique of both political and architectural post-1960s discourse and contemporary architectural discourse, the particularity of the context in which the essay was written is highlighted. Guided by this conviction, I examine the relevance of re-visiting the political context of Tafuri's 1969 essay and construct the thesis by first addressing the difficulties of approaching Tafuri and his project in general and then providing an account of the political context of 1960s Italy in order to demonstrate the limitations of returning to this context within an architectural discourse.[8]

---

and the Operaisti: Art and Class Struggle in the Italian Economic Boom," in *Grey Room* 45 (Fall 2012): 80-101. I believe they deserve more attention as they contrast with what we observe that in the dominant twenty-first century architecture discourse where the political trajectory opened up by *operaismo* is taken into consideration are still most likely through attempts to appropriate theories and writings of *operaismo's* controversial subsequent movement *autonomia*. For example, we should acknowledge that apart from inquiries by academics listed above, Antonio Negri is simultaneously being drawn into architectural debates. This is demonstrated most recently, at the time of writing, by François Roche in "A Dialogue: Negri and Roche," interview with Antonio Negri in "Reclaim Resi[lience]stance," ed. François Roche, *Log* 25 (New York: Anyone Corporation, 2012): 104-117; which had been preceded by Hans Ulrich Obrist, "In Conversation with Antonio Negri," in *e-flux journal* 18 (September 2010), http://www.e-flux.com/journal/in-conversation-with-antonio-negri/ and Negri being asked to commentate on Rem Koolhaas in *Radical History* in 2009. See Antonio Negri, "On Rem Koolhaas," trans. Arianna Bove in *Radical Philosophy* 154 (March-April 2009): 48-50.

8 Not having access to original documentation in Italian is a limitation for inquiries into Manfredo Tafuri and his works. Having said that, in response to my research question in this thesis, which seeks the relevance of returning to Manfredo Tafuri and his 1969 essay in the contemporary context, I avoid suggesting a more proper or a more accurate reading of Tafuri or his works. Instead, I try assessing the implications of isolating his inquiry in 1969 as a response to the reception of Manfredo Tafuri and his works amongst architectural theoreticians and historians today. The body of works I focus on is either translations of Manfredo Tafuri's works; secondary literature on Manfredo Tafuri; his works, as well as the context that is described in the studies study Italy in the 1960s and 1970s. Although I tried my best to study and address crucial texts and interviews in Italian, most works in Italian that are not translated into English, and similar studies in languages other than English, have not been studied in depth within the confines of this research. It is worth mentioning that the given emphasis on the political dimensions of Tafuri's works that dominates the discourse around his in English speaking audience is also present in the works of Italian authors. An example is Felice Mometti's research on Manfredo Tafuri he is undertaking at Paris VIII and his article "La crisi come progetto: Architettura e storia in Manfredo Tafuri" ("The crisis as the project: Architecture and History in ManfredoTafuri") where the author establishes a link between the Italian *operaismo* movement, particularly with reference to Tafuri's contributions to *Contropiano*. See Felice Mometti, "Le crisi come progetto: Architettura e storia in ManfredoTafuri" in *Marx au XXI siècle :l'esprit& la lettre* (n.d) http://www.marxau21.fr/index.

Located within the context of 1960s Italy, the essay occupies a precise moment within the *operaisti* project when fractures between the *operaisti* intellectuals deepened with reference to their position on their roles as intellectuals in relation to the working class struggle against capitalist structures and the State after 1968. By returning to this context, we see neither *operaisti* nor autonomists actually exhaust the political framework of the 1960s with the tactics they adopt in the 1970s. Their efforts need to be acknowledged as part of a wider context that shaped the culture of struggle in Italy at that time.[9]

In the contemporary discourse, Pier Vittorio Aureli and Gail Day can righteously claim that they pioneered the discourse that re-introduces *operaismo* and *autonomia* movements into the architectural discourse for English-speaking audience. However their return to this context is bound within their academic inquiries and fails to go beyond a particular strand of post-1960s rhetoric, or simply they do not intend it to. This rhetoric takes it for granted that surrendering to capitalist development is the a priori condition without tackling how the revolutionary rhetoric of the context they re-visit came to that conclusion. Especially in the architectural discourse, not acknowledging the eruption of social conflicts that threatened the State and its institutions is a common way to approach the role Tafuri adopted in the 1970s. Tafuri's critique of architectural practice, which he raised in 1969 in Italy,

---

php?option=com_content&view=article&id=175:manfredo-tafuri-la-crisi-come-progetto&catid=54:culture-arts-a-esthetique&Itemid=77. In his research, Mometti does address the content of Marco Biraghi's *Progetto di crisi: Manfredo Tafuri e l'architettura contemporanea* (Milan: Marinotti, 2005). Via Silvia Micheli, I am aware of the translation of this volume, which has not been released at the time of writing, as *Project of Crisis: Manfredo Tafuri and Contemporary Architecture* (New York: MIT Press, forthcoming).

9 In English, Steve Wright's *Storming Heaven: Class Composition and Struggle in Italian Autonomist Marxism* (London: Pluto Press, 2002) is still the most comprehensive study of the period studied by an English-speaking scholar since it was published in 2002. Probably due to the lack of accessibility to seminal texts and pamphlets other than those predominant figures of the *operaisti* thinking had produced, *operaismo* suffers from lack of complete apprehension in English-speaking readers, that does not translate what the interviews with what *operaisti* thinkers and intellectuals suggest with their reflections on their intervention in the 1960s and 1970s. In Italian, for one of recent surveys of the period, see Guido Borio, Fracesca Pozzi, Gigi Roggero, eds., *Futuro anteriore: Dai "Quaderni rossi" ai movimento globali – Richezze e limiti dell'operaismo italiano* (Rome: DerriveApprodi, 2002). Steve Wright's *Storming Heaven* contains a dedication to overcome the limits and filters of approaching the *operaisti* project in English, even though Wright does not enmesh the interviews present in *Futuro anteriore.* He inquires into those interviews though, in his later publications such as: review of *Futuro anteriore. Dai 'Quaderni rossi' ai movimenti globali: ricchezze e limiti dell'operaismo italiano,* edited by Guido Borio, Fracesca Pozzi, Gigi Roggero and *La nefasta utopia di Potere operaio: Lavoro tecnica movimento nel laboratorio politico del Sessantotto italiano* by Franco Berardi: "Children of a Lesser Marxism?" in *Historical Materialism* 12, no.1 (2004): 261-274; "Back to the Future: Italian Workerists Reflect Upon the Operaista Project," in *ephemera* 7, no.1 (2007) 270-281. For other comprehensive studies on *operaismo* in English, see Sidney Tarrow, *Democracy and Disorder: Protest and Politics in Italy 1965-1975* (Oxford: 1989) and Robert Lumley, *States of Emergency: Cultures of Revolt in Italy from 1968 to 1978* (New York: Verso, 1990).

is too hastily identified with the trajectory immediately following that Tafuri and *Contropiano* conformed to. This happens to be the case without tackling the debates on the role of the intellectuals, artists as well as professionals in capitalist development when they find themselves in the moment of social conflicts reaching to their peak by the late 1960s. Whereas within the broader cultural intervention *operaisti* intellectuals attempted before the 1970s, the potential of the essay to agitate intellectuals and architects to question their own participation in capitalist development is genuine enough to generate a conviction that the text needs to be treated as an agitating tool rather than a project in itself.

I conclude that in order to re-visit 1960s and 1970s Italy to locate Tafuri's 1969 essay, it is crucial to be willing to challenge the imagery of the cultural subversion attached to the 1960s which is now encapsulated in the mood of 'If you can't beat them, join them.' I attempt to demonstrate contemporary efforts in English-speaking architectural circles to re-visit Tafuri in that context fail to do so as in the cases of Aureli and Day. I argue that revisiting the essay itself loses the significance of such an attempt, if we are not prepared to confront Tafuri's 1969 essay as an agitation in itself.

In response to my research question, my conclusion is that a return to Tafuri's 1969 essay is relevant within the contemporary context not only because it exposes problems with the reception of Tafuri and his 1969 essay amongst architects, architectural historians and theoreticians.

The primary motivation for my inquiry into Tafuri and the political context of the 1960s and 1970s Italy, comes from what I try to depict in the contemporary discourse around a social vocation that promotes the potential of architecture as a progressive profession. The contemporary architectural discourse falls beyond the post-critical architectural discourse with the architectural trends such as participatory; socially sustainable; green/ecological that embrace the contemporary tools which are accessible to architects and engineers today. They address the problems which are also the consequences of the possibility of having access to those tools. Capacity to address those problems via architectural design is presented as necessary for the survival of architect and architecture. In other words, I argue that the presence of a social agenda still makes the art and profession of architecture resilient to political, economic and social structures that transform it. Hence it is important to the generation of architects who have not yet acquired their professional autonomy as architects in the built environment construction and design industry, such as students or interns, to be reminded of Tafuri's critique within its context before they appropriate a social vocation and become professionals. It is more valuable for us to be agitated, rather than appropriate the actions of our prior generations without necessarily interrogating their own practice. One of the most significant implications of the conclusions we may draw from revisiting "Toward a Critique of Architectural Ideology," in its proper context, may be our need to be challenged to become more critical in our professional role as architects, whether progressive or not, which would take more than clinging to

the comfortable chairs professions grant to architects, artists and intellectuals.[10]

1.1 Document Structure

Following this introduction chapter, I execute my thesis in the subsequent three sections. Both Section I and Section II are composed of two chapters and Section III has the concluding chapter and an epilogue.

With Section I, I depict a setting as described above and re-visit Manfredo Tafuri within this setting after postulating the problems with approaching Tafuri in the contemporary discourse. In Chapter Two, I present the problematic of the implicit and necessary relationship between the architect and capitalist structures and introduce the work of Tafuri as he addresses this relationship in his 1969 essay "Toward a Critique of Architectural Ideology." I focus on reflections on professionalism and architectural practice in the 21st century to address Manfredo Tafuri's relevance to these debates. I pay attention to attempts where architects are located within the contemporary economic, political and social structures and are confronting ethical dilemmas in their participation in production of spaces and relationship that fails to go beyond advancing capitalist structures which thrive on globalization.

With Chapter Three, I look at Manfredo Tafuri's "Toward a Critique of Architectural Ideology" and locate his essay within the reception of his works in the post 1960s architectural discourse. After demonstrating the problems which are associated with approaching Tafuri in the political framework to which his work is assigned, I argue the essay's political implications should not be equated and reduced to Tafuri himself or to his other works but instead those implications should be understood precisely within the context which his essay was produced, published and circulated. I conclude Section I with my argument that the precise context of Tafuri's essay needs to be acknowledged without positing Tafuri or his complete oeuvre as the reference to identify the implications of the arguments present in the essay. I further

10 Implications of approaching Tafuri's essay within the political framework of 1969 Italy by embracing the agitating tone of the essay could be demonstrated against Raymond J. Cole and Richard Lorch, eds., *Buildings, Culture & Environment: Informing Local & Global Practices* (Oxford: Blackwell Publishing, 2003); Simon Foxell, ed., *The Professionals' choice: The Future of the Environment Professions* (London: Building Futures, 2003); Nicholas Ray, ed., *Architecture and its Ethical Dilemmas* (New York: Taylor & Francis, 2005); Danial A. Barber, "Militant Architecture: Destabilising Architecture's Disciplinarity," in Dorrian, Mark, Murray Fraser, Jonathan Hill, et al., eds. *Critical Architecture* (London and New York: Routledge, 2007): 57-66; Graham Owen, ed., Architecture, *Ethics and Globalization* (New York: Routledge, 2009); Aggregate, *Governing by Design: Architecture, Economy, and Politics in the Twentieth Century* (Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 2012). Those works point out how architecture and what it can yield is demarcated by the economic, political and social structures, with which capitalism has been advancing. Within the limits of this thesis, I avoid testing the implications of my conclusion against those contemporary inquiries.

argue that by equating the 1969 essay with its 1973 version that was published as a volume, architectural historians and theoreticians have been avoiding confronting the implications present in the 1969 essay. In response to this, I suggest it is important to be able to confront the essay as it is: an agitating piece that is located in a wider context that goes beyond the art and practice of architecture.

In Section II, firstly I address the context in which Tafuri's 1969 essay was written, published and circulated and then inquire into this context and how it is adopted by the contemporary architectural discourse in relation to works by Pier Vittorio Aureli and Gail Day.

In Chapter Four, I present a narration of the political project, which the Italian *operaisti* opened up in the 1960s Italy. In this narration I identify the journal *Contropiano*, where Tafuri's 1969 essay was published, as a medium where intellectuals, especially Massimo Cacciari, constructed one of the pathways for the intellectual to claim a role within the struggle against capitalist society that fell beyond being an agitator. I argue it is important to acknowledge the intensified social conflict in the late 1960s to approach this shift within the *operaisti* discourse as it grants intellectuals a role in the struggle with their intellectual work without relinquishing the work they deliver as intellectuals totally. I conclude that this later approach can explain the project associated with Tafuri's 1973 volume, however it fails to exhaust the implications of the 1969 essay.

In Chapter Five, I look at Aureli's and Day's attempts to return to the same context. Without studying the shift the *operaisti* discourse went through in the late 1960s, Aureli and Day appropriate the subsequent trajectory of *Contropiano* and the cultural intervention intellectuals self-assigned themselves as constituting a moment in the class struggle as granted. I argue that their commitment to explain the impasse or the deadlock, which Tafuri's project was/is attributed with, in their inquiries prevents them from approaching Tafuri's 1969 essay in relation to its context.

I conclude Section II by suggesting that unless we return to this context to tackle and go beyond its consequences, and embrace Tafuri's essay with its agitating qualities, it is unlikely that we will overcome the existing debates on architecture and limits of architecture as an art and profession to address social problems and conflicts. After inquiring into the works of Aureli and Day, I conclude that this is not the case with the sector of Tafuri's audience who inquire into the political framework associated with Italian *operaismo* and *autonomia* movements.

With Section III, first I provide a summary of my conclusions that lead to the demonstration of the inaccuracy of the assumption with regards to Tafuri's 1969 essay and his 1973 volume In response to my research question which seeks the relevance of re-visiting Tafuri's 1969 essay in its political context: I conclude that it is relevant and to some extent necessary to do so, since the problems raised in the essay have

been avoided instead of being confronted by the architects. What is more, in regard to the contemporary questions of the future of the architect and the changing nature of the practice of an architect within transforming social, political and economic structures, it is timely to confront Tafuri's 1969 essay as it is.

With Chapter Six, the conclusion, I reiterate that the implications of the 1969 essay are not present in the 1973 volume, due to the fact that the moment 1969 essay occupies within the political and social context of Italy in the late 1960s is not the same moment which the 1973 volume occupies, especially in relation to the role intellectuals attributed to themselves in relation to their intellectual endeavours. That assumption that 1969 essay and 1973 volume are identical itself may explain why the dominant theme around Tafuri is constructed in order to address the impasse and deadlock his project is associated with, and hence we need to approach those inquiries which return to the political framework of Tafuri's 1969 essay with more scrutiny as they fail to address the problematic assumption. In the light of this conclusion, it appears to be more appropriate to treat Tafuri's 1969 essay as an agitating piece than a critique that opens up trajectories for architects, architectural historians and theoreticians to justify their professional engagement. The relevance of returning to the political framework of Tafuri's 1969 essay to contemporary discourse comes from the potential of re-approaching Tafuri's 1969 essay in the light of the conclusions I draw. Hence if we are returning to Tafuri and his critique of architectural ideology in order to seek his projects' relevance to struggling against capitalist structures, we first need to confront the implications of Tafuri's 1969 essay. Architectural theoreticians and historians have avoided confronting or addressing these implications, which are: refusal to practice by architects challenging capitalist structures.

In the epilogue, I argue that for my generation of architects, architecture students and interns need to be more willing to be critical. We are currently captivated by the rhetoric and discourse constructed by Tafuri's and his subsequent generation of architects, architecture historians and theoreticians who insisted on shoring up the profession.

SECTION I

Presenting the Work and the Problem

CHAPTER TWO

PRELUDE-PROBLEM

Before studying Tafuri's 1969 essay and its context, in this chapter I will establish a reading of the contemporary setting from which I will be approaching my research question "What is the relevance of re-visiting Tafuri's 1969 essay in relation to its political context?" In the Epilogue of my thesis, I am returning to the setting established in this chapter after my inquiry into the political context of "Toward a Critique of Architectural Ideology," to address the significance of my inquiry as a call to my generation of architects, architecture students and interns to reconsider their practice in light of the critique Tafuri made in 1969.

2.1 The role of the architect in the contemporary socio political framework

Tahl Kaminer, in his book *Architecture, Crisis and Resuscitation*, states "architecture, as a discipline, is not the building."[1] In his accurate archeology of the discipline architecture as we know it today, he traces the origins back to the attempt to establish a break from the crafts during the Renaissance in favor of an autonomy of architecture. The attempts of architects to distinguish themselves from the craftsmen, shifts the "centre of architecture from the material object itself, from the building, to the ideal object, and further, to the process of thought and the knowledge of the architect."[2] Kaminer's approach to architecture urges us to question assumptions we might possess about architects and architecture.

2.1.1 Architecture as a profession

Jeremy Till puts the kind of knowledge professionals hold to justify their professional claim to "being a figure of authority" in relation to architecture rather bluntly: "we would be deeply concerned if the knowledge base of the profession was not directly played out in practice; without this instrumental application people would die, buildings would fall down."[3] According to Till, the knowledge which professionals require to claim the roles they claim seems to be "instrumentally transferred across to become the rules and procedures of practice," as in the cases of, for example, medicine and engineering.[4] Leaving aside the genealogy of our presumptions about depending on this knowledge to survive, we can agree that the knowledge one demands from the

1 Tahl Kaminer, *Architecture, Crisis and Resuscitation: The Reproduction of Post-Fordism in late-twentieth-century Architecture* (London and New York: Routledge, 2011), 3.

2 Ibid.

3 Jeremy Till, *Architecture Depends* (New York and London: MIT Press, 2009), 161.

4 Ibid.

professionals stands on the assumption that we require their expertise to be able to sustain, at least, our physical and spatial 'integrity'. In the case of architects, the territory of the expertise we, who are not clients nor employers, quite naively expect from the architects is that the space and/or form in which we find ourselves do not threaten our well-being.[5]

There are different definitions that address what architects do, yet the Australian Institute of Architects' (AIA) definition of their professional service is the closest definition we can get to address what their role is. As generalists they "manage the entire architectural design and construction process."[6] In this version of the definition of the architect's expertise, it would be quite easy to dismiss the architect from the equation, as engineers and other professionals from other disciplines could be the ones in the most crucial and essential role that relates, literally to everyone.

Referring to the knowledge of the architect, Raymond J. Cole and Richard Lorch make use of explicit knowledge and tacit knowledge (know-how), as they distinguish knowledge from information in order for the architectural discipline to acquire professional status.[7] According to Cole and Lorch, knowledge is attached

5 Rather than well-being the correct assumption would be about architect's professional and/or disciplinary engagement not threatening our existence. Although this sounds simplistic and uncomplicated, in Mike Davis' inquiry into the sprawl of urbanization as a global phenomena, the conditions of survival in the 'slums' of the physical space of the global capital impacts a population of more than one billion people. With reference to infrastructures that constitute the biopolitical elements of the urbanization, not only via buildings but with sanitary sewer systems, transport and power infrastructures, planners', developers', capital holders' and governments' appropriation of those structures with reference to their agendas, is argued to be used for suppressing the 'mobilization' of marginalized 'majority' and 'minority'. What is more, this creates a vulnerable condition of 'being' for those groups, by being forced to depend on those services to simply survive, which are appropriated to suppress and exploit their land, actions and labour at the first place. Located within the picture Davis portrays, from the architects who are not already addressing the problems pointed out by Davis' inquiry, for example, one would simply expect not to create further problems with the way they intervene to the built environment via their design. See Mike Davis, *Planet of Slums* (London and New York: Verso, 2006). On the issue of how design is utilized in different levels of governance that allows sustaining the picture portrayed by Davis, see Aggregate, *Governing by Design.*

6 "What Architects Do", Australian Institute of Architects, accessed October 2, 2012, http://www.architecture.com.au/i-cms?page=13274. See the Winter 2011 issue of *Architect Victoria* where architects reflect on the question of the role of the architect. Especially Timothy Hill's contribution to the magazine dwells on the common 'expectations' from the architect and the actual role architects possess with reference to the work they produce. See Timothy Hill, "Newsworthy: People Clear About Architect's Role," in "Bring me the Horizon," ed. Anthony Parker, *Architect Victoria: Official Journal of the Australian Institute of Architects Victorian Chapter* (Winter 2011): 4.

7 Raymond J. Cole and Richard Lorch, introduction to *Buildings, Culture and Environment*: "Knowledge, Values and Building Design," in Raymond J. Cole and Richard Lorch, eds., *Buildings, Culture and Environment: Informing Local and Global Practices*

to an individual or a group that is not as easily transferable as information is; it is more than mere data which are assumed to provide a factual basis of reasoning; but rather "a deeper understanding of a subject (the why)," which also "entails capabilities of assessment to form judgment, interpretation and understanding."[8] It can be argued that, to distinguish architects as professionals within their industry of built environment design and practice, "formal exchange of explicit knowledge between researchers and practitioners," is not as helpful as it is in medicine or engineering, in making them figures of authority through their expertise. Cole and Lorch, who put tacit knowledge at the centre of the kind of knowledge for the design and construction process, describe it as the knowledge that "is provided largely through the experience of the diverse members of the design team."[9] Architects' participation when they "join a wide circle of other skilled professionals to provide a service leading to the construction and operation of a suitable environment fit for its purpose" as Giles Oliver describes what acting as an architect is.[10]

Establishing the dialogue between different parties in the construction process appears to be a crucial aspect of the architect's professional service. Citing Willis and George's description of the duties of an architect in the text book *The Architect in Practice* which dates back to 1981, Cole and Lorch link this service to Soane's description of the business of the architect. The professional ground on which architects can claim and justify their position as figures of authority: "the ideal of the architect as impartial arbitrator between client and builder," is what Soane puts forward as the business of the architect: "to make the designs and estimates, to direct works and to measure and value the different parts; he is the intermediate agent between the employer, whose honor and interest he is to study, and the mechanic, whose rights he is to defend."[11]

Yet, this vocation, as an arbiter, is only one aspect of the architect's professional service. In the RIBA's 2008 publication *Explaining an Architect's Service*, for example, the architect's role as an arbiter in the relationship with the client, comes

(Oxford: Blackwell Publishing, 2003): 1-8, 2. Cole is an academic who focusses on built environment research and teaching, and Lorch is an architect and the editor of the journal *Building Research and Information*.

8 Ibid.

9 Ibid., 3.

10 Giles Oliver, "Responsive Practice," in *Architecture and its Ethical Dilemmas*, ed. Nicholas Ray (New York: Taylor and Francis, 2005): 55-68, 61. Oliver is a practicing architect who was also a member of the Commission for Architecture and the Built Environment's research steering group in the UK.

11 Andrew Saint, "Practical Wisdom for Architects: The Uses of Ethics," in *Architecture and its Ethical Dilemmas*, ed. Nicholas Ray (New York: Taylor & Francis, 2005): 7-21, 8. Saint is an academic and the author of the books: *The Image of the Architect* (1983) and *Towards a Social Architecture* (1987).

into the scene at the stage of "Monitoring Construction" only if the architect is appointed as the "contract administrator" or "construction overseer."[12] Before this last stage of actualization of the material object, the architect and the client have a different relationship that involves architect estimating building costs and informing the client of the progress of the project, while the architect is working on the design proposal. At the very last stage, the contract between the client and the contractor is administered for the project to be delivered, and hence architect becomes a true intermediate agent.

We may rightly suggest there is a contention among the architects that the title architect does not entail authority over the space. The architect's professional authority depends on their ability to deliver a design as long as they are able to facilitate and manage the responsibilities the client expects from the architect. As Cole and Lorch suggest, the tacit knowledge is central to the authority the architect can claim. On the other hand, as Andrew Saint puts it, architects' knowledge is not a form of a knowledge that grants them a de facto a professional status:

> Neither the state nor the public thinks architecture awfully important ... in the governance, prosperity and welfare of the country, even in the procurement and maintenance of its built estate, architects remain bit-part players. Few buildings are put up without their help along the way, because even a modest hut has at some stage, after all, to be 'designed'. But most are procured in a manner remote from the Soanean ideal, whereby the architect holds the scales impartially between client and builder.[13]

12 RIBA, *Explaining an Architect's Services: General Information on the Usual Tasks Undertaken by an Architect* (London: RIBA, June 2008). For this and other guidelines see http://www.architecture.com/UseAnArchitect/GuidanceAndPublications/PracticalMatters/PracticalMatters.aspx

13 Saint, "Practical Wisdom for Architects: The Uses of Ethics," 9.

Mark Crinson and Jules Lubbock formulate the Soanean ideal in relation to the ideal architect depicted and advocated by the English architect John Soane (1753-1837). As Soane's lectures at the Royal Academy portray: "Soane's ideal was of an architect who was a poetic designer, an intellectual and a manager imbued with high ethics, who could lead by virtue of his very distance from mechanical work." Mark Crinson and Jules Lubbock, *Architecture: Art or Profession? Three Hundred Years of Architectural Education in Britain* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1994), 26.

As Crinson and Lubbock stress, Soane himself was an architect who received an education which was different than what his own pupilage prompted. Soane's training as an architect came close to what was formulated as an ideal training of the architect in 1773 pamphlet *An Essay on the Qualifications and Duties of an Architect*. In this rare formulation of the 'ideal training', in print, the training of the architect involved an ideal education that aimed at mastery in drawing and design by studying and observing classical monuments by comparing them with the modern ones in order to improve upon both in their own Designs. Ibid., 24-25. It is argued that this anonymous

Even if the architect was able to provide their service as an intermediate agents, they would depend arguably most on the client who holds the capital, which may constitute another problematic of this agency. Their professional expertise as the designer, project coordinator, documenter and the intermediate agent for procurement and construction, is of more value to the client than to anyone else. In order to resolve this, Andrew Saint suggests through "the moral hegemony," architecture invents two sides to the coin as "the personal" and "the collective."[14]

The personal side focusses on the personal merits of the architect: their talent as an artist-architect.[15] Saint argues: "When social hierarchies and norms slumber, the architect and his client meet on potentially equal terms."[16] Hence the architect needs to convince the client that their talent will change their life "for better."[17] However for this talent to be legitimized on a professional ground with which architects can claim a role in shaping the built environment; the public, not only the capital holder, needs to be convinced that the architect is an agent who should be involved in the production of the built environment. This allows architects to be able to cope with this dependency on the capital holder, or the client. The capital holder needs to

---

pamphlet was written by James Peacock who worked in the office of George Dance (1741-1825). Crinson and Lubbock offer a repost of the pamphlet, as they cite Kaye's reprint of the pamphlet as follows:

> Here the prospective architect is from a middle-class family and has had a good general education until the age of fifteen. He is then articled to an architect. In his first year or two he learns to measure and improves his drawing. Then he is taught to design and to draw plans, sections and elevations; he is instructed in mechanics, hydraulics and perspective, improves his French and finally travels abroad. During his tour he draws and measures classical monuments, 'studies their Proportions, searches into their Antiquity, explores the Materials of which they are composed, and the Manner in which they are put together, and makes every Observation that is likely to prove of the least Utility'. He then compares these buildings with modern ones and 'improves upon both in his own Designs'. When he returns home he is well prepared in the studiousness and probity required to become an architect. Ibid., 24-25.

What is left out in this pamphlet: "practical side of building and its materials, tools, skills and surveyance," were parceled out in the office practice supplemented to Soane by George Dance and Henry Holland (1745-1806) as well as by the familiarity with craftsmen's work Soane must have developed from his father, who was a bricklayer. Ibid., 25. Ironically, the contemporary debate on the knowledge of the architect which depends on the communication between other members involved in the process of designing and building the built environment, resonates with the late 18th century Soanean ideal: almost attempting calibrate it for the contemporary construction and built environment industry market.

14 Saint, "Practical Wisdom for Architects: The Uses of Ethics," 16.

15 Ibid.

16 Ibid.

17 Ibid.

relinquish *his* absolute authority in the process, as the product of the process which architect coordinates, is more than the building and what is more, has a collective aspect: the public believes the architect will demonstrate high ethical merits with their interventions to the built environment, which, otherwise, could have been less desirable, if not catastrophic.

Where Till understands this aspect of professions with reference to their pragmatic approach to the political economical and social structures. He is more cynical as he says:

> Professions are quick to engage with politics when it directly affects their professional status in terms of protection of title or funding for their actual practices but much less quick to acknowledge the political constitution of their actual practice or the wider consequences of their products …architects are complicit in this appropriation of professional values by the market. Yet they prefer not to acknowledge this raid on their professional capital, and instead focus on the pursuit of the higher ideals, using the smokescreen of perfection and beauty to disguise any dealing with dirty reality.[18]

This description might hold true for any other discipline and/or profession. However the knowledge of the architect is an especially suspect form of knowledge, sometimes discredited by the image of the architect in contrast to what Colin Ward espouses when he writes: "I've met more anarchist, pacifist and socialist architects than dissident members of most jobs, professions or trades."[19] Andrew Saint goes beyond Ward's observation and postulates this as a survival kit of the profession as he asks:

> For how can any architect enter maturely into designing something … in the public realm, without imagining or hoping that in some way it will make a difference to the lives of others, sooth them, impress them, teach them, inspire them, terrify them? … In order to operate, most architects have to believe that that difference is needed as a beneficial part of human activity, and that only design of a specific nature … can achieve it. That constitutes not only the underlying ethical 'code' of architecture, but also its survival kit.[20]

18 Till, *Architecture Depends*, 163.

19 Colin Ward, *Talking to Architects: Ten Lectures by Colin Ward* (London: Freedom Press, 1996), 7. Ward (1924 – 2010) was an anarchist writer who was concerned with urban and housing issues.

20 Saint, "Practical Wisdom for Architects: The Uses of Ethics," 10.

The perception is that architects are either genuinely collective-oriented individuals or they appropriate such a persona in order to solidify their privileged role within the society. Regardless what the real motives are, architects do not seem to be satisfied with the vocation of being an intermediate agent. In fact, in many instances this vocation is subcontracted to certain specialist architects, who act as subcontractors to other architects, developers, or project managers. This can be regarded as critical because it means architectural institutions need to provide different kind of experts with special involvement with the design regardless and at the end of the day they will be placed to be a dispassionate arbiter between client and builder. As intermediate agents, architects depend on outsiders, as they need to establish the dialogue between them. This is a challenge to the logic of the profession as defined by Jeremy Till who writes, "the defining feature of any profession is to distinguish itself from the ordinary; professions inscribe territories in order to better control them, and thereby give themselves status and economic power."[21] The ongoing debate suggests despite the understanding of the necessity of the arbiter and criticality of this being done competently and cost effectively, this job for experts in this aspect of work is still not regarded as the one and only job of the architect. This may be one way to understand this dissatisfaction.

However, besides architects having a role as being the intermediate agents in the process of actualization of the material object: the building; their design already embodies the existing conditions of not only civil engineering structures but/hence economic, political and social structures. Ian Cooper elaborates on this embodiment in built environment as "patterns of power and privilege between people and preferred relationships between humans and other species, materials and other resources."[22] We may ask: regardless the common perception of architects as agents who are already working within structures that are exterior to their design, why are architects having troubles with being an intermediate agent who facilitates a common ground for outsiders to establish a dialogue?

This resonates with Colin Rowe and Fred Koetter's analogy of which Kaminer reminds us: "architecture is a social institution related to building in much the same way that literature is to speech."[23] Kaminer goes beyond Koetter and Rowe's argument though.

---

21 Jeremy Till, *Architecture Depends*, 154.

22 Ian Cooper, "Understanding Context," in Raymond J. Cole and Richard Lorch, eds., *Buildings, Culture and Environment: Informing Local and Global Practices* (Oxford: Blackwell Publishing, 2003): 11-17, 11. Coopers is an independent research consultant who works in the private sector.

23 Kaminer, *Architecture, Crisis and Resuscitation*, 3. Koetter and Rowe argue:

> For, the requirements of professional empire building apart, the demand that all buildings should become works of architecture (or the reverse) is strictly offensive to common sense … one might possibly stipulate that architecture is a social institution related to building in

Koetter and Rowe challenge the "myth of the architect" as "eighteenth century natural philosopher," with their analogy, where Kaminer returns to this analogy as he reminds us also of the attempts to regulate the speech. For Koetter and Rowe, the analogy works only when the literature can claim an autonomy from the speech, and the inflections imposed on the speech do not affect the language or vice versa. On the other hand, there exists the possibility of the language being altered and manipulated by its own products. The limits of both literature (architecture) and speech (building) in relation to their dependency on one another as they are both affecting and are affected by the tool they depend. Where the syntax of the language (codes and regulations that govern construction) is controlling, possible alterations in the semantics of the language simply by introducing a new piece of literature and/or speech (the city and how its inhabitants occupy, use the space) demonstrates the intertwined relation between built environment professionals and the outsiders.

Kaminer approaches architecture, not necessarily in relation to the distinction 'literature' is attributed by Koetter and Rowe; but as a discipline from the "multiplicity of meanings 'architecture' stands in the territory that is dominated by", as he lists, "schools, publications, regulations, ateliers, representational organizations and drawing."[24] Outsiders to the product of the architect, include not only other professionals but also a number of regulatory institutions, agents, as well as a complex network of participants where 'clients' are directly or indirectly involved, due to the contemporary structure of accumulation of the capital, whose financial stakes may constitute or be part of those outside factors.[25] In this picture, within the transforming social, economic and political structures, the autonomy, which architects have been enjoying so far with their 'art' and/or design, is threatened more than before. The transforming structures demand that architects make more compromises in their role amongst other built environment professionals.

---

much the same way that literature is to speech. Its technical medium is public property and, if the notion that all speech should approximate to literature is, ipso facto, absurd and would, in practice be intolarable, much the same may be said about building and architecture. Fred Koetter and Colin Rowe, Collage City (Cambridge: MIT Press, 1983), 101.

24 Ibid.

25 Without necessarily giving enough emphasis to the role of the architect, the role of the built environment and ascribed power relations of the sovereign over the 'oppressed' is a very common theme in sociology, urban planning, critical geography, and even architectural theory. Henri Lefebvre (1901-1991), David Harvey, Manuel Castells and Saskia Sassen are quite infamous writers on the appropriation of the space by the 'capital', that ascribes 'the conditions of existence' prior to the existence of the people or the *multitude* in the built environment. A study of extending this power relation embedded in the city, that is not necessarily ascribed by the 'global capital' but its genealogy is found in Simon Parker's *Cities, Politics and Power* (New York: Taylor and Francis, 2010).

2.2 Confronting the Contemporary Role of the Architects

In *The Professionals' Choice*, which is published by a joint initiative between Royal Institute of British Architects (RIBA), Commission for Architecture and the Built Environment (CABE), Davies and Knell depicts the transition from the industrial society to the 'professional society'. They describe a context to which built environment professionals, including architects, need to adjust, respond or intervene in order to sustain their profession.[26] In five different scenarios: "regulatory scenario;" "economic scenario;" "social scenario;" "technological scenario;" and "managerial scenario," different authors are asked to depict the future of the architect in different contexts in which built environment professionals operate. By depicting different pressure points, which the group believes affecting the construction industry, the publication aims to expose the compromises and benefits design professionals are faced with as social political and economic structures transform. In those scenarios, architects are depicted as sharing a common ground with other built environment professionals. This does not only include the client, the constructor and the architect; but includes various agents representing governmental and professional bodies, institutions, investors, insurance companies and such.

As one of Building Futures' objectives is to build upon and complement the existing work, there is no break from the existing political social and economic structures in any of their scenarios or projects. Instead they establish the existing dominant social, political and economic structures and their transformation as given. Hence theirs is an attempt to perfect this as a development of and acquisition of new ideas and skills, which predominantly refers to the need to give more emphasis to the tacit knowledge component of the discipline.

---

26 William Davies and John Knell, "Context" in *The Professionals' Choice: The Future of the Environment Professions*, ed. Simon Foxell (London: Building Futures, 2003): 17-34, 20. The Building Futures group, that was established to address the future of the built environment, promotes the tacit knowledge as the group seems to embrace even by the schema they operate with. Consisting of a 'steering group', an advisory group and a RIBA Team, Building Futures is a think tank that tries to perceive the 'bigger picture' architects fit into to. The steering group plans the work program and decides on the key discussion issues, supported and inspired for future directions and projects by the Advisory group where the RIBA Team administers as well as managing, co-ordinating the activities of Building Futures. Through a designed and curated interpersonal communication between the groups and the individuals in the groups, Building Futures publishes the outcomes of its projects in order to "influence relevant professionals, clients, educationalists, decision-makers and policy makers." Since 2003, they provided 25 projects and published their outcomes, made widely accessible on the internet, mostly free of charge, and work on 8 on going projects at the time of writing. By 2016, RIBA aims to "strongly influence government policy, legislation and regulations to reflect RIBA policy areas," to accomplish the objective "influence the formation and implementation of public policy, the regulatory framework, and the environment in which architecture can flourish internationally, nationally and locally." Their "Influencing Policy" objective involves the future studies program, Building Futures, which is active since the restructuring RIBA went through in 2003-2004. See "About Building Futures," Building Futures, accessed March 18, 2013, http://www.buildingfutures.org.uk/about

With their ideal to promote the advancement of society, built environment professionals' skill to know-how to make things happen do not only constitute a model with the process of realization of their 'material object': the building, but also ascribes a social agenda to it: the need to address problems associated with 'building'. This is concretized and narrated in Cole and Lorch's work with the aim to improve "the environmental performance of buildings,"[27] that underpins one of the most contemporary 'social' role of architectural design and practice: sustaining the state that is prior to the architect's intervention with the building, as the worst case scenario. This vocation they seek commonly evolves around the notion of a more 'sustainable' future: an environmentally sustainable built environment that is further articulated via notions of such as participation and social sustainability for the vocations professionals to occupy to ensure social well-being.[28] While with this approach built environment professionals are expected to acknowledge the structures which they are part of; it does not necessarily promote an explicit understanding of them to practice their art and profession.

On this note, Paolo Tombesi, in his paper "Capital Gains and Architectural Losses: The Expansion Journey of Caudill Rowlett Scott: 1948-1994," points to the tendency among architectural scholarship to ignore and understand those structures, particularly economic structures. Putting emphasis on the need to consider outside factors, including outside investors and board members with financial stakes, he suggests the contemporary context can facilitate a redefinition of a social vocation for architects that is not merely profit-oriented, but allows a special kind of enterpriser whose performance in the market can provide a model for public sectors. This position comes from design work's strategic role in the economy with "the combination of market scanning and industrial foresight, problem seeking and research development."[29] Apart from the problems regarding the changing modes of production and fabrication that architects need to address, the exploration of the socioeconomic complexity of the industry is a challenge for architects to tackle. Tombesi writes in his paper "On the Cultural Separation of Design Labor":

> Understanding architecture ... requires understanding of both the practice and policies of building, because the way

27 Cole and Lorch, "Knowledge, Values and Building Design," 2.

28 See Ian Cooper, "What is the Problem?" in *Buildings, Culture and Environment: Informing Local and Global Practices*, ed. Raymond J. Cole and Richard Lorch (Oxford: Blackwell Publishing, 2003): 109-124,

29 Paolo Tombesi, "Capital Gains and Architectural Losses: The Expansion Journey of Caudill Rowlett Scott: 1948-1994" in *LIMITS: from the 21st Annual Conference of the Society of Architectural Historians Australia and New Zealand*, ed. Harriet Edquist and Hélène Frichot, vol.2 (Melbourne: SAHANZ, 2004): 485-491, 490. Tombesi is an academic and a major figure in the debate that acknowledges the presence of 'outside' factors to architecture, and studies the transformation of those 'outside' structures with reference to contemporary capitalist development.

> technical responsibilities and capital investments [that] are socially allocated affects not only who architects are and what they are supposed to do, but also what they are in fact asked to do and what they can do.[30]

Tombesi argues that in the contemporary context, for the architect to sustain their professional ground between the employer and the industry, the architect simultaneously needs their attention in and on what Cooper refers as: "the political economy of the production and consumption of the built environment in both developed and developing countries its relationship to the engines and trajectory of globalization."[31]

Tombesi's point is crucial in light of Oliver's depiction of this context signals one of the 'threats' professionals face with: "one can immediately recognize the signs of consumer culture and relatively abundant private capital impacting on a professional milieu."[32] If architects are to lose their professional ground due to the transformation of social, economic and political structures, studies which study the future of the architectural profession point to a vocation in those structures, that does not necessarily transcend but where they demonstrate the capability to cope with those structures. The social vocation architects can claim, in this picture, is pragmatically appropriated through an understanding of the development of capital in the twenty-first century.

What differentiates those works from works which tackle 'ethics' of the profession in the context of globalization, is their pragmatic use of the social role of the architect that needs to be addressed by the professionals. Rather than attempting to 'transcend' the context of globalization, works mentioned above establish the understanding of architects' dependency on the industry and hence outside factors. Within this relationship, they seek a vocation which not only sustains architects' professional ground, but thrives it via putting emphasis on the 'social' aspect of the profession.

With "Replicant Urbanism: The Architecture of Hadid's Central Building at BMW, Leipzig" Douglas Spencer provides a study of a built environment that produces; and in return is produced through the complex situation built environment professionals are finding themselves in today.[33] Spencer's research adds to the setting, which I

30 Paolo Tombesi, "On the Cultural Seperation of Design Labor," in *Building (in) the Future: Recasting Labor in Architecture,* ed. Peggy Deamer and Phillip G. Bernstein (New York: Princeton Architectural Press, 2010): 118-136, 135.

31 Cooper, "What is the Problem?" 120.

32 Oliver, "Responsive Practice," 63.

33 Douglas Spencer looks at the contemporary examples where built environment and the actors involved in its design served the contemporary configuration of economic, political and social structures by utilizing a discourse which was developed as a critique of those structures. Specifically referring to the work of Zaha Hadid Architects (ZHA), FOA and Rem Koolhaas/OMA,

attempted to establish in this chapter, as it exemplifies a form of practice which is not necessarily threaten by the transformation of contemporary capitalist structures. It narrates a practice which thrives on by addressing and adjusting itself to the demands of this transforming climate.

Spencer points at a pairing of an architecture office with a corporation: ZHA with BMW.[34] Rather than putting the architect in an asymmetrical relationship in the conflict between market demands and professionals, Spencer presents the corporates and the design professionals as equivalent players which both increase the value of their brand through the partnership they develop. Similar to efforts of Albert Kahn (1869-1942) for the Fordist mode of production by introducing the standardized space for Fordist production to take place in, BMW Central Building design by ZHA allows post-Fordist production to thrive.[35]

It is interesting to note how Zaha Hadid, along with the architects and designers who have delivered the project, approach to their commitment to their client's project. Bruce Ferguson is reported as saying BMW Central Building is the first twenty-first century building he experienced in a conversation between Todd Gannon and Zaha Hadid.[36] Zaha Hadid replies to this complimentary comment by suggesting " ... it springs from the idea that everything moves through the building. The blue-collar and white-collar workers, the public, and of course the cars themselves."[37] For her it is the idea of movement and velocity that makes BMW Central Building a twentieth-century project. Where as most probably, it is the contemporary city presented to the site of the factory is possibly what makes BMW Central Building a twenty-first century building; hence the design brings the movement and the velocity to the site. This way the space for the contemporary factory is produced that houses the tools for the most advanced capitalist development in the twenty-first century.

In the design of ZHA, Central Building, where the urban is replicated, is filling the gap between previously designed standard factory buildings; connecting sheds where

---

which acquired a radical or progressive status through their untenable status of 'Deleuzian architectures', Spencer's research synopsis promises a study which exposes how the architectures of those offices had been willing and useful instruments of "capital's current mode of power as a 'society of control'." See Douglas Spencer, thesis synopsis of "Smooth Operators: Architectural Deleuzism in Societies of Control," accessed March 15, 2013, http://www.westminster.ac.uk/about-us/schools/architecture/research/research-students/douglas-spencer.

34 Douglas Spencer, "Replicant Urbanism: The Architecture of Hadid's Central Building at BMW, Leipzig," in *Journal of Architecture* 15, no.2 (2010):181-207, 181.

35 Ibid., 190

36 Todd Gannon, "Conversations with Zaha Hadid," interview with Zaha Hadid, Patrik Schumacher, Lars Teichmann by Todd Gannon in *Zaha Hadid: BMW Central Building,* ed. Todd Gannon (New York: Princeton Architectural Press, 2006): 13-22, 13.

37 Ibid.

Fordist linear production takes place.[38] The contemporary city, which is identified as complex and unpredictable by Schumacher, urbanizes the site to point to instruments the relationship between the metropolis and the general intellect, reports Spencer.[39]

"Architect's Statement" by Lars Tiechmann adds to Zaha Hadid's rather too literal approach to their design: "commingling of typically disconnected functions" integrate blue-collar and white-collar workers: "engineering and administrative functions are located within the trajectory of the manual work-force's daily movements ... the plant's restaurant, for example, is located right in the middle of the office floors attracting all workers amidst the administrative areas."[40] It is referred as a "communication hub" offering a new interpretation of office design, suggested by Teichmann, with "office desks floating randomly on air-conditioned floor plates ... with its cascades and platforms, provides maximum transparency and a high degree of spatial identification" within one volume.[41] The Central Building, Teichmann says, "exposes the heart of the plant to the public by avoiding any factory gates or fencing."[42] Concepts or literal applications of transparency, mobility, selective-inclusiveness are assumed to publicly represent the ideal conditions of experience within contemporary capitalism.

As Spencer reports, since the 1970s BMW shifted the labour organization from Fordist modes of production towards the "'Toyota system' of 'lean production'."[43] This requires ZHA to develop a participatory design; one of which that does not necessarily aim to include the complete spectrum of the users of the building as participants in the design process; but rather those who finance and own the building. The program and scenario BMW implements into the site in Leipzig is not only a product of their corporate agenda; but a product developed by the EU's developmental bodies as Spencer reminds. The site BMW chose allowed for an EU subsidy; it was also influenced by the work councils and metal workers' union IG Metall as BMW convinced them to set wages at 20% below the standards thanks to high unemployment rate in Leipzig; local government played a part, as did employment agencies; University of Halle established a training and recruitment program for BMW to manage effectively the demographics of its workforce.[44]

As Spencer argues through out the paper, it is capital that produces its own version

38 Except as Hadid points out in the conversation between her and Gannon, the serial production taking place in those sheds allows assembly of 10×10^{17} different configurations.

39 Spencer, "Replicant Urbanism," 194

40 Lars Teichmann, "Architect's Statement," in *Zaha Hadid: BMW Central Building*, ed. Todd Gannon (New York: Princeton Architectural Press, 2006): 9-11, 10- 11

41 Ibid., 11.

42 Ibid.

43 Spencer, "Replicant Urbanism," 183.

44 Spencer, "Replicant Urbanism," 182-183.

of space for cognitive capacities of general intellect to be elicited and channeled to. In this case, it produces a space where "the technical communication between the different stages of production" enhances the verbal communication and stage "a more transparent production process along flexible office areas within a communication network."[45] Design professionals come later into the picture to design the space which had been negotiated and designed beforehand by multiple agents. Designers willingly lend their skills to innovate which has the potential to generate profit and hence be applied by capital. To some extent, this shows that built environment professionals, architects, interns and researchers at ZHA do not need to feel threatened by their role to which they are assigned by the most advanced form of capital. It looks like as though, every agent involved in the process at ZHA seems to fulfill their role quite successfully.[46]

The "urbanization of the site and reproduction of the complexity and unpredictability of city life" responds well to the program BMW asked for.[47] However whether things are ideal in this built environment or not is open to discussion.[48] As Spencer also points out, BMW's model creates what the Western academics and intellectuals refer as "precarious existence for labour" due to the contractual arrangements by BMW's management, the hours of work and wage levels in this twenty-first century building.[49] As being a tool for "power of control within this realm of production", the built environment no longer exercises control through "the measurement of outputs and the observation of labour by foremen and supervisors."[50] This old way, which was simply Foucault's identification of the pan-optical means with disciplinary societies; now exercises its power through replicating the complexity of and instrumentalizing urban organization within the factory to achieve real subsumption of the labour.[51]

In the picture Spencer provides, the product of the architect is the transformation of the built environment that addresses the needs of the dominant political and economic structures while making it more resilient to any possible alteration of

45 Teichmann, "Architect's Statement," 9.

46 For the complete list of agents involved in the design and construction of the project, see "Credits," in *Zaha Hadid: BMW Central Building,* ed. Todd Gannon (New York: Princeton Architectural Press, 2006): 158-159. Some of those agents and/or roles are listed as follows: 'Design Architect' (Zaha Hadid); 'Architectural Design' (Zaha Hadid and Patrik Schumacher); 'Project Architects' (Jim Heverin and Lars Teichmann); 'Design Team' (Lars Teichmann with nineteen more people); 'Project Team' (thirteen people).

47 Spencer, "Replicant Urbanism,"194.

48 Spencer reminds the reader that in 2009, 500 temporary workers were dismissed from employment at the Leipzig plant. See Ludwig Nitehammer, "Germany: Temporary workers are first victims of recession," *World Socialist Web Site* (January 12, 2009) http://www.wsws.org/articles/2009/jan2009/germ-j12.shtml.

49 Ibid., 205.

50 Ibid., 198.

51 Ibid., 181-198.

the contemporary structures through the advancement of the 'control society.' The relation between the architect and the capitalist structures in relation to the advancement of the 'control society' may have been established with the victory of the capitalist society in the aftermath of 1968. This is most likely to be another consequence of the transformed modes of productions of the highest level of capitalist development. However, does this point to a new form of relation between the architect and capitalist development?

2.3 Understanding the Contemporary Circumstances with the Aid of Post-1968 Discourse

Both Till and Kaminer elaborate on the inherent relationship of architecture and outside factors that architecture depends on, by studying the transformation of architecture from the 1960s to today. Till refers to the architectural community of the 1970s and 1980s, to study reproduction of post-Fordism in late twentieth-century architecture. Till explains, for architecture to be a profession as it is today, architects had to have "a revised version of professional values, asking them to come down from their detached heights and instead engage as one set of informed principles among many."[52] Referring to modernism and 'crisis' architecture was found in back in the 1960s, Till argues engaging in object-making to provide an architectural agency rather than problem-solving, architectural knowledge was "reconsidered away from any notions of authority and certainty."[53]

The modeling of the architect as an interpretative agent rather than a despotic agent who forces *his* "utopia" on others reconciles with Kaminer's depiction of a change in perception among the public towards architecture in the 1960s. Kaminer oberves in the 1960s and onwards that among the architects, either as a response to the change of perception among the public or not, the project of modernism was perceived as "dystopian, dark and authoritarian."[54] Kaminer suggests this was an outcome of the emergence of post-Fordist society "with its distinctive worldview, with its lack of interest in equality and its stress on individualism."[55] The aftermath of the crisis of modernism brought about an advancement of the "real:" the material object of architecture. Kaminer argues that: "The real challenged the École des Beaux Arts: the Arts and Crafts movement, the need for mass-housing, the influences of industrialization on architectural production - new materials and engineering practices - and finally, modernism itself,"[56] which resuscitated architecture by

52 Till, *Architecture Depends*, 169.

53 Ibid., 165.

54 Kaminer, *Architecture, Crisis and Resuscitation*, 26.

55 Ibid.

56 Ibid., 77-78.

achieving a form of autonomy which the discipline failed to experience in 18th century as fine arts did "beyond expansion of its clientele to the growing middle class."[57]

Despite the fact that "the social and economic crisis of the era was being assessed and analyzed by sociologists, economists, politicians and journalists," the architectural crisis of modernism back in the 1960s assumedly took place in a distant realm confined to discipline.[58] This crisis lead to the shift in the revision of professional values within the discipline: "disgust with formal, figurative architecture, which pervades the projects of Archizoom and Superstudio, expresses the perception of architecture as a camouflage of ideology, the logic of projects leads to exposing the ideology and undermining the institution of architecture."[59] Kaminer argues criticism embedded in the works of "radical architecture" of the 1960s are "the most explicit expression of architectural autonomy, reducing architecture to its own medium -drawing- and bypassing the building, the end product of design which depends not only on the work of the architect but on investment, engineering, regulations and labour."[60] However even this, Kaminer reminds, "exposes a certain acceptance of the commodity market,"[61] as the architects could not overcome, what he quotes from Violeau: "necessity to actually materialize an object."[62]

The anxiety coming from the dissolution of the promises and solutions that modernist architecture could not deliver, was suppressed by the 'real' architecture, creating an advent of the real, providing a solution to the crisis of modernity "by concentrating on the present, on the already existing, and accepting the emerging post-industrial society."[63] Defining the role of the architect within this 'real' realm brought back the 'intermediate agency' of the architect between the client and the rest. Although this was as near as it could get to overcoming the dependency on structures which imposed an ideology on the discipline, "its renouncement of a possibility of a different future, its rejection of critique, and its endorsement of reality" acted as a "legitimation of neoliberal reality, rejecting the need to reevaluate the already existing."[64]

Kaminer attributes an anxiety coming from the advent of real and the discipline of architecture completing a circle that actually "never undermined its preference of the

57 Ibid., 77-78.
58 Ibid., 25.
59 Ibid., 39.
60 Ibid., 87.
61 Ibid., 39.
62 Ibid.
63 Ibid., 166.
64 Ibid.

ideal … offering solutions, which in the long run, were exposed as piecemeal and partial at best,"[65] and observes:

> The emergent consciousness of crisis in the first years of the twenty-first century marked the end of the euphoria of the 1990s. The 'end of history' and the belief that Western economy had moved beyond recession into a trajectory of continuous growth appear, only a few years later, inconceivably naive. The developing crisis has posed a challenge to the stasis of the real, suggesting the need for change and brave decisions, offering forking paths to a future, and, to some extent exposing the artificiality of the veneer of movement.[66]

On the outer most layer, the construction industry that is affected by the transformation and reconfiguration of modes of production are arguably dominated by capitalist development. Capital grows by infusing into everyday life physically and socially, forces the architect to position themselves in a more complex network than they used to. This is not only due to the change in the production and construction methods. It can be considered as a consequence of changing of the requirements and expectations architects need to acknowledge and address within their work. Architects do not need the hats of social ideologues for their profession to entail what is 'more than the building.' Partially relinquishing their power and participating in a network with multiple agents in order to provide their service, are compromises already made in the advance of late capitalism that lets go the active social ideologue role they did possess within modernist discourse. Capitalist development that thrives on globalization today challenges the profession with creating a division of labour in architecture on a global scale. Vulnerability of the discipline of architecture to outside factors, especially economic factors, challenge the last legitimation which Peter Eisenman mentions as quoted by Till: "When one denies the importance of function, program, meaning, technology and the client-constraints traditionally used to justify and in a way support form-making- the rationality of process and the logic inherent in form become almost the last 'security' or legitimation available."[67] Yet "the logic inherent to form" can be overtaken by codes and conducts based on construction, building regulations, imposed by actors with financial stakes, on energy consumption, safety and economic constraints, as they are threatening the profession to be confined within a very limited domain today. For those, who are following in the footsteps of those who claimed the form-making as their last domain to hold on to, there might be another crisis waiting them. The post 1960s 'autonomous' architecture no longer fails only to address the impact it has on the rest of the society and built/

65 Ibid.

66 Kaminer, *Architecture, Crisis and Resuscitation*, 166.

67 Till, *Architecture Depends*, 160.

unbuilt environment. The contemporary economic factors also signal that the 'form' can no longer be supported on its own. This brings about an old problem which older generation of architects, including Eisenman, should be familiar with: how to confront capitalist structures which the architects are necessarily and inherently bound to, for the sake of not giving away their professional autonomy?

2.4 Manfredo Tafuri Haunts (Again)

Jeremy Till, reminds us about the prison Manfredo Tafuri confined architects to with his identification of crisis of architectural ideology. Till quotes Tafuri: "architecture obliged to return to pure architecture, to form without utopia; in the best cases to sublime uselessness."[68] As Jeremy Till points out, the position Tafuri grants architects within the structures of capitalism is a constraining one:

> In the last chapter of *Architecture and Utopia*, Manfredo Tafuri writes of the impossible position of the architect caught within the structures of capitalism, the architect has lost any means of resistance … architecture has deluded itself into believing that the production of form alone can intervene productively in the social world, and that this delusion has hidden the real state of affairs in which fresh form has been appropriated by the very forces of capital that it presumes to escape. … [Tafuri] talks of being 'uselessly painful' because it is useless to struggle for escape when completely enclosed and confined without an exit.[69]

Till's argument is problematic, and to an extent ironic, as he returns to the last chapter of Tafuri's *Architecture and Utopia* in the last chapter of his book *Architecture Depends*: "Hope against Hope." Till attempts to "see opportunities in the smallest gap," to overcome the "seamless barrier of capital contra architecture," which Tafuri constructs.[70] As he does so, he too hastily reduces architectural culture to a culture that is uncritical of perpetuation of social conditions and of iconic buildings and prize ceremonies and implies if the architect could become critical of this culture, there is still hope for architecture.[71]

Till's identification of the prison, that Tafuri confines architects within, does not seem to have an impact on Till himself. Instead, Till seems to appropriate Tafuri's critique to grant himself his own position as a critic who reminds architectural circles of

68 Till, *Architecture Depends*, 189.

69 Ibid.

70 Ibid., 193.

71 Ibid., 191.

their practices' contradictions. However, it is questionable whether Till goes beyond paying lip service "to open spaces for new possibilities" for struggles against capitalist structures.[72]

Andrew Leach's inquiry into Manfredo Tafuri provides a substantial and balanced critique of Tafuri's audience which is valuable for twenty-first architectural historians and theoreticians who study Tafuri. Leach depicts two strands of Tafuri's audience with reference to the monographic issues published by Italian *Casabella* and American *Architecture New York (ANY)*. The first group of Tafuri's audience is most likely to be Italian or at least Italian-literate, who were "capable of claiming first degree knowledge of Tafuri's 'project;'" where the latter group is most likely to be submerged in Anglophone literature who mediated Tafuri and his project by mechanisms of reception.[73] Regardless, according to Leach, both publications are helpful to

---

72 Ibid.

73 Leach,"Choosing History," 9.

For a quick survey, it is relevant to first look at the compilation of theoretical works by Michael Hays, Kate Nesbitt and Krista Sykes and their reflection on the role of Manfredo Tafuri in the post-1960s architectural discourse in relation to architectural theory today. See Michael K. Hays, ed., *Architecture Theory since 1968* (MIT Press, 2000); Kate Nesbitt, ed., *Theorizing a New Agenda for Architecture: An Anthology of Architectural Theory 1965 – 1995*, (Princeton Architectural Press, 1996); Krista, A. Sykes, ed., *Constructing a New Agenda: Architectural Theory 1993-2009* (Princeton Press, 2010). For a brief portrayal of Tafuri in those works, we can refer to Michael Hays who starts his chronologically ordered compilation *Architecture Theory since 1968* with "Toward a Critique of Architectural Ideology." He attributes a crucial role to Tafuri in the architectural discourse as he suggests Tafuri radically theorized contemporary architecture's situation more than anyone. Andrew Leach holds Hay responsible for the precise set of "politico-theoritical coordinates" in the North-American perception of Tafuri's contribution to architectural discourse as a demonstration of "the capacity and limitations of a Marxist critique of architecture, and thus of architecture as a system subject to economic and social theories in a Marxist tradition." Leach, "Choosing History," 4. For Hays, Tafuri's work on modernism is "the maximization of the classical mediating term of critical theory, reification … but now with the twist that architecture's utopian work ends up laying the tracks for a general movement to a totally administered world." Hays, *Architecture Theory since 1968*, xi. Tafuri's contribution with this approach is portrayed as crucial if not seminal, as it is part of a multitude of architectural theories that "freely and contentiously set about opening up architecture to what is thinkable and sayable in other codes." Ibid. Where for Nesbitt the capacity and limitation of Tafuri's work is regarded as a pessimistic and an extreme skeptic point of view about the possibility of resistance to status quo through design. Nesbitt, *Theorizing a New Agenda for Architecture*, 361. From Nesbitt's perspective, the grim future Tafuri posits to the architects, provides the space for more optimistic figures such as Fredric Jameson who are not necessarily as critical of architecture and its institutions, with their response to Tafuri's "restricted definition of architecture" as Tafuri's work is regarded as a pathway to "disseminate" Walter Benjamin and other Frankfurt School members.

Also see monographic issues on Tafuri published by *Casabella* and *ANY*. After Tafuri's death, theoreticians and practitioners who claim upon Tafuri's legacy in architectural culture, reflect on their own appropriation of a reduced image of Tafuri especially via those two monographic issues. In those publications, especially the English-speaking audience of Tafuri, give the impression as if they want to move on from the multitudes of legacies of Tafuri by paying a last tribute to Tafuri (as well as to his ghosts as the title of Michael Hays essay published in monographic issue by *ANY* is

"approximate the 'production' of [Tafuri's] intellectual life in its first and second iterations," and offer "helpful supplementary material and contextual information that can aid the contemporary reading of Tafuri's published writing."[74] However they also demonstrate the problems and complexities of explaining Tafuri's oeuvre "both within its recent reception and in studies concerning its reception."[75]

From Leach's point of view, *Casabella* provides a more "balanced and thoughtful analysis of [Tafuri's] contribution to architectural debate."[76] This audience who had access to Tafuri's works without being biased by a selective spectrum of Tafuri's oeuvre through translations, were able to confront Tafuri within his own context, who in return approximated his own legacy with his works, his engagements and his academic career in Italy.[77] Whereas the relationship of the Anglophone audience of Tafuri with his works is portrayed as more likely to be fixed and filtered through a less accurate lens which failed to comprehend Tafuri's project in its completeness: an image that was more or less fixed through "'a reading programme' for a community in New York concerned with the Marxist critique of architecture."[78]

"Tafuri's ghosts") and then forget it (as the title and the paper "Oublier Tafuri?" by Evelina Calvi's contribution to *ANY* implies). Tafuri's historiography and criticism is postulated as something to be overcome as Ignasi de Solà-Morales writes: "Today, what we find somewhat cruelly revealed are his own historical dependencies, together with the evident presence of an ideological discourse that is not too difficult to identify, linked to certain prejudices characteristic of his theoretical sources and the currents of thought dominant at the time," and argues that it would not make sense to "develop a new radical critique grounded in some new discourse designed to unmask of all ideology." Hence "Toward a Critique of Architectural Ideology," no longer helps us to "carry on with the struggle." Ignasi de Solà-Morales, "Beyond the Radical Critique: Manfredo Tafuri and Contemporary Architecture," in "Being Manfredo Tafuri," special issue, ed. Ignasi de Solà-Morales, *Architecture New York*, nos. 25-26 (2000): 56-60, 60.

74 Leach,"Choosing History," 9.

75 Ibid.

76 Ibid., 6.

77 Ibid., 5-6.

78 Ibid., 4.

Here it is relevant to note Joan Ockman edited *Architecture Criticism Ideology* (New York: Princeton Architectural Press, 1984) which had contributors -other than Manfredo Tafuri himself- such as Fredric Jameson, Joan Ockman, Demetri Porphyrios, and Alan Colquhoun. A further articulation on this group is present in the next chapter. This North American and the architectural community which was formed around Peter Eisenman's Institute for Architecture and Urban Studies in Manhattan in the 1970s and 1980s and their appropriation of Tafuri's works are attacked by Dianne Ghirardo as I will elaborate later in Chapter Three. Someone who -to some degree- evades Ghirardo's attacks is Fredric Jameson (most probably because they are not a practicing architect). Jameson is an important figure who fixes the North American Marxist discourse around Tafuri. James O'Brien suggest that Jameson was invited to the architectural critical theory debate by the architectural historians themselves, who failed to contest or review his arguments. James P. O'Brien "The Possibilities for Architectural

At the end of the day, Tafuri's reception in both Italian and Anglophone audience suffered from what Leach lists: "repetitive, formulaic devices as Tafuri's divisibility into 'early' and 'late' periods, the difficulty of translating his work from Italian being responsible for his poor accessibility elsewhere, the absolute dominance of political factors in his critical thinking, the interchangeability of the thinking of the key theoreticians of the so called 'Venice School' (Tafuri, Cacciari, Dal Co) and so on."[79] Leach argues once Tafuri's complete oeuvre itself is used to test constructions of such altered Tafuris, those constructs can be undermined, as Leach demonstrates with his own study.

To some extent, Leach is critical of reading Tafuri merely as a politically charged theoretician, placing emphasis on his persona as an architectural historian. Looking at Tafuri's works and his words beyond his works, such as the interviews he has given since the 1980s, it is clear that Tafuri's architectural historian persona is consciously chosen over 'the architect' whether he was politically motivated or not. It would be putting words into Tafuri's mouth to suggest that his "rejection" of being an architect and choosing to reside as an historian after the year 1964 was only related to and a consequence of his critique of the crisis architecture was found in the 1960s. Although *Contropiano* and the political project surrounding it were

---

Production under Capitalism" (PhD diss., MIT, 2007). In the early 1980s, Jameson's engagement with Tafuri is published as an essay "Architecture and the Critique of Ideology" in *Architecture Criticism Ideology* in *Architecture Criticism Ideology*, ed. Joan Ockman (New York: Princeton Architectural Press, 1984): 51-87; and his publication *Archeologies of the Future* (London and New York: Verso, 2005) re-postulates Tafuri's crucial role in Jameson's theoretical endeavors in the twenty-first century. That is today most furiously challenged by Gail Day.

My approach to this audience of Tafuri is primarily shaped around Andrew Leach's contemporary efforts which put light on Manfredo Tafuri as an architectural historian. As mentioned in the introduction, Leach is an author who is accountable for bringing Manfredo Tafuri back into twenty-first century architectural discourse from a more critical perspective than the past reflections on Tafuri by Tafuri's contemporaneous or subsequent generations possessed. He elaborates on *Progetto e utopia* and the lens fixed by the English speaking audience of Tafuri to approach Tafuri, and his subsequent works, in the book *Manfredo Tafuri: Choosing History*.

Beatriz Colomina and Craig Buckley co-edit the project *Clip Stamp Fold* in 2010, which is dedicated to "radical architecture of little magazines" from the 1960s and the 1970s. Principally surveying the magazines which had impact on Anglo-Saxon architectural culture of the post 1960s, the editors as well as the contributors to the project participate in discussions, exhibitions and the publication. Contributors to the project include editors of the magazines and predominant figures, authors and intellectuals who contributed to the domains of those magazines; such as Kenneth Frampton, Peter Cook, Peter Eisenman. In this publication, contributors refer to *Contropiano* through specifically Manfredo Tafuri and his 1969 essay "Toward a Critique of Architectural Ideology." See Beatriz Colomina, et al., introduction to *Clip Stamp Fold: The Radical Architecture of Little Magazines 196x to 197x* by Beatriz Colomina and Craig Buckley, eds. (Barcelona: Actar, 2010): 6-15; and Bernard Tschumi, "London-Milan-Paris-Florence," in *Clip Stamp Fold: The Radical Architecture of Little Magazines 196x to 197x*, ed. Beatriz Colomina and Craig Buckley (Barcelona: Actar, 2010): 47-57, 51.

79 Leach,"Choosing History," 10.

significant constituents of the framework within which Tafuri was writing in the 1960s, they can not be reduced to be the limits of his influence and project. Leach does not address this aspect of Tafuri's project with his inquiry:

> How can we ... explain the equivalence of the terms invoked by means of a contemporary Marxist vocabulary, proper to the discourses of *Contropiano* and *Quaderni rossi*, with the disciplinary schemes that surround Tafuri's initial 'choice' for history, and that extend into his mature historical practice, widely perceived to have left aside his 'militant' Marxism? These questions circumnavigate a vacuum that we have deliberately left as such.[80]

With my research, to some extent, I address the vacuum which Leach leaves intentionally. However unlike Day and Aureli, who also address this vacuum, I believe Tafuri's 'militant' Marxism is less likely to be related to Tafuri himself, Tafuri's oeuvre nor Tafuri's audience, and transcends the architectural discourse.

Standing out as the most politically charged piece of Tafuri, *Architecture and Utopia* is significant. His 1969 essay "Toward a Critique of Architectural Ideology" forms the basis of *Architecture and Utopia* which was originally published in Italian in 1973 as the volume *Progetto e Utopia*. Whether intentional or unintentional, an amnesia or short term attention span is dedicated to "Toward a Critique of Architectural Discourse," which can explain why implications of Tafuri's arguments in 1969 are treated identical with what he presents in *Architecture and Utopia*; with his subsequent career as a historian or with his complete oeuvre. I argue, once his essay is located precisely within its particular context with reference to the political framework of the journal *Contropiano* taken into account, the deadlock of Tafuri's politics and politics of his works is easy to be resolved. This deadlock of the role of an architectural historian, theoretician and professional had dominated the post-1960s discourse on Tafuri and to the extent of its influence, the capacity of architecture to make a radical change in society in the post-1960s discourse. In order to seek the relevance of the political framework of the essay, the first thing we need to avoid is the inclination to assess this context against Tafuri, constructions of a multitude of Tafuris or his works including his book *Progetto e utopia*.

I do not argue that establishing a proper reading of Tafuri, especially in relation to his 1969 essay "Toward a Critique of Architectural Ideology," in contrast to his 1976 volume *Architecture and Utopia*, will resolve the problems which architects feel obliged to confront today. However it may provide a different perspective to the origin of those problems, namely to the inherent and necessary relationship architects have with the capitalist structures. Hence the contemporary generation

80 Ibid., 120.

of architecture students, interns and architects who are facing the transformation of their profession before their eyes can be reminded of not only an earlier version of a similar confrontation but also the existing possibilities of more radical ways to confront this transformation, which are significantly lacking in the contemporary debates in or outside the architectural discourse.

CHAPTER THREE

"TOWARD A CRITIQUE OF ARCHITECTURAL IDEOLOGY"

3.1 Introduction to Chapter Three

The starting statement of "Toward a Critique of Architectural Ideology" is: "bourgeois art's primary ethical imperative is to dispel anxiety by understanding and internalizing its causes."[1] This ethical imperative is valid for architects as well. In his essay Tafuri confronts architects with their implicit and necessary relationship with capital. He goes further and suggests that the ideology of architecture was a necessary endeavor by architects to grant themselves a symbolic role as the "agents of politics who continuously invent advanced solutions at the most generally applicable levels."[2]

Writing in the midst of the crisis that modern architecture was going through, Tafuri puts emphasis on the role of the architect in this crisis. According to Tafuri, architects themselves marked "the paths of [modern architecture's] own destiny by becoming the bearers of ideals of progress and rationalization to which the working class is extraneous, or in which it is included only in a social democratic perspective."[3]

Instead of explaining the crisis as laid "at the feet of the Fascisms of Europe on the one hand, and Stalinism on the other,"[4] Tafuri proposed that the crisis was *the crisis of* the ideological functions of architecture, on which some architects had to rely to dispel their anxiety coming from their implicit relationship with capital. The social mission that architects could facilitate was implied to be inherently related with the capital, as any project architecture could deliver was bound to be commodified to sustain "the substratum of production techniques corresponding to the new conditions of bourgeois ideology [as in the case of Modern architecture] and laissez-faire economics."[5] Hence the anguish of "leftist" architects was as valid as it was historically inevitable, but useless at the same time, according to Tafuri.[6]

Every call by scholars to take Italy in the 1960s and 1970s into consideration while revisiting Tafuri is initiated by recalling Tafuri's comments in the preface of *Architecture and Utopia*. In 1976 with the English translation of his 1973 volume *Progetto e utopia*, Tafuri makes it clear that in order to approach his essay, we need

1 Tafuri, "Toward a Critique of Architectural Ideology," 6.
2 Ibid., 9.
3 Ibid., 32.
4 Ibid., 28.
5 Ibid., 9.
6 Ibid., 32.

to understand it within the political framework which the journal *Controipiano* provided. Referring to the essay "Toward a Critique of Architectural Ideology," Tafuri argues:

> The journal that published this essay (and others by myself and by colleagues working along the same lines) was so clearly defined in its political history and particular line of thought and interests, that one would have supposed that many equivocal interpretations might a priori have been avoided.
>
> This was not the case. By isolating the architectural problems treated from the theoretical context of the journal, the way was found to consider my essay an apocalyptic prophecy, 'the expression of renunciation,' the ultimate pronouncement of the 'death of architecture'.[7]

In the light of what Tafuri points to, I return to this context in order to seek the relevance of reading Tafuri's essay within the political context of 1960s Italy following the tracks laid out by preceding attempts by Asor Rosa, Ghirardo and Day. However with my study I am reconsidering how convincing it is to treat "Toward a Critique of Architectural Ideology" from the late 1960s and *Architecture and Utopia* from the 1970s as if they are identical; given that returning to this context reveals the fractures amongst the intellectuals in regards to their role in social conflicts that were happening at the time in Italy. Therefore, we need to ask ourselves how much Tafuri's direction in 1975 helps us with approaching Tafuri's essay to address the contradictions and limitations of the architect which Tafuri exposes in his essay when the Italian 1968 was not yet dissipated.[8]

If we study the political framework of 1960s Italy in order to apprehend Tafuri's project, the context of "Toward a Critique of Architectural Ideology" is exposed as not necessarily the proper context that we can position Tafuri and his complete historiography in. The problems with the assumption that the essay's context should be unveiled with reference to Tafuri's personal politics as well as with attempts for approaching this context via Tafuri's complete oeuvre are demonstrated in ongoing debates on Tafuri's legacy. If we can overcome those problems, we can establish a better understanding of the context which informs Tafuri's 1969 essay where Tafuri presents the problematic relationship between architects and capital. After that we can consider approaching Tafuri's essay in relation to the most advanced levels of capitalist development to date. And instead of avoiding the problematic relationship between the architect and capitalist structures, we can confront that relationship in the light of Tafuri's 1969 essay.

---

7 Tafuri, *Architecture and Utopia*, vii–viii.

8 Tafuri wrote the preface to the English translation of *Progetto e utopia* in 1975.

3.2 A Cross-section of "Toward a Critique of Architectural Ideology"

"Per una critica dell'ideologia architettonica" by Manfredo Tafuri was published in the Italian journal *Contropiano* in 1969.[9] This essay formed the basis of the 1973 volume *Progetto e utopia: architettura e sviluppo capitalistico*. Translated into English as *Architecture and Utopia: Design and Capitalist Development* by Barbara Luigia La Penta in 1976; the volume is a rework and enlargement of the essay.

Architecture and Utopia is constituted of eight chapters with a preface to this English edition. Each chapter in the book is an enlargement of arguments present in the essay, except the third and seventh chapters. The third chapter, titled as "Ideology and Utopia" is the first fourteen pages of Tafuri's forty page long 1970 *Contropiano* article "Lavoro intellettuale e sviluppo capitalistico" ("Intellectual Work and Capitalist Development").[10] The seventh chapter is titled "Architecture and Its Double: Semiology and Formalism," where Tafuri enmeshes semiology, the use of language and structures by capitalist development in his arguments he presented in 1969 essay.

"Per una critica dell'ideologia architettonica" first appeared in English as "Toward a Critique of Architectural Ideology" in Hays' compilation *Architecture Theory Since 1968* in 1998: four years after Tafuri's death. In this translation by Stephen Sartarelli, section headings were added to the text as an aid for the reader; following the Spanish version of the essay as Hays explains.[11] Those headings mostly correlate the chapter

9 From the 1970s onwards, Tafuri had given various interviews where he reflects on his own practice and project. In one of those interviews, we learn from Tafuri himself that his 1969 essay was "written somehow earlier." Manfredo Tafuri, "History as Project," interview with Manfredo Tafuri by Luisa Passerini, trans. Denise Lynne Bratton in "Being Manfredo Tafuri," special issue, ed. Ignasi de Solà-Morales, *Architecture New York*, nos. 25-26 (2000): 10-70, 33. Tafuri mentions this in the most extensive interview he had given two years before his death, in 1992, to Luisa Passerini in Rome, Italy on February 10, 1992 and March 28, 1992. It was part of the Oral History Program at the University of California Los Angeles and the Getty Center for the History of Art and the Humanities. The English version of the interview appeared in *ANY*'s monographic issue on Tafuri, which was edited by Denise Lynne Bratton for the magazine. For other interviews see Manfredo Tafuri, "I mercati della cultura: Françoise Very intervista Manfredo Tafuri" / "The Culture Markets: Françoise Very interviews Manfredo Tafuri," interview with Manfredo Tafuri by Françoise Very, trans. Kenneth Hylton in "Il progetto storico di Manfredo Tafuri" / "The Historical Project of Manfredo Tafuri," special issue, ed. Gregotti, Vittorio, *Casabella* nos. 619-620 (1995): 36-45, originally published as "Entretien avec Manfredo Tafuri," in *Architecture mouvement continuité*, 39 (June 1976): 64-68; Manfredo Tafuri, "Manfredo Tafuri," interview with Manfredo Tafuri by Fulvio Irace in *Domus* 653 (September 1984): 26-28; Manfredo Tafuri, "There is No Criticism, Only History," interview with Manfredo Tafuri by Richard Ingersoll in *Design Book Review* 9 (Spring 1986): 8-11 and Giacinto Di Petrantionio in *Flash Art*, 145 (March-April 1989): 67-71.

10 Manfredo Tafuri, "Lavoro intellettuale e sviluppo capitalistico," in *Contropiano: Materiali marxisti* 2 (1970): 241-281.

11 Michael Hays, introduction to "Toward a Critique of Architectural Ideology," in Michael K. Hays, ed., *Architecture Theory Since 1968*, 5. Spanish version of the essay was published in the book which Manfredo Tafuri co-edited with Massimo Cacciari and Francesco Dal Co in 1972: *De*

titles of *Architecture and Utopia* to the sections of the essay, which are elaborated as chapters in the volume; except the two chapters which were additions to the arguments in the essay. Also the final section heading of the English translation of the essay is: "Capitalist Development Confronts Ideology," where the final chapter of *Architecture and Utopia* is titled "Problems in the Form of a Conclusion." Although the main arguments follow the order of the last section of the essay in "Problems in the Form of a Conclusion;" in the volume Tafuri introduces "the new phenomena and new participant forces."[12] He elaborates on them via semiology and cybernetic system theories in the 1973 volume to articulate his concluding remarks. Those remarks in the 1973 volume also have some indistinctive yet subtle changes in his reflections in comparison to the 1969 essay.

Other chapters of the book which happen to be also the subsection headings of the English translation of the essay are titled subsequently: "Reason's Adventures: Naturalism and the City in the Century of the Enlightenment;" "Form as Regressive Utopia;" "The Dialectic of the Avant-garde;" "'Radical' Architecture and the City" and "The Crisis of Utopia: Le Corbusier at Algiers."

The last sentence of "Toward a Critique of Architectural Ideology" sums up three endeavors Tafuri undertakes with his essay. First, Tafuri presents architecture as the practice of concretizing ideology. Then he sets up the objective which he puts as: "the systematic destruction of the mythologies" that sustained architecture's development. Lastly, and most likely to be the most controversial for those who believe in a progressive or positive change through design and architecture, he postulates the fundamental exteriority of the architect with regards to class struggle.[13]

---

la vanguardia a la metrópoli: Crítica radical a la arquitectura (Barcelona: Gili, 1972) before the publication of the 1973 volume *Progetto e utopia*. Cacciari's contribution to this volume was his essay "Dialéctica de lo negativo en la época de la metrópoli" ("The dialectics of the negative in the age of the metropolis").

12 See Tafuri, *Architecture and Utopia*, 172-76; compare with Tafuri, "Toward a Critique of Architectural Ideology," 31.

13 Tafuri, "Toward a Critique of Architectural Ideology," 33. Here is the last paragraph of Tafuri's 1969 essay with its English translation by Stephen Sartarelli:

> La riflessione sull'architettura, in quanto critica della ideologia concreta, "realizzata" dell'architettura stessa, non può che andare oltre, e raggiungere una dimensione specificamente politica, di cui la distruzione sistematica delle mitologie che no sostengono gli sviluppi non è che uno degli obbiettivi: e solo le condizioni future della lotta di classe daranno modo di sapere se questo che ci prefiggiamo è compito di avanguardia o di retroguardia. Tafuri, "Per una critica dell'ideologia architettonica," Tafuri, "Per una critica dell'ideologia architettonica," in Contropiano 1 (1969), 79.
>
> (Reflection on architecture, as a critique of the concrete ideology 'realized' by architecture itself, can only push further, and strive for a specifically concrete dimension in which the systematic destruction of

As mentioned at the beginning of this chapter, written in the 1960s, it is the crisis of modern architecture which lays in front of the architects that Tafuri attempts to expose by addressing "how one of the most functional proposals for the reorganizing of capital has come to suffer the most humiliating frustrations."[14] To do so, Tafuri undertakes the "systematic exploration of the Enlightenment debate" in order to trace the origins of the "increasingly generalized interest in the Enlightenment" within architectural culture among his contemporaneous.[15] This study Tafuri undertakes is an earlier demonstration of what constitutes Asor Rosa's admiration of Tafuri: his "almost 'scientific'"examination of the "documentation of sources" and "a knowledge of texts, all examined with impeccable precision."[16] It is in the first three subsections of the essay: "Reasons's Adventures: Naturalism and the City in the Century of the Enlightenment;" "Form as Regressive Utopia" and "The Dialectic of the Avant-garde" that Tafuri interprets the total absorption of architecture into the process of capitalist rationalization from the Enlightenment to the Modern Movement.[17] Via this hard-labour, Tafuri demonstrates his primary thesis: architectural thinking that finds its roots in the Enlightenment is the demonstration of the architectural ideology, which lends itself as a tool for capitalist development.

With subsequent two subsections "'Radical' Architecture and the City" and "The Crisis of Utopia: Le Courbusier at Algiers," the crisis Modern Architecture had entered is elaborated on. Within the setting which Tafuri established prior to his dissection of modern architecture's ideology, the crisis is depicted as the moment when architecture exhausts the functions it had been granted by the capitalist development with or without the consent of the architect.[18] Even when architects were committed to a 'progressive' architecture or planning attempts; like what modern architects envisioned their "Utopias" to be, architects had been lacking the capability

---

the mythologies sustaining its development is only one of the objectives. But only the future conditions of the class struggle will tell us whether the task we are setting ourselves is that of an avant-garde or a rearguard. Tafuri, "Toward a Critique of Architectural Ideology," 33.)

14 Tafuri, "Toward a Critique of Architectural Ideology," 6.

15 Ibid.

16 Asor Rosa, "Critique of Ideology and Historical Practice," 31.

17 For Tafuri's analysis of the introduction of the Enlightenment and how it is spread and inherited by architects and planners who politicize their practice, see Tafuri, "Toward a Critique of Architectural Ideology," 6-10. For Tafuri's analysis' progression towards the exposure of the dialectics played out in this task of politicizing that lead to the assumed autonomy of architectural practice and profession, see ibid., 10-13. For Tafuri's identification of the initiation of the "modern movement" with reference to architects committing to the bourgeoise project, architectural practice had internalized for the plan of the Capital to appropriate architecture to advance itself, see ibid., 13-15. For the depiction of the exposed contradictions of the modern movement via the avant-gardes' attempts to confront or affirm the project of modernism, see ibid., 16-21.

18 See ibid., 21-25.

or willingness to understand the reality of the economic and political structures. This, Tafuri demonstrates, resulted in the failure of their work and its appropriation within capitalist development.[19] In response to this, in the last part of the essay, Tafuri articulates the mesh of the political framework for his work.[20]

With the last subsection "Capitalist Development Confronts Ideology," Tafuri argues that the crisis of the ideological functions of architecture is a consequence of architects paving the way for their own destiny with their commitment to the bourgeoise project: "Architecture as the ideology of the Plan is swept away by the reality of the Plan the moment the plan came down from utopian level and became an operant mechanism."[21] Tafuri refers to Antonio Negri and his reading of John Keynes' General Theory (1936) in "La Teroria capitalista dello stato nel '29: John M. Keynes," ("John M. Keynes and the Capitalist Theories of the State Post-1929"), to explain the fundamental ideological overtones of the poetics of modern architecture: "To free oneself from the fear of the future by eyeing that future as present."[22] Keynes aiming "at coopting [the catastrophe's] threat by absorbing it at ever new levels," was taken to a next level in modern architecture as "the public" was integrated as the "operator and active user of the urban mechanism of development:"[23] affirming the reality of the new class of the modern city. As architects realized the ideology of the Plan, they obliterated their role as ideologues. In other words, the whole cycle of modern architecture with its birth, advancement and crisis was a consequence of the application of the ideology of the Plan by the architects who lacked the vision to perceive themselves within the economical and political reality of the capitalist society. By promising to resolve "the imbalances, contradictions and delays typical of capitalist reorganization of the world market," without acknowledging their own role in concretizing those with their practice, the architectural ideology finally found itself in crisis.[24] Tafuri concludes, as the consequence of reflecting "on architecture, as a critique of the concrete ideology 'realized' by architecture itself," architects would eventually need to confront the roles they were given by capitalist development.[25]

Through this reflection and understanding of the architect's role in the realization of the ideology that Tafuri articulates, architects are posited exterior to the actual

19 See ibid., 25-28.

20 See Ibid., 28-33.

21 Ibid., 28.

22 Antonio Negri, "John M. Keynes and the Capitalist Theory of the State in 1929," in *Revolution Retrieved: Selected Writings on Marx, Keynes, Capitalist Crisis and New Social Subjects 1967-1983*, trans. Ed Emery and John Merrington (London: Red Notes, 1987):177-197. Originally published as "La teoria capitalista dello stato nel '29: John M. Keynes," in *Contropiano* 1 (1968): 3-40 quoted in Tafuri, "Toward a Critique of Architectural Ideology," 28.

23 Tafuri, "Toward a Critique of Architectural Ideology," 28.

24 Ibid., 32.

25 Ibid., 33.

working class struggles since "just as there can be no such thing as a political economics of class, but only a class critique of political economics, likewise there can never be an aesthetics, art or architecture of class, but only a class critique of aesthetics, art, architecture and the city."[26] Hence, Tafuri dismisses the possibility or assumptions of being a critical architect, artist or intellectual.[27] However, regardless of the "useless" anxious state the architects were found in back in the 1960s with the fear of "the proletarianization of architects and his [*sic*] insertion ... within the planning programs of production;"[28] Tafuri implies that there may still be hope for architects to confront their role in the capitalist development. "For a liberated society," architects needed to address whether "such an objective could ever be sought without a linguistic, methodological and structural revolution reaching well beyond the simple subjective will or the simple updating of a syntax."[29] He concludes his essay by reminding architects: "but only the future conditions of the class struggle will tell us whether the task we are setting ourselves is that of an avant-garde or rearguard."[30]

3.3 Problems with Approaching the Essay

It is not a matter of debate whether Tafuri actually argued for the incapacity of architects to escape capitalist structures or not. He makes this argument. Rather than the argument Tafuri makes, it is the implications of his argument which dictate the way Tafuri's work is problematized by architects, architectural historians and theoreticians. With the picture Tafuri depicts in 1969, unless an architect is willing to lend their practice to capitalist development, there is no domain for them to practice architecture as their profession. Hence if one is to take Tafuri and his arguments in 1969 seriously, there is no point of practicing architecture as an architect and pretend

---

26 Ibid., 32.

27 Tafuri says:

> Order and disorder, in this light, cease to be in opposition to each other. If we interpret them according to their true historical significance, it becomes clear that there is no contradiction between constructivism and "protest art," between the rationalism of building production and informal subjectivism or Pop irony, between the capitalist plan and the urban chaos, between the ideology of planning and the poetics of the object.
>
> The destiny of capitalist society, in this interpretation, is not at all extraneous to the project . The ideology of the project is as essential to the integration of modern capitalism, with all its structures and superstructures, into human existence, as is the illusion of being able to oppose that project with the tools of a different project or with those of a radical "anti-project. Ibid.

28 Ibid., 31

29 Ibid., 32.

30 Ibid., 33.

struggling against capitalist society.

In the context of 1960s Italy, pleading for not lending oneself to the service of capitalist development does not necessarily mean a portrayal of an apocalyptic vision or a pessimistic critique. In 1966 Tronti writes in "The Strategy of Refusal": "When the development of capital's interest in the factory is blocked, then the functioning of society seizes up: the way is then open for overthrowing and destroying the very basis of capital's power."[31] Tronti distanced himself from this strategy which was calling for refusal to work and instead started adopting a different discourse which Cacciari articulates further in *Contropiano* at a time when agitated political subjects in Italy intensify their struggle against capitalist structures and the State with the Italian 1968. 'Negative thought', with which former *operaisti* agitators established a discourse as a potent political autonomy is assigned for intellectuals through which they were expected to radicalize the institutions of the labor movement. Where this later project, which was elaborated until and after *Contropiano* ceased to be published, is what Tafuri adopts in his 1973 edition of his 1969 essay; the 1969 essay is more likely to be a translation of the earlier common call that had been vocalized frequently in 1960s Italy within the architectural discourse.

Instead of approaching the essay as it is within its political framework; architects, architectural historians and theoreticians adopted the less controversial approach to reading Tafuri's 1969 essay, which was via the 1973 volume. A postulation of the pessimistic outlook presented in Tafuri's work is crucial for this approach. With this approach, architects, architectural historians and theoreticians commit their inquiries into finding a way around Tafuri's pessimism in order to justify not retreating as architects whose work will never contest capitalist development.

For architectural circles who choose not to go beyond the limits of the architectural discourse, this can be a legitimate way to approach Tafuri's essay. With this approach one can numb the implications Tafuri's essay points out to architects in the 1969 essay. So far this had been the case. Yet, if we intend to approach the essay within its political framework, demarcating Tafuri's arguments within the scholars' disciplinary endeavors obfuscates the relevance of the contemporaneous *operaismo* movement to the essay.

In the English-speaking audience, this approach finds its origins in 1982 with the publication of the collaborative book *Architecture Criticism Ideology,* and most recently taken over in the contemporary discourse by Gail Day.[32] Given that Tafuri's

31 Mario Tronti, "The Strategy of Refusal," trans. Red Notes, in *Autonomia: Post-Political Politics*, ed. Sylvère Lotringer and Christian Marazzi (Los Angeles: Semiotext(e), 2007): 28-35, 28-29. Originally published as "12. La strategia del rigiuto," in *Operai e capitale* (Torino: Giulio Einaudi editore, 1966): 234-252.

32 On 13 March 1982, The Institute for Architecture and Urban Studies in New York held a

essay starts with referring to the "anxiety" caused by "understanding and internalizing its causes;"[33] it should not come as a surprise when Tafuri's audience fail to overcome this anxiety and try to numb the controversial implications of Tafuri's arguments

---

symposium which involved Deborah Berke, Walter Chatham, Alan Colquhoun, Pe'era Goldman, Denis Hector, Christian Hubert, Michel Kagan, Beyhan Karahan, Mary McLeod, Joan Ockman, Alan Plattus Michael Scwarting, Bernard Tschumi, Lauretta Vinciarelli. This group's interest in politics and architecture lead them to realize the little attention the subject had received in North American architectural discourse. In order to widen their perspective, they turn their attention to "young post-Marxists" of Italy, especially Manfredo Tafuri, and this attempt of theirs marks the introduction of the most generic approach to Manfredo Tafuri and his work within English-speaking architectural circles. One problem with their approach was that they did not attempt to understand the political project Tafuri's work had been preceded by, not until after Tafuri's death when the architectural circles tried to confront Tafuri without his presence in two monographic issues published in architectural magazines *Casabella* (1995) and *ANY* (2000). Jameson's "Gramscian alternative" to Tafuri's pessimistic outlook for architecture, involved "a limited notion of 'progress' into the endless historiographic cycle of deconstruction and reconstruction," within the "intellectual marketplace." Joan Ockman, postscript to *Architecture Criticism Ideology*: "Critical History and the Labors of Sisyphus," in *Architecture Criticism Ideology*, ed. Joan Ockman (New York: Princeton Architectural Press, 1984): 182-189, 184 and see Fredric Jameson, "Architecture and the Critique of Ideology" in the same book. Where in 1981 Sandra Pescarolo brought into the attention of the English-speaking audience how the *operaisti* critique of the early 1960s diffused into a number of trajectories after 1969. And one of the emphasis she puts on is the connection and the disconnection of this critique in relation to Gramsci. See Sandra Pescarolo, "From Gramsci to 'Workerism': Notes on Italian Working-class History," in *People's History and Socialist Theory*, ed. Raphael Samuel (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1981): 273-78. One of the seminal criticisms the *operaisti* had was against the Gramscian notion of "organic intellectual" and "progress" which was diluted in the policies of the Communist Party back in the 1950s and 1960s Italy. See Mario Tronti, "Our Operaismo," trans. Eleanor Chiari in *New Left Review* 73 (January-February 2012): 118-139. The *operaisti* project required a reassessment of the notion of progress and the efforts of those who were exterior to the working class yet still assumed a role within the working class struggles. As my primary interest is not in the way North American audience of Tafuri understood Tafuri, I am not going to dwell on this too much. However in the following chapter, the reader will come across another footnote on Gramsci and Gramsci's notion of 'organic intellectual.'

In the twenty-first century, the lack of understanding of the political dimensions of Tafuri's work is started to be addressed to confront approaching Tafuri's work via the lenses set by the North American audience. See Gail Day, "Manfredo Tafuri, Fredric Jameson and the Contestations of Political Memory," in *Historical Materialism* 20, no. 1 (2012): 31-77. Still, it is arguable how much Gail Day herself is able to confront Tafuri's 1969 essay in its political framework without filtering it through further obstacles to be able to avoid addressing the implications Tafuri's essay may actually possess.

On this note, it worth mentioning Marco Biraghi: an Italian scholar of Tafuri. Biraghi grants "Project of Crisis" as one of the fundamental aspect of Tafuri's project. I do not inquire into his approach to Tafuri's works and project, as it has limited reception in the English-speaking audience of Tafuri, at the time of writing. Felice Mometti's research on Manfredo Tafuri, which I have mentioned earlier in Chapter One, is an example where the author establishes a link between Italian *operaismo* movement, particularly with reference to Tafuri's contributions to *Contropiano*. He does this in the light of the work of Biraghi, as well as other writers who inquire into Tafuri;s scholarship such as Leach and Day.

33 Tafuri, "Toward a Critique of Architectural Ideology," 6.

which he raised in 1969.

What is more, a similar approach to his 1969 essay can be observed in Tafuri himself, if we consider his complete oeuvre and his career as a historian. Tafuri's 1992 reflection on his practice as a historian exposes the breaking up from the *operaisti* discourse with his intentions he narrates; and what his works demonstrate. Beside the image he portrays of himself in the oral history documented by Luisa Passerini in 1992, in the light of the basis of his formation as a historian in the 1960s and his complete historiography, Leach and Asor Rosa identify the impasse in which Tafuri's project as a historian is confined which establishes the limits of assigning Tafuri as a political figure whose project was a demonstration of the 'militant' Marxist discourse of 1960s radical Italy.

In this picture, neither Tafuri himself or his complete oeuvre will actually address the political framework of his 1969 essay, but will only expose the obstacles on our way to return to this context. Hence if we intend to revisit "Toward a Critique of Architectural Ideology," in the light of the political framework of 1960s Italy, we need to bracket out the 1973 volume, Tafuri himself with his complete oeuvre, and his audience from our inquiry as they easily deflect our attempts and hinder our approach to the essay in its particular context.

3.3.1 Problems with approaching the essay via *Architecture and Utopia*

Amongst the English-speaking audience, arguments present in Tafuri's essay are most likely to be approached via *Architecture and Utopia*. Andrew Leach argues that *Progetto e utopia* was the work of Tafuri that gained the most wide-spread attention. He describes *Progetto e utopia* as

> an indictment of contemporary architectural theory as the barren endpoint of a five-hundred-year-long trajectory extending from Architecture's artistic 'liberation,' its evolution from complete integration in a wide range of institutions -individual, social, religious, economic and political- to its modern status as an isolated practice insulated by self-referential theoretical limits.[34]

The fact that the volume was translated into English only three years after the Italian text was published, where the essay was translated into English not until 1998 may indicate the indifference to the potential difference between two texts. Yet, the link which Tafuri himself established between the essay and the volume appears to be an obstacle for us to return to the political framework of the essay.

Regardless of the link Tafuri establishes between the two works: the 1969 essay

34 Andrew Leach, "Choosing History," 4.

and 1976 book and their identical content in the arguments Tafuri delivers, those two works should not be treated as one and the same. Even if they do not seem to deviate on an argumentative level, implications of the arguments differ once the political framework within which Tafuri had written, published and circulated his work is taken into account. Leach briefly touches on this subtle distinction as he says: "*Progetto e utopia* directly indexes the vivid and engaged debates for which he first wrote 'Per una critica dell'ideologia architetonica,' drawing from and adding to a discussion centered (in part) on the Leftist Roman journals *Quaderni rossi* (1960-66) and *Contropiano* (1968-1972 [*sic*])."[35]

In the preface to his book *Progetto e Utopia*'s English translation *Architecture and Utopia*; Tafuri says what he presented as a working hypothesis back in 1969, stood up on the basis of analysis and documentation in 1975.[36] Tafuri suggests that studies of the relationship between the historical avant-garde movements and the metropolis;[37] the relationships between intellectual work and capitalist development;[38] researches on ideology and the planning practices of the Soviet Union;[39] on architecture and American cities;[40] on German sociology of the early twentieth century[41] provided "the basis of analysis and documentation" for his argument to be developed.[42] Through critical analysis of the basic principles of 1960s contemporary architectural ideology, Tafuri says his attempt was to identify "those tasks which capitalist development" had taken from architecture.[43] Despite Tafuri's association with the pronouncement of the "death of architecture," he says clearly, such a misinterpretation of his essay

35 Leach, *Manfredo Tafuri*, 140. Although the last issue of *Contropiano* was numbered 3 of 1971, it was published in 1972.

36 Tafuri, *Architecture and Utopia*, viii.

37 See Massimo Cacciari, Francesco Dal Co and Manfredo Tafuri, *De la vanguardia a la metropolis: Crítica radical a la arquitectura*.

38 See Tafuri, "Lavoro intellectuale e sviluppo capitalistico."

39 See Alberto Asor Rosa, ed., *Socialismo, città, architettura, URSS 1917-1937: Il contributo degli architetti europei* (Rome: Officina, 1971); "Les premières hypotheses de planification urbaine dans la Russie soviétique, 1918-1925," in "Sozialistische Architektur? UdSSR / Architecture socialiste? URSS 1917-1932," special issue, *Archithese* 7 (1973): 34-41.

40 See Giorgio Ciucci, Francesco Dal Co and Mario Manieri-Elia, eds., *La città americana dalla Guerra civile al New Deal* (Bari: Laterza, 1973) translated into English by Barbara Luigia La Penta as *The American Ctiy from the Civil War to the New Deal* (Cambridge and London: The MIT Press, 1979).

41 Manfredo Tafuri, "Socialdemocrazia e città nella Repubblica di Weimar," in *Contropiano* 1 (1971): 207-223; "URSS-Berlin: Du populisme à l''internationale constuctiviste'," in "L'architecture et l'avant-garde artistique en URSS de 1917 à 1934," special issue, *VH101: Revue trimestrielle* nos. 7-8 (1972): 53-87, English edition published as "USSR-Berlin, 1922: From Populism to 'Constructivist International'," in *Architecture Criticism Ideology*, ed. Joan Ockman (New York: Princeton Architectural Press, 1984):121-181.

42 Tafuri, *Architecture and Utopia*, viii.

43 Ibid., ix.

would be possible by "isolating the architectural problems treated from the theoretical context of the journal" in which his essay was published: *Contropiano*.[44] Apart from the possibility of misinterpreting his argument, he acknowledges he might also be interpreted as favoring a "return to pure architecture, to form without utopia; in the best cases, to sublime uselessness."[45] Tafuri says he would give more credit to those who sincerely refer to "purity" than "the deceptive attempts to give architecture an ideological dress," however his inquiry is not a blueprint provided for architects to follow.[46]

Instead of presenting a method or a solution, in relation to the crisis of modern architecture or narrating "an apocalyptic prophecy" in relation to architecture's role; Tafuri was making an observation, which was "actually taking place" before architects' eyes.[47] Since his 1969 essay it became clear that: "Ideology is useless to capitalist development, just as it is damaging from the working-class point of view."[48] Fortini's *Verifica dei poteri* along with Tronti, Asor Rosa and Cacciari demonstrated this fact already, Tafuri says. Simultaneously, he demarcates his own inquiry as he postulates that he is not in a position to put forward "what instruments of knowledge might be immediately useful to the political struggle."[49] However even if he does not speculate on the instruments themselves, Tafuri can be argued to assign the kind of political struggle to the architects, more lucidly in 1973, than he did in 1969.

If one is to take his 1969 argument echoing in his 1976 book seriously, as he says in the preface: "one certainly does not see on the architectural horizon any ray of an alternative."[50] The question of how to deal with this "pessimism," which Tafuri dismisses in 1975, underlines the change of Tafuri's tone and the possible different contexts in which the essay and the book are found. Tafuri's change of tone in his 1973 book in comparison to his 1969 essay may come to one's attention only after returning to the precise context of the essay. However there are some rather interesting articulations in Tafuri's arguments which are especially significant in the concluding chapter of the book when we compare it with conclusive remarks Tafuri makes in the essay. Those fine shifts and changes in Tafuri's argumentation and tone, will hopefully make more sense at the end of my inquiry into 1960s Italy.

Tafuri identifies two concurrent phenomena architects were faced with back in 1969.

---

44 Ibid., viii.
45 Ibid., ix.
46 Ibid.
47 Ibid. ix-x.
48 Ibid., x.
49 Ibid.
50 Ibid., x.

The first one is that architecture's ideological role, is no longer functional.[51] Hence this causes the crisis amongst the architects who find their practice transforming into a profession as the transforming economic and political structures dictate. The second phenomena is that the identification of "the economic and social conflicts exploding with ever greater frequency within urban and outlying areas," which impose a "pause on capitalism's Plan," if not an end.[52] Tafuri considers those two simultaneously happening phenomena had forced architects to "a return to activism -to strategies of stimulus, critique and struggle- on the part of the intellectual opposition, and even of class organizations, which to this day have assumed the task of fighting to resolve such problems and conflicts," even if this source of anxiety is mostly benumbed with "the illusion that the fighting for planning could actually constitute a moment in the class struggle."[53] In 1969, Tafuri delivers the descriptive analysis of the state of things and the limits architects are confined within their professional ground that would challenge this illusion.

In 1973, Tafuri reiterates those two phenomena.[54] However the mentioning of the "forced return to activism" is replaced with an observation that suggests "the 'radical' opposition (including portions of the working class) has avoided a confrontation with the highest levels attained by capitalist development."[55] Even though this was a prevailing theme in 1969, apart from the need for architects' to acknowledge the "new professional situation -already realized in advanced capitalist countries like US or in countries of socialized capital such as the USSR,"[56] in 1969 the confrontation with the capitalist structure did not require further engagement with the highest level attained by the capitalist development as Tafuri puts forward repeatedly in 1973. In 1973, even if Tafuri is not putting forward it as a method, he postulates the embracement of the highest level attained by the capitalist development as a prerequisite for architects to move on.

The identification of those two simultaneously happening phenomena leads Tafuri to elaborate on the need to go beyond the "criticism of ideology" as a kind of a task, which "concerns the working class point of view and that only in a second instance regards capital" in 1973.[57] Tafuri borrows this from Tronti's 1966 essay "Marx, forza

51 Tafuri, "Toward a Critique of Architectural Ideology," 31; Tafuri, *Architecture and Utopia*, 170.

52 Tafuri, "Toward a Critique of Architectural Ideology," 31; the English translation of the 1973 volume says: "economic and social contradictions, which explode in an always more accelerated was within urban agglomerations, seem to halt capitalist reorganization." Tafuri, *Architecture and Utopia*, 170.

53 Tafuri, "Toward a Critique of Architectural Ideology," 31.

54 See Tafuri, *Architecture and Utopia*, 170.

55 Ibid.

56 Tafuri, "Toward a Critique of Architectural Ideology," 31.

57 Mario Tronti, "Marx, forza lavoro, classe operaia," in Operai e capitale (Torino: Einaudi,

lavoro, classe operaia," ("Marx, Labour, Working Class"): one thing he does not mention in his 1969 essay. In this light, his 1973 concluding remarks stand on the analysis that "all the functional apparatus of bourgeois ideology has been consigned by capital into the hands of the officially recognized working class movement. Capital no longer manages its own ideology; it has it managed by the working lass movement."[58] The relevance of Tronti's 1966 essay, in comparison to 1969, is somehow clearer to Tafuri in 1973 in terms of what is beyond this analysis:

> There exists the 'partisan' analysis of such a reality ... It seems to me that, for an architectural culture that would accept such a terrain of operations, there exists a task yet to be initiated. This task lies in putting the working class, as organized in its parties and unions, face to face with the highest levels achieved by the dynamics of capitalist development and relating particular moments to general designs.[59]

Another analysis Tafuri avoids in 1969 but presents in 1973 is the rather long elaboration on the great complexity of the most advanced level of capitalist development and the need to confront it face to face within the institutions of the working class movement.[60] The advancement of capitalist development between 1969 and 1973 must be significant for Tafuri as his 1969 conclusion: "only the future conditions of the class struggle will tell us whether the task we are setting ourselves is that of an avant-garde or a reargueard," is no longer as relevant as it was in 1969.[61] After "having done away with any disciplinary ideology," with a "reflection on architecture, inasmuch as it is a criticism of the concrete 'realized' ideology of architecture itself;" Tafuri is confident that for architects, it is now

> ... permissible to take up the subject of the new roles of the technician, of the organizer of building activity, and of the planner within the compass of the new forms of capitalist development. And thus also to consider the possible tangencies or inevitable contradictions between such a type of technical-intellectual work and the material conditions of the class struggle.[62]

The leap Tafuri makes from 1969 to 1973 needs emphasis and consideration. It is significant that in 1973 Tafuri prescribes architects what he did not in 1969:

1966), 171, quoted in Tafuri, *Architecture and Utopia*, 171

58 Tafuri, *Architecture and Utopia*, 171

59 Ibid., 172.

60 Ibid., 170-79.

61 Tafuri, "Toward a Critique of Architectural Ideology," 33.

62 Ibid., 182.

confronting the highest levels attained by capitalist development *to embrace* the new professional condition architects are granted. In 1969, acknowledgment of those new roles was equally central to Tafuri's arguments, yet the confrontation with the highest level attained by capitalist development was not necessarily in the form of an embracement to revolutionize the "architectural language, method, and structure" "for a liberated society."[63] The essay was simply lacking the what the 1973 volume possess: a call for architects to adopt the new roles they find themselves in whether as a method or not. What used to be a pessimistic and confronting piece in 1969, becomes a demonstration of Tafuri's analysis and arguments' competency in 1973, which is clearer about the implications of the analysis Tafuri made in relation to the architectural ideology.

The major outcome of returning to "Toward a Critique of Architectural Ideology" is found in the fact that the essay and the volume are not identical in terms of their implications. I have not yet come across an attempt to challenge the inclination to equate "Toward a Critique of Architectural Ideology," and *Architecture and Utopia* to one another. As we return to the context of the essay, however, it is likely to expose the fact that the emphasis given on *Architecture and Utopia* over "Toward a Critique of Architectural Ideology," whether intentionally or not, indicate something more than prioritizing a mature version of the seminal text.[64] Collapsing Tafuri (as an *operaista* and/or historian) or his complete oeuvre over the essay equally obfuscate and misconstrue the implications of the essay which appear to be unique to "Toward a Critique of Architectural Ideology," and its political framework.

3.3.2 Problems with approaching the essay via Manfredo Tafuri

3.3.2.1 Tafuri the *operaista*

When Tafuri was speaking about the crisis of contemporary architecture in his 1969 essay he was speaking from the Italian society that was growing to be antagonistic within the transition from an industrial society to a late capitalist; post-industrial society. This context, as portrayed in Steve Wright's book *Storming Heaven*, can be articulated within the midst of an the attempt to find a 'Left' alternative to the politics of Communist Party (PCI) and Socialist Party (PSI) by young dissidents in the Italian post-war period.[65] It is the discourse which Italian New Left elaborated on

63 See ibid., 179-180 and "Toward a Critique of Architectural Ideology," 32-33.

64 For a demonstration of the emphasis given on *Architecture and Utopia*, in order to address the effect of the architect and architecture in economic realm and vice versa, James O'Brien, with his dissertation, provides the reader a chance to compare a different approach to the inherent relationship of the architect and capitalist structures which Tafuri points to, particularly when his work in the 1960s and his formation as a historian are not contextualized in relation to the political framework of 1960s Italy. See O'Brien, "Possibilities for Architectural Production under Capitalism."

65 Steve Wright, *Storming Heaven*, 3. Partito Comunista Italiano (PCI) was in the

with their critique and theories in light of the post-fascist Italy after the second World War, within which Tafuri's 1969 essay was written, published and circulated. Post-war Italy presents the setting that initiated the discourse which the Italian *operaisti* would adopt in their critique and analysis in the 1960s.

post-war Italy

With their leader Palmiro Togliatti's return to Italy from Moscow in 1944, the strategy of PCI was shaped around "national unity, progressive democracy, a lasting coalition of mass popular parties," since Togliatti insisted "the unity of the war years should ... be continued into the period of reconstruction."[66] Part of this policy was due to the needs of the Russian war effort, according to which the parameters of PCI strategy was determined. Ginsborg argues, untimeliness of Italian Communists' pursue of an independent policy for Stalin, such as Tito's dictatorship of the proletariat, was accompanied by Togliatti's adaptation of Gramsci's theoretical reflections, with whom he was in Turin after the First World War.[67] Ginsborg draws the relation between Gramsci and Togliatti's bottom upwards social alliances -including the one with DC- with Gramsci's emphasis on the long-term success of any revolutionary moment necessarily being "dependent upon the outcome of the prior struggle for hegemony."[68] On this note, later, Ginsborg suggests that Togliatti's conviction about DC being a progressive force in Italian society, lead to: "in the hands of left, working-class militancy" becoming "virtually discarded, in the major political battles of the time."[69]

On the other end of the spectrum the Christian Democrats (DC), while paying lip-service to Vatican's warning against "the effects of industrial society;" in practice "fully espoused the cause of 'modernization'."[70] This was shaped by American influences which Ginsborg lists as: "the liberty of the individual and of the firm, the unfettered development of technology and consumer capitalism, the free play of

---

government from 1945 to 1947. It was the Socialist Party (PSI: Partito Socialista Italiano), the first workers' party in Italy, that was greatly weakened by fascism. After the first parliamentary election of Republic in 1948, the Italian Socialists (PSI) remains in pact with PCI until 1956. As of 1963, PSI, like Giuseppe Saraga's Italian Democratic Socialist Party (PSDI: Partito Social Democratico Italiano) which was formed after splitting from PSI in 1947; starts cooperating with DC (Democrazia Cristiana): a path, which PCI undertakes in the 1970s as the 'historical compromise': the strategy of alliance with the ruling Christian Democrats. DC had been in the government since 1948 until 1994, the year of the demise of the party, due to corruption allegations. For further detail of organizations including unions and political parties of the 1960s and 1970s Italy, see Lumley, glossary of organizations in *States of Emergency*, ix-xii.

66 Paul Ginsborg, *A History of Contemporary Italy: Society and Politics 1943-1988* (Harmondsworth: Penguin Books, 1990), 42-43.

67 Ibid., 42-45.

68 Ibid., 45.

69 Ibid., 83.

70 Ibid., 153.

market forces."[71] The plan presented as the Vanoni Plan in 1954, which was referred as laissez-faire policies of the DC that covered the decade 1955-64 with objectives encouraging growth "while ensuring government control of economic priorities, and the government intervention to correct imbalances and distortions," was never realized.[72] However Amintore Fanfani committed himself to the Vanoni plan, even if "politics and planning were bound to clash when the DC's prime concerns were to establish its own power base within the State and to cater to the needs of the different sections of its electorate."[73]

Architects and architecture students would find themselves in the midst of this transforming social fabric and structure with social-conflicts happening mostly around workers' struggles, along with debates on architecture and planning as this period covers also the 'great building boom.' In this period, the government allowed "the maximum degree of freedom to private initiative and speculation in the building sector," while abandoning the idea of "any serious government intervention."[74]

Gail Day writes a repost to Ginsborg's study and suggests that the wave of attempts of "progress," promised by DC, came to an end by 1962 with law 167, which meant "state acquisition of land by compulsory purchase-order" that resulted with "prices being forced up in response to the law's 'freezing' of sections of the urban fabric."[75] With Tiburtino, which represented the "archetypal development;" installing the infrastructure in order to "sell back the plots for private development but at controlled prices," or other progressive attempts in architecture and planning without radical changes in institutions and structures that urban planning was governed by, was proven to be bound to failure.[76] In her return to Tafuri's critical practice's political framework, Day suggests this and other failures of the politics shaped by DC, along with the frustration with the Socialist Party entering a coalition with the government as of 1963; prompted an organized militant resistance as a result of the growing disaffection amongst architecture students.[77] The mood architecture students found themselves in, was actually resonating with the radical left and dissidents of that time, as Day iterates:

---

71 Ibid., 153-54.

72 Ibid., 165.

73 Ibid., 166. Fanfani became the secretary of the DC in 1954, and then became president of the council of ministers until 1963, with Antonio Segni and Fernando Tambroni of the DC briefly taking over the presidency subsequently in 1959 and 1960.

74 Ibid., 246. As a matter of fact, Ginsborg also reports that in this period, only 16 percent of total investment in the construction of houses was initiated by public housing schemes with the most notable one being INA-Casa. Ibid., 247.

75 Gail Day, "Manfredo Tafuri, Fredric Jameson and the Contestations of Political Memory," 57-58.

76 Ibid.

77 Ibid., 58.

> The lessons of Tiburtino -and other projects like it- were similar to those that had contributed to frustrations in the architectural schools in the early 60s (and which contributed to the left-rejection of the policies of the PSI's coalition with the Christian Democrats, and its disappointment with the PCI's incapacity to propose an alternative). Essentially, what concerned the *operaisti* - and those taken by their ideas- was the way in which 'reform' and 'development', led under the socially-oriented struggles of the official Left, became practice, leverage for capitalist developers.[78]

Contropiano (1968-1971), with other journals such as *Quaderni rossi* (1961-1966) and *Classe operaia* (1964-1967) was founded along the lines of the Italian *operaismo* movement; and it is the journal which opened up the trajectory that lead to *Potere operaio* (1969-1973): a newspaper which came into the scene as Antonio Negri split from the editorial board of *Contropiano* after its first issue was published. This split eventually leads to the advancement of the rhetoric, which Negri was held responsible by the Italian State in 1979, for various extra-parliamentary struggles in the 1970s.

A critique of orthodox Marxism and institutions affiliated with it, constituted the theoretical framework preceding *Contropiano*. With the emphasis given on the praxis of resistance, as Tronti convincingly proposed: "act as if the revolution was taking place,"[79] *operaismo* and rather controversially closely related consequent *autonomia* movements became most active in Italy between the 1960s and the 1970s. By revisiting Marx and challenging Marxism to that day; Raniero Panzieri, Mario Tronti, Antonio Negri, Sergio Bologna, Alberto Asor Rosa along with other philosophers, sociologists and intellectuals depicted a society that was being produced in the factory along with the material goods in response to restructuring of capitalism. In contrast to orthodox Marxists who perceive class struggle as taking control over the means of production that capitalism alienates workers from, *operaisti* perceived taking control of the labour process constituted the class struggle. The tactics to do so, however, would later cause the dissolution of the *operaisti*.

The Workers' movement in Italy continued ascending in an intensified manner until 1977 and finally experienced the "historic defeat" after the loss of the 1980 Fiat Strike; where in the rest of the Europe and the USA, the events of 1968 were effectively over by 1969.[80] Revolts starting at 1968 in Europe and around the

78 Ibid.

79 Alisa Del Re, "Feminism and Autonomy: Itinerary of Struggle," trans. Arianna Bove in *The Philosophy of Antonio Negri: Resistance in Practice*, ed. Timothy S. Murphy and Abdul-Karim Mustapha (London: Pluto Press, 2005): 48-72: 57-58.

80 Patrick Cuninghame, "'Hot Autumn': Italy's Factory Councils and Autonomous Workers' Assemblies," in *Ours to Master and to Own: Workers' Control from the Commune to the Present*,

world, continued for ten years in different forms of struggle in Italy; which were preceded with the Piazza Statuto revolt in 1962, intensified with constant revolts; through 1968 and 1969: marking the long Italian 1968, and the 35-day strike at FIAT factory in Turin in 1973. In 1973, the Historic Compromise of PCI lead to the auto-dissolution of a number of groups which were formed on the left line of Communist Party in 1969. As *operaismo* was dissolving from the late 1960s onwards within the debates predominantly around the question of entering the Party or not; *autonomia* started shaping the working class struggle with the formations of autonomous committees inside the factories that were filled with younger and more militant generation of workers. The refusal of organizational forms and the definition of new needs and objectives for liberating everyday life from labor time unified the autonomous collectives such as women's groups, radical youth, students, ecologists and environmentalists, which were not part of the "working class" analyses before.[81] As the struggles intensified from 1968 and onwards, autonomous groups found themselves on the streets most of the time, to protest "the politics of 'austerity' and 'sacrifice' that everybody -including the unions and the Communist Party- demanded of the 'working class'."[82] Such uprisings and civil disorder ascended along with a militant rhetoric accompanied by strikes, clashes with police, rejection of work becoming the expression of masses of their dissent and struggle accompanied by militant and armed-struggle in the 1970s, such as Brigate Rosse (Red Brigades) bitterly opposing the Communist Party's coalition with Christian Democrats which lead to kidnapping and assassination of Aldo Moro, the former prime minister of Italy. In the aftermath, the coalition of the historic compromise installing "a highly repressive regime of state terror," resulted with intellectual leaders of *autonomia*, Antonio Negri receiving most of the attention with charges "association and insurrection against the state" which were dropped later, but sentenced for "masterminding" the Red Brigades.[83]

With the method *operaisti* appropriated, and the global point of view it presented; *operaismo* is the political movement which Tafuri's "Towards a Critique of Architectural Ideology" was written, published and circulated in relation to. I will elaborate on *operaismo* movement in Chapter Four. Nevertheless, in the context depicted so far, I argue the essay to be a product of 1960s Italy where Tafuri opens up the trajectory for the architect to struggle against capitalist development by agitating them.

---

ed.Immanuel Ness and Dario Azzellini (Chicago: Haymarket Books: 2011): 322- 337, 322.

81 Jim Fleming, editor's preface in *Marx Beyond Marx: Lessons on the Grundrisse* by Antonio Negri (London and New York: Pluto Press and Autonomedia, 1991): vii-xiii, ix.

82 Ibid.

83 See Sylvère Lotringer, "In the Shadow of the Red Brigades," in *Autonomia: Post-Political Politics*, ed. Sylvère Lotringer and Christian Marazzi, 2nd ed. (Los Angeles: Semiotext(e), 2007): v-xvi, v.

Tafuri in relation to 1960s Italy

Having said that, Tafuri's personal politics can not be framed restrained with one line of thought influenced by *operaismo*. In his last and the most extensive interview he gave to Luisa Passerini before his death, Tafuri reflects on the 1960s in length. His tone and his account for his political actions and affiliations hardly allow the reader to assign a central political role to Tafuri and his oeuvre if our reference is Tafuri in 1992. However as Asor Rosa notes, Tafuri's collaboration with groups and individuals who refer themselves as *operaisti* do suggest and to some extent prove the presence of Tafuri's contribution to their discussions and debates especially with reference to *Contropiano*.[84]

In the interview he gave to Passerini, Tafuri reports that he had been actively involved in demonstrations at the University of Rome by architecture students and graduates to "stage something that would violently shake up the entire department."[85] In 1958, demonstrations framed as "freedom of teaching" and "freedom of learning;" were actually targeted to confront Saverio Muratori: as Tafuri suggests, Muratori was against "everything modern."[86] In a period where the idea of "everything starting over again" was meant to be an end in itself, dissident students and graduates of architecture felt the need to stir their "ignorant colleagues to action," in order "to effect disruption."[87] He recalls: "We use to say that we had a little bit of the whole world concentrated within the department. But the whole world was conceived, as Antonio Cederna taught, as a protest against corrupt building practices from which emerged a political comprehension of the situation."[88] The demonstration in 1958 was followed by another in 1963: "an extended occupation of the department, the longest and the most famous one before 1968."[89]

In the early 1960s, Tafuri was convinced that it was not an option for them to continue without a party affiliation after the incidents Tambroni government, hence Tafuri became member of the Socialist Party, "for obvious reasons," as he says.[90] In

84 Alberto Asor Rosa, "Critique of Ideology and Historical Practice," 29.

85 Tafuri, "History as Project," 22.

86 Ibid. As Tafuri reports, Muratori was the architect of the Christian Democrat office at the Esposizione Universale Roma (EUR) and back then teaching at architecture department in University of Rome. Tafuri portrays Muratori as believing "true modernity meant that everything should start over again:" a thought Tafuri was fascinated by.

87 Tafuri, "History as Project," 22.

88 Ibid.

89 Ibid., 23.

90 Ibid., 26. In 1960, Tambroni government allowed neo-fascist party Movimento Sociale Italiano (MSI) to hold a congress in Genoa, which is referred as "the traditional working-class citadel." Tamborini resigns, in the aftermath of the street fights sparkled by the government's decision. The resignation of Tambroni is followed by a centre-left coalition government. See Wright, *Storming Heaven*, 35-36.

those years, Tafuri publishes what he calls as "the most insignificant things in minor magazines like *Argomenti di architettura* and *Superfici*."[91] It is one of those publications in *Argomenti di architettura* which would be referred later by Galvano Della Volpe in his notes to *The Critique of Taste* as portraying "the crucial question of architecture today."[92] Tafuri reminded that, according to Della Volpe, with the embracement of the architecture as built environment that sought to meet human needs by altering the physical environment, the contradiction in architects' attempts needed to be exposed.[93] Tafuri showed "quite rightly, that the definition of those ethical and social contents which are 'the starting-point' of the modern revolutionary movement in architecture, owes much to the Enlightenment."[94] For Della Volpe, the modern architecture was understood through the "mass ordinary people" of the agnostically accepted "mechanistic, 'functional' rationality, in a cultural and social automatism, in an ever more uncontrolled process of 'quantification' (implicitly divorcing the architect and the engineer)."[95] Hence according to him, Tafuri's work was significant as he had depicted that to "give 'a very precise content'" to the continuity which "the most committed contemporary architects are tending to look for," in "the modern revolutionary movement in architecture," which needed to aim "the human condition of the architect in the web of its relations with the social world towards which his activity is directed."[96]

In spite of his disinterest in his works produced in the 1960s, Tafuri assigns the 1960s a significance in his political as well as intellectual formation. Described as "scholastic," Tafuri says he despised all the Marxist works published at that time.[97] However, the problems contemporary dissident Leftists were occupying themselves with, were arising as "entirely new in political terms" with the influence of Raniero Panzieri and *Quaderni rossi*; making Tafuri return to Marx- for whom his original interest was found in the critique of the "philosophical teachings of Bruno Widmar -a non Marxist doctrine." [98] For Tafuri, Panzieri's return to Marx meant "to negate

91 Ibid. Tafuri says in the early 1960s he was in a crisis because he did not "have an individuality," and could not act on in his interest in history over architecture as he felt guilty as "someone who had followed Panzieri and Basso;" he considered "history was an escape, something to be renounced in favor of action. Ibid., 29.

92 Gelvano Della Volpe, *Critique of Taste*, trans. Michael Caesar (London: NLB, 1978), 246. Della Volpe is an important figure for the *operaisti* as he is a stepping stone for Panzieri, Tronti, Asor Rosa and others to break apart the orthodox Marxism. I will articulate on this later in Chapter Four. Critique of Taste is his attempt to systematically expose "an historical-materialist aesthetic, and by extension, an orderly sociological reading of poetry and art in general." Ibid., 11.

93 Ibid., 246-47.

94 Ibid., 247.

95 Ibid.

96 Ibid.

97 Tafuri, "History as Project," 26.

98 Ibid., 27.

Marx himself;" and Tronti's reflections grafted onto the questions "to whom the ideal of social and urban justice refers" meant "the whole of leftist thought is impeded by its own ideological constructions."[99] According to Tafuri, the critique of ideology meant the critique of the Left.[100] From this perspective, in the interview he defines the critique of ideology as the advancement of "the idea that it is possible to do theoretical politics, which becomes in practice the critique of ideology."[101] Tafuri identifies his need back in the 1960s as a consequence of his professional concerns, which made him seek "a critique of ideological thought, which has embedded itself in the history of architecture and the history of art in general."[102] Yet, similar to the way he approaches his earlier works in the 1960s, Tafuri fails to understand why his 1969 essay and the version he publishes in 1973 as *Progetto e utopia* attracted the attention they had.[103]

It is with his first teaching position on the faculty at Palermo in 1966, when Tafuri

99 Ibid., 32.

100 This rather questionable image of the 1960s political rhetoric is articulated in such a fashion by Tafuri in 1992, as he seems to feel obliged to elaborate on his account of the operaisti project as he reminds the reader about the dispute he had with Asor Rosa over Rinascita in the earlier 1990s. The dispute is his polemical reside with Massimo Cacciari from the editorial board of Rinacista, which was the magazine of IPC, that resumed publication in January 1990 under the direction of Asor Rosa. See "Rinascita Torna in Edicola Polemica Asor Rosa – Cacciari," La Repubblica, February 4, 1990, http://ricerca.repubblica.it/repubblica/archivio/repubblica/1990/02/04/rinascita-torna-in-edicola-polemica-asor-rosa.html; Leonard Weinberg, The Transformation Of Italian Communism, (New Jersey: Transaction Publishers, 1995), 118.

101 Tafuri, "History as Project," 32.

102 Ibid. Leach argues that "[Tafuri's] specific motivations and a great deal of language from Mario Tronti's political critique- from which essay "Critica dell'ideologia" his own title [of the essay] comes," had been preceded in his earlier book, *Teorie e storia* (1968). Leach, *Manfredo Tafuri*, 158; Tronti, "3. Critica dell'ideologia," in *Operai e capitale* (Torino: Giulio Einaudi editore, 1966): 152-159. In 1968 Tafuri "identifies the Renaissance as a moment wherein architecture entered a state of artistic autonomy conditioned by the new intellectual value-setting inherent to architectural theory."Leach, *Manfredo Tafuri*, 141. This publication sets the target for the historian that is further elaborated in his book *L'Architettura dell'Umanesimo* (1969): "humanism" and "its origins and deformations relative to the rise of the Renaissance." Ibid.

103 Ibid., 33. Aureli reports that Tafuri avoided speaking about his earlier works in his classes at IUAV. See note 16 in Pier Vittorio Aureli, "Intellectual Work and Capitalist Development: Origins and Context of Manfredo Tafuri's Critique of Architectural Ideology," in *The City as a Project* (blog), March 11, 2011, http://thecityasaproject.org/2011/03/pier-vittorio-aureli-manfredo-tafuri/. In 1992, Tafuri gives more emphasis to writing his first book on Quaroni in 1963. Tafuri explains his interest in Quaroni as: "it wasn't easy to find an architect who had spent so much of his time doing research for the parliamentary commission on poverty." Suggesting the questions Quaroni posed as crucial, instead of Quaroni's architecture and his reputation as an architect, Tafuri says: "he posed the same questions I would pose for myself in the 1960s and 1970s: "Where are we coming from?" and "Where are we?"- not so much "Where are we going?" On this remark Tafuri finds what Quaroni did was "very important, in the same sense as us abandoning our books (or the graphic designers their drawing tables) to go and throw rocks at the police." Tafuri, "History as Project," 30.

turns his attention to the *operaisti* and the revisionist study inspired by Tronti, Asor Rosa and the circle around Raniero Panzieri.[104] With his arrival in Venice, and his experiment with his institute of history in IUAV, Tafuri becomes closer to Cacciari and starts participating in the discussions with the *Contropiano* group forming around Negri along with Marco de Michelis and Francesco Dal Co; who were active in organizing demonstrations in the University of Venice.[105] Asor Rosa suggests as he refers to Tafuri's contribution in *Contropiano*, their collaboration was "accompanied, or even preceded, by the work of conspicuous group of architectural students, who had made their theoretical and political beginning in *Angelus novus*."[106] The group which was organizing the demonstrations in the University of Venice, published the journal *Angelus novus* (1964-1974) with Cacciari. Tafuri refers to *Angelus novus* as with it they spoke "a common language that probably harked back to an earlier discourse: that which is worldly must only be worldly, and therefore ideology for us was not so much the phrases of Marx as a spurious practice somewhere between the sacred and the practice. And thus there was direct confrontation."[107]

As though he has to testify to Tafuri's involvement in *Contropiano*, Asor Rosa argues that

> the excursus on the history and identity of the journal is not external to Manfredo Tafuri's segment of intellectual history ... Tafuri, in fact, accepted *toto corde* [with his heart] the definitive structure of the journal, and participated to it with enthusiasm

104 Tafuri, "History as Project," 36.

105 In 1968, Tafuri was appointed as the Chairman of the Faculty of History of Architecture and the Director of Venetian Istituto di storia dell'architettura, the Institute of History at the IUAV, which in 1972 would become a department. There he tries out his pilot experiment to create "a history department composed of all histories of the present" by unifying "the history departments of the University of Venice Ca Foscari and the IUAV in such a way that the art historian, instead of always looking at paintings and drawings of architecture, would come into direct confrontation with those who study social history, the history of women in the Veneto, and so on." Tafuri, "History as Project," 47.

Antonio Negri refers to 1968 through his experience in Venice: "Nineteen sixty-eight was marvelous, because in reality it had begun long before: the school of architecture at the university there had been a center of student resistance since 1965. This was a truly fine department, very distinguished, and there were a number of very important artists who lived in the city during this period as well. And you had only to cross a few bridges before you came to dry land and the largest petrochemical complex in Italy, Porto Marghera. This is where I started out as an activist." Antonio Negri, *Negri on Negri: Antonio Negri with Anne Dufourmantelle*, trans. M.B. DeBevoise (New York and London: Routledge, 2004), 168.

106 Asor Rosa, "Critique of Ideology and Historical Practice," 29.

107 Tafuri, "History as Project," 54. Bernard Tschumi reports that Angelus novus was the discovery of Walter Benjamin by the Italians, whose texts were published in early 1960s with the title 'Angelus Novus.' According to him it was Tafuri, who introduced architecture to the magazine's agenda. Tschumi, "London-Milan-Paris-Florence," 51.

> and through the specific instruments of his discipline, on both the chosen lines of research. And what's more, I would say that in those years his collaboration with *Contropiano* became the most characteristic element of his work.[108]

Tafuri produces four essays for *Contropiano*. After his 1969 "Toward a Critique of Architectural Ideology," Tafuri publishes "Intellectual Work and Capitalist Development" in 1970; "Socialdemocrazia e città nella Republica di Weimar" (Social democracy and cities in the Weimar Republic) and "Austromarxismo e città: 'Das rote Wien'" (Austromarxism and cities: 'The Red Vienna') in 1971.[109] Both works in 1971, according to Asor Rosa, provide examples of architectural "catastrophic clash, with the economic necessities of the Plan, and triumphant and spectacular expectations of 'accomplished socialism' (in one country)."[110]

With regards to his earlier two essays, Asor Rosa argues that Tafuri's clear position provided: "a battle of two fronts."[111] Those fronts were:

> First, against that architectural thinking which presents itself as an ideology and as an instrument of civil cohabitation, and thus becomes the secular arm of capitalism; second, against that architectural thinking which derives from certain aspects of urban proletariat organization ... and elaborates an 'alternative ideology', this too totally submitted to the guidelines of capitalist development.[112]

Asor Rosa reminds the reader one of the intentions of *Contropiano*: the critique of ideology, formulated as demystifying "all those intellectual and political manifestation related to the workers' movement tradition, which over time and in different ways had attempted to better define a level of integration with the social realm of capitalism."[113] He places Tafuri's project in this completed picture of *Contropiano* as argues:

> For Tafuri, leaving the 'critique of ideology' behind did not mean returning to architectural ideology, not even to the discipline closer to architectural historiography; rather, it

108 Asor Rosa, "Critique of Ideology and Historical Practice," 29.

109 Asor Rosa summarizes: with "Socialdemocrazia e città nella Republica di Weimar" Tafuri studies "the critique of the Austrian-German social-democratic experiment," and with "Austromarxismo e città: 'Das rote Wien'," Tafuri develops "the critique of those illusions of the European architectural avant-garde with a democratic and anti-fascist message." Ibid.

110 Ibid.

111 Ibid.

112 Ibid.

113 Ibid.

> meant understanding that in this field too one should come as close as possible to the certainty of the datum, resisting, both for the present and the past, all ideological seductions, even the fascinating ones generated by the enlightened Venetian patriciate of the early 16th century.[114]

Tafuri's personal politics is not necessarily what *operaisti* project embraced nor constituted. In fact, while his formation as a historian and an intellectual was clearly influenced by the discourse the *operaisti* were developing in the 1960s, Tafuri's participation in this discourse hardly went beyond his attempts to utilize it in his intellectual inquiries, as "Toward a Critique of Architectural Ideology" also demonstrates. We need to acknowledge this before assuming Tafuri's subsequent career as a historian in the years following the 1960s and 1970s can provide us guidelines to approach his 1969 essay. On this note, Asor Rosa convincingly argues that:

> The 'critique of ideology' precedes and determines the discovery of 'philology', and makes it both possible and necessary. Think about this: once no veil any longer exists, all that remains is to study, understand and represent the mechanisms of reality, for which one should refinedly use the instruments of objective inquiries (clearly, with some limits). Total disenchantment produces great historians. And Manfredo Tafuri was a great historian of this kind.[115]

Tafuri finds himself in dichotomy between politics and history which he eventually resolves by committing himself to the idea that: "History is history,"[116] in response to the use of history as a political tool. His commitment to history happens simultaneously as he was getting more affiliated with intellectuals whose works Tafuri was influenced by, such as Mario Tronti and Raniero Panzieri.[117] This quandary, which Tafuri depicts in his reflections to his choice over history and his embracement of the *opearisti* critique, is left unresolved. His choice of history in contrast to the political critique of ideology he appropriates in the 1960s leaves the deadlock which Leach identifies with reference to Tafuri's role as a historian: "The practice of historiography will therefore involve, at some level, an encounter with an historiographical ideology that applies burdens that the historian cannot but pass on to their audience."[118]

Tafuri's utilization of the discourse, which the *opearisti* initiated with their critique of

114 Ibid., 33.

115 Ibid.

116 Ibid., 31.

117 See ibid.

118 Leach, *Manfredo Tafuri*, 158.

ideology, demonstrates the limits of the *operaisti* persona one can assign to Tafuri. In 1992, we encounter a Tafuri who identifies his practice and project with his academic career after 1968 as follows:

> I realized that the profession of the architectural historian could be completely autonomous in relation to architecture because its objective was to start from the discipline and embrace history itself. I wanted to elevate the history of architecture to the same level as all the other histories. ... In the built environment, particularly in Venice, there is no stone that doesn't have an institutional meaning. Ultimately, nothing about a building can be understood unless we know not only who the patron was but also to which faction he belonged, because the work is always expressive of him in one way or another. The kind of history that I am doing today is somehow a manifestation in myself, in my work, of what I hoped an institution could be or accomplish. However, for me, the institutionalization of this practice remains the objective.[119]

Hence Tafuri's objective lacks a method or a guideline apart form what Tafuri's own practice stands in its completeness. However Tafuri is powerless in terms of institutionalizing this as it is not Tafuri himself but the reader who can initiate that process. Like this compromise the historian accepts de facto, Tafuri had other limits in terms of his personal politics which he could not over come at that time such as the elitism that he perceived to be attached to his and others 'radicalism'. It is in the early 1970s when Tafuri joins PCI as he recalls:

> We worked on our research without prejudices, always stressing the connection between politics and culture. But we had this elitist attitude and were snobs about the trends of the time ... One tragic night we decided to enroll in the Partito Comunista after weighing the possibility of joining the Democrazia Cristiana. Those who don't have ideology don't have such problems. We were rigid and radical, like the atmosphere around us, but we didn't see ourselves in that way.[120]

119 Ibid., 44-47.

120 Ibid., 55. It is worth mentioning that chronologically, between Tafuri's 1969 essay and his decision to join PCI, lies the 12 December 1969 Piazza Fontana bombings in Milan, which killed 16 people.Tafuri leaves the Party before 1976 as PCI prepares for the historic compromise. In 1976, Cacciari would join the party. The relevance of the context will be hopefully clearer for the reader in Chapter Four.

Tafuri explains the role they attributed to themselves within the academia, assumed a form of autonomy, along with Francesco Dal Co, Marco de Michelis and other members of the History department in IUAV whom Tafuri had power to appoint. With their decision to join PCI, they maintained that they should begin the transformation in the university rather than departing from it.[121] Tafuri refers to *Contropiano* and *Angelus novus* and reiterates his perception of himself and fellow members of the magazines: "We felt we were some kind of elite. We knew that the Partite Comunista was all wrong but that we should stay with it out of a genuine pragmatism."[122]

The connection between Tafuri in 1969 and Tafuri in 1992 in terms of their critiques and their politics is a hard one to sustain.[123] It is questionable, whether it is justifiable

121 Ibid., 42.

122 Tafuri, "History as Project," 54.

Reminding the reader about the generation difference between Cacciari, Dal Co and de Michelis against Negri, Asor Rosa and Tafuri may have further significance which I am not taking into consideration. In 1968, Cacciari was 24, De Michelis and Dal Co were 23 years old. Where Tafuri was 33, Negri and Asor Rosa were 35 years old. In this light, *Contropiano*, which Negri leaves Cacciari and Asor Rosa in the editorial board after his departure, is a medium where the young founders and members of *Angelus novus* intermingle with a slightly older generation of dissidents whose experience of post-war Italy must be reasonably different.

123 It should be noted that, Tafuri in 1992 does not necessarily address every single persona Tafuri has been attributed to via his practice as a historian, as an intellectual, as a teacher, as a Marxist or a reactionary and so on. As Andrew Leach argues, Passerini's record of this oral history can not say the "final word" on Tafuri. Though this interview, especially via the version *ANY* published in 2000 as "History as Project," established "the terms of his own reception by a new generation of scholars, and to undermine the image of his work that dogged his later practice as an historian." Andrew Leach, "Tafuri's eyes: the Biographical Subject and Subjectives of Reception," in *Contested Terrains: Proceedings of the 23rd Annual conference of the Society of Architectural Historians, Australia and New Zealand*, ed. Steve Basson, Terrance McMinn and John Stephens (Perth: SAHANZ, 2006): 293-298, 295.

Leach further suggests that this documentation of Tafuri in 1992 offered a challenge to the image of Tafuri as a Marxist, which his image in the 1970s was dominated by, and is now provoking a younger generation of Tafuri to "expand the number of his writings that receive critical attention." Ibid. Leach is critical of postulating "History as Project" as a foundation to approach to Tafuri and asks: "How can we bring Tafuri's 'explanations' of his work into discussion without either unnecessarily diminishing his authorial stance through suspicion or turning to his account for concrete answers, for the truth?" With his own research as part of a younger generation of Tafuri's readers, Leach addresses this problematic and chooses the "evidence" over the "essence." See ibid. 295; 298n13. Hence he prefers to construct a persona around Tafuri's practice as a historian within a complete picture, rather than prioritizing Tafuri in the interview of 1992 who seems to contradict with his prior practice. Having said that, it needs a further critical assessment of Leach's attempt in comparison to those who prioritize Tafuri's reflection on his own work over what Leach considers to be the evidence: the works themselves.

Where in my case with this thesis, since I do not postulate Tafuri himself or his complete oeuvre as the subject of my inquiry, I grant myself a degree of resilience against Leach's criticism. I do not consider my research as an attempt for a better apprehension of Tafuri's works and legacy, but instead demarcate my intention within "a better understanding of how to approach the political

to revisit Tafuri's 1969 essay in its political framework with reference to Tafuri himself, to his career as a historian and to his complete oeuvre unless we believe every possible implication of "Toward a Critique of Architectural Ideology," needs to be demonstrated with and by Tafuri. However if that is the case, then Tafuri's disinterest to his works in the 1960s suggests that returning to his 1969 essay might be lacking prospective implications. And to some extent, this is demonstrated with contemporary attempts which do revisit the political framework *operaismo* constituted in order to have a better apprehension of Tafuri's project, and their conclusion is most likely to point to an impasse, which Tafuri is confined in.

Tafuri's personal account of his personal politics and his political engagements are more likely to address the vacuum which is left by Tafuri's initial "choice" of history over architectural design and practice. It is in this vacuum, a wide audience, with their "ever-political" image of Tafuri but dismissal of his "intentions," is more likely to hope for or promise a form of resistance to capitalist structures within architectural design, practice, theory and discourse.[124] Yet, it is again in this vacuum, where the deadlock which the intellectual and the historian is confined to appear when one assumes to take Tafuri's persona as a historian, into consideration.

3.3.2.2 Tafuri the historian

From a naive point of view, Tafuri's choice of history over architecture may suggest a break from architecture because of Tafuri's frustration with architecture as a discipline and practice whose institutions are too constraining to break away from. He portrays this in "Toward a Critique of Architectural Ideology." Somehow complementary to this expectation, Tafuri narrates his break up from architecture as a result of an existential anguish, in 1964, after a "big Michelangelo exhibition" opening. Tafuri's frustration with the way history was treated as an instrument of politics lead Tafuri to his choice of history over architecture:

> From a subjective point of view, you could say that I resolved my destiny in one night … One tragic night I was miserable because I had to decide between practice and history. I remember I was sweating, walking around, felt ill, had a fever. At the end, in the morning, I had decided, and that was it! I gave up all the tools of architecture and determined

framework of the influential 1969 essay "Toward a Critique of Architectural Ideology." The document by Passerini nevertheless, does demonstrate the disconnectedness between the evidence and the essence, or Tafuri's intentions and his practice. Hence I find it as a primary reference to refer in order to remind ourselves that Tafuri himself nor the various personas he had been attributed through his work can provide us guidelines to approach to the arguments in Tafuri's 1969 essay, but instead expose the potential distractions we need to tackle and bracket out before returning to the context of his 1969 essay.

124 Leach, "Choosing History" 120.

> to dedicate myself entirely to history. What kind of history, I didn't know.[125]

If we address Tafuri's project as a historian, even though we can apprehend better his intentions and motivations as a historian, the relevance of the political context of the 1960s and 1970s Italy do not necessarily help us to move on from the already existing debates on Tafuri, nor address any implications of returning to this context apart from the need to internalizing the impasse which Tafuri's project as a historian also failed to resolve.

This impasse is addressed in Andrew Leach's "'Everything we do is but the larvae of our intentions': Manfredo Tafuri and Storia Dell'Architettura Italiana, 1944-1985." In his paper, Leach elaborates on the general tendency to approach Tafuri's career as "an 'early' theoretician of modern architecture and its institutions, and a 'later historian of the Renaissance."[126] This explains the tendency to perceive a retreat in Tafuri's oeuvre which in return becomes an attempt to overlook to the deadlock Tafuri's project as a historian is confined within. Instead of approaching Tafuri with this problematic perspective, Leach returns to the political framework of 1960s and 1970s Italy and posits Tafuri the historian as he points out to the need to embrace the impasse Tafuri's project was bound to, for a proper apprehension of Tafuri's oeuvre.

By referring to the "left-wing intellectual activity in Italy during the 1960s and 1970s,"[127] Leach attempts to inquire into Tafuri's "absence as 'actor' within the text in terms of his 'authority' as a writer."[128] He does this in order to portray Tafuri applying the critical mechanisms with the histories of "his contemporary milieu, and … in his Renaissance studies," as a strategical response to the context architecture was found in, from/within that context.[129]

To come to this conclusion, Leach argues that the contents of *Teorie e storia dell'architettura* along with *Progetto e utopia* were being explained by *Storia dell'Architettura Italiana, 1944-1985*.[130] Identification of "obstacles contained in the discipline" and the "confirmation of the availability of institutions" fail to be relevant with "building and development," as Leach argues: "Tafuri poignantly observes while introducing the fourth (1976) edition [of *Teorie e storia*]: 'What seems most valid … is the effort to show how ineffectual are the brilliant gymnastics carried out in the yard of the model prison, in which architects are left free to move

125 Tafuri, "History as Project," 30-31.

126 Leach, "'Everything we do is but the larva of our intentions'," 1..

127 Ibid., 4.

128 Ibid., 1.

129 Ibid., 12.

130 Ibid., 7.

about on temporary reprieve'."[131] This was already confirmed in *Architecture and Utopia*, according to Leach, where "Tafuri's 'revolution' is played out on a field where knowledge and institutions are at stake."[132] He continues: "architecture becomes an example in that setting of an institution that has cloaked the gradual loss of its authority in a rhetorical metanarrative reinforcing the power of hypothetical action to implement change."[133] With Leach's narration, Tafuri's project appears in its completeness without overlooking its formation as Tafuri attempts to utilize the discourse the *operaisti* constructed as his practice as a historian evolved in relation to his take on the critique he initiated his historiographical studies.

Storia dell'architettura italiana 1944-1985 is significant as it demonstrates what Tafuri's strategy allows Tafuri: to "act" via "withdrawal from 'action'" that granted the "authorship" in writing a history within which [author] is involved subjectively as an 'actor,' albeit in absence."[134] This effort of Tafuri, Leach quotes James Ackerman coining "special effort to achieve 'distance'" identifies the moment of Tafuri's historiography being activated rather than 'operative' that required engagement and complicity.[135]

Portrayed as Tafuri's challenge by Leach: the "illusion of critical distance from his subject, by extension from the shortcomings of the institution torn open by critical history,"[136] is referred as a paradox by Alberto Asor Rosa in his reflection on *Teorie e storia dell'architettura* where Asor Rosa finds the signals of Tafuri's criticism of operative critic (critica operativa). It is the militant critic (the operative critic) which corresponds to what Tafuri tries to distance himself to deliver a critique, of this form of criticism along with the institution of architecture, as a "pure critic."[137] Asor Rosa argues, Tafuri "traveled this road in both directions several times in the course of his research, without ever arriving at definitive, fixed conclusions:"[138]

> Insofar as the critic detaches himself from the Modern Movement and is predisposed to consider it from the perspective of an autonomous historical context, the "militant critic," working in defense of the Modern Movement, is inevitably replaced by the "pure critic" who takes no stand,

131 Tafuri, "Note to the fourth (Italian) edition," in *Theories and History of Architecture* quoted in ibid.

132 Ibid., 8.

133 Ibid.

134 Ibid.

135 Ibid., 9.

136 Ibid.

137 Asor Rosa, "Manfredo Tafuri, or, Humanism Revisited," 31.

138 Ibid.

> since he maintains his role is to understand, to discover contradictions, and eventually to deconstruct. ... while the pure critic might aspire to the overall transformation of the world by criticizing, demystifying, and denouncing, on the other hand, by analyzing and furthering knowledge, he takes up the cause of the historian and tends to identify with that role.[139]

Asor Rosa suggests between two extreme positions, the critic and the historian, lies Tafuri's personal history and "an important piece of architectural and cultural historic thought ... in the period between the triumph and the decline of the idea of the mass-worker and its strong political and ideological connections."[140] Tafuri "the historian" is argued to be a product of the "accuracy and depth of [Tafuri's] disciplinary knowledge" that filled the "framework of ideological criticism with real content, just as the framework of ideological criticism introduced a revitalizing ferment into the then paralyzed structures of each discipline."[141]

According to Asor Rosa, if we are to make a maneuver to give an account of Tafuri's assumed prevalence of history over criticism which appear to be "alternating phases" in Tafuri's works, we need to provisionally put history aside in order to reflect on criticism Tafuri's work possessed.[142] In his revisit to Tafuri's *Progetto e utopia*, Asor Rosa first underlines the connection between criticism and history in -and with reference to- Tafuri's later works.[143] Through the critique of "architectural ideology" which led "every case to the discovery of nihilism as the true driving force of bourgeois intellectual research in the 20th century;"[144] Asor Rosa argues, "demystification of the false bourgeois consciousness hidden beneath this particular attitude,"[145] produced the same affect with working-class thought with reference to Tafuri's criticism of architectural-urban planning project of European social democracies.[146]

Asor Rosa's endeavor to go back to the context of *Contropiano* to identify and understand crisis depicted in *Architecture and Utopia* in order to tackle "the issue of Tafuri's historical thought," is not necessarily intended to address the issues Tafuri

139 Ibid.
140 Ibid., 32
141 Ibid., 30.
142 Ibid., 32.
143 Ibid., 31.
144 Ibid., 34.
145 Ibid., 31.
146 Ibid., 33.

raises in his 1969 essay.[147] Revisiting Tafuri within this picture is crucial in order to understand Tafuri and particularly his book *Progetto e utopia* as Asor Rosa refers to this period as "an attempt to construct upon the same ideological foundations a shared interpretative grid in which to fit different cultural objects."[148] The labour in Asor Rosa's revisit to Tafuri is to reunite "two parts of Tafuri's critical-historical discourse"[149] and to overcome the deadlock the researcher is bound after Tafuri's identification of the crisis of criticism. Asor Rosa argues Tafuri found this experience "exhilarating and tragic" which lead to Tafuri's choice of history over criticism. Therefore the choice of history was established as an "empirical, highly problematic, and slightly desperate response to the vacuum created by the "crisis of criticism."[150] Asor Rosa raises a similar point which Diane Ghirardo raises with reference to Tafuri's interview with Françoise Very in 1976. Ghirardo reports Tafuri saying "acting, or movement, … mattered more than results, and the movement that 'tends toward something' constitutes the 'rectitude of all political activity'."[151] However this does not necessarily mean that Tafuri himself, even with his complete historiography, can be regarded as a figure from whose acts, practice and life we can postulate he accomplished what he set out as a challenge for himself.

As Leach and Asor Rosa identifies, Tafuri's project does not allow necessarily a guide to the architectural critic or historian or architects themselves to cope with the future

147 Asor Rosa's revisit to Tafuri is to some extent personal since via revisiting Tafuri he constructs somehow a nostalgic Tafuri whose research would demonstrate "an equilibrium the uncertainty and precariousness of which do not prevent … us from continuing to search for it as the ultimate goal of our common research." Ibid., 38. I feel I need to mention that Asor Rosa's lecture, in its English translation, sounds more like an account to justify the impasse encountered by his own and Tafuri's audiences via Tafuri's choice over history, in contrast to the provocative tone "Toward a Critique of Architectural Ideology" had. Asor Rosa concludes with the "inevitable" reduction of the "greatest project" of any "intellectual worker" corresponding to the "greatest impasse." In a recursive manner, the greatest impasse corresponds to the greatest project, from Asor Rosa's point of view. This, he justifies through a revisited humanism, which "Tafuri would have said," Asor Rosa speculates, "in a perennially unsteady equilibrium between reason and destiny: an equilibrium the uncertainty and precariousness of which do not prevent -and should not prevent- us from continuing to search for it as the ultimate goal of our common research." Ibid., 38. Once I elaborate more on *operaismo*, the contrasting reflections ie., by Antonio Negri and Mario Tronti, on the context of Italy in the 1960s, with reference to strategies and tactics the *operaisti* appropriated; Asor Rosa's attempt to give an account for the impasse the "intellectual" seems to be bound; and actually referring to one of the distinctive features of the trajectory opened up after the dissolution of *operaismo* as the movement *autonomia* ascends. On this account, the lack of the mention of Massimo Cacciari's articulations on *Krisis* and "negative thought" by Asor Rosa, for example, is a curious case.

148 Alberto Asor Rosa, "Manfredo Tafuri, or, Humanism Revisited," 29.

149 Ibid., 37.

150 Ibid., 34.

151 Diane Y. Ghirardo, "Manfredo Tafuri and Architecture Theory in the U.S., 1970-2000," in "Mining Autonomy," *Perspecta* 33 (2002): 38-47, 39.

his essay condemns architects to. What is more, with his own practice, Tafuri himself needs to be subjected to a fair bit of interrogation about whether the lessons we draw from Tafuri today are truly applied by Tafuri. [152] Therefore, where returning to Tafuri and the political project his career was founded upon may expose the limits and to some extent the failure, Tafuri was confronted with as a critic and as a historian, it does not necessarily justify the impasse as the ultimate condition the intellectual or the academic should aim for.

What is more, Leach raises an important point which I briefly mentioned earlier: Tafuri is institutionalized with his Venetian Istituto di storia dell'architettura. As Leach observes, instead of graduating "Historians" who would correspond to the call for a historical research of "the distant past as analyzable in the present while forcing neither 'resolution' nor reconciliation with the present, Tafuri's institution actually graduated "Architects."[153] Leach elaborates on this aspect of Tafuri's project as a historian, in "Criticality and Operativity" as he refers to the instrumentality of history by elaborating on the notion "instrumental history."

"Instrumental history," Leach argues, "appears to offer an historically grounded logic to the direction taken by the present and immediate future"[154] which Tafuri "famously accuses the modern movement's historians (Sigfried Giedion, Nikolaus Pevsner, Bruno Zevi, Paolo Portoghesi) of maintaining too heavy an investment in architecture's future."[155] Within the impasse Tafuri's project is founded upon, there lies the pragmatic appropriation of this impasse as an intellectual, which granted Tafuri a position in the academia for him to experiment his approach to architectural practice and history.

What Tafuri opens up, according to Leach, is the suggestion that one can either "stand in the present looking back while looking forward" as "the operative;" or "from the present, look back in order to communicate the past to the present" as "the critic."[156] Tafuri's attempt to confront the values of the present and the past targeting "ideological insularity" through "testing architectural knowledge solely against architectural theory" is confronting; however it is equally problematic since Tafuri

152 Ghirardo also reminds Tafuri's remarks on *Architecture and Utopia*: "it was to the critic and the historian that he addressed his remarks as an approach to the criticism and history of architecture," particularly referring to Tafuri's criticism of the works of New York Five. Yet, as she continues reporting from Tafuri: "if architecture demands engagement with political, social, and economic systems and institutions, criticism requires distance, Tafuri insisted, something in short supply today." Ibid. 46.

153 Leach, "Criticality and Operativity," 18-19.

154 Ibid., 18.

155 Ibid., 16.

156 Ibid. 18.

himself constitutes the only figure who is granted that right.[157]

Leach points to the case of Tafuri as the "historian's new standing" in architectural discourse where he occupied a position "within architectural culture but 'beyond' architectural ideology, even if not beyond … history's disciplinary ideologies" as a unique case also in regards to its "ethical" dimensions.[158] According to Leach, even if Tafuri himself appropriated an operative position with reference to his engagement with architectural history in order to expose the disciplinary limits it possess, he simultaneously performed the role of a critic by laying out different functions than what past-operative historians contributed to architectural knowledge. This aspect of Tafuri's works binds together his historiography all together. Regardless the lack of attention given to his later histories *Venezia e il rinascimento* (1985), *Storia dell'architettura italiana 1944-1985* (1986) or *Giulio Romano* (1989) than his more "'theoretical' histories" such as *Progetto e utopia*, *La città americana or Architettura contemporanea* (1976): in complete they present the refinement of Tafuri's "methodology of reporting historical research in a manner that undermined the utility of historical narrative."[159] This refinement was possible via the ethical imperative that colored Tafuri's practice: the reiteration of the operativity of the historian being misleading, and Tafuri as the historian who constantly struggled with his own practice to overcome the operative historian defined the legacy of Tafuri as a historian.[160]

This critical approach to Tafuri and his historiography addresses and to some extend resolves the problems with the "phenomenon of Tafuri's reception," as it exposes his audience's failure to approach Tafuri as a historian through their somehow faulty understanding of his oeuvre. With Tafuri the historian we can demonstrate what his project can provide to architectural historians today when we postulate Tafuri's project as a challenge to the culture of operative historians as well as to himself. And this legacy can be well founded upon the formation of Tafuri as a historian in the light of 1960s and 1970s Italy. If it is the political Tafuri we identify with reference to the project of the *operaisti* of the 1960s, on the other hand, the identification of those formative years do not go beyond the impasse his politics leads to.

Yet again, there is still a crowd amongst Tafuri's audience who trouble themselves to find the operative aspects of Tafuri's impasse as a historian and an intellectual, with reference to his political affiliations in the 1960s. This leads to the final problem I will address before moving on to looking at the political framework of Tafuri's 1969 essay: Tafuri's audience who appropriate a political Tafuri with their inquiries.

157 Ibid.

158 Ibid.

159 Ibid., 19.

160 Ibid., 19-20.

3.3.3 Problems with approaching the essay via Tafuri's audience

As Leach points out, "a generation of theoreticians, in equalizing ... [Tafuri's thinking on ideology and his personal politics], or at the very least promoting them as unconditionally interdependent, has failed to unfetter the wider implications of his thinking."[161] One of the reasons for failing to address wider implications of Tafuri's works, Leach points to, is Tafuri's "incessant interrogation of the basis of historical knowledge in architectural culture."[162]

Architecture and Utopia and the books where Tafuri inquires into the "survival (or demise) of architectural thought in the face of the rising dominance of the capitalist mode of production," demanded scholarly communities to return to the early moment that Tafuri refers to.[163] Tafuri, in his work, referred back to Renaissance; project of humanism and Enlightenment thought, questioned "the reassuring postulates accumulated since the twenties," as Leach quotes from Jean-Louis Cohen, and "imposed a long, regenerative return to the archives ... innovated in terms of both discourse and project, and practiced an authentic 'deconstruction' (in the Freudian sense) before the term was adopted by the architectural profession."[164] Researchers, who were "concerned with the twentieth century and particularly those preoccupied with the European avant-guard," Leach suggests, found it difficult to return to those earlier moments.[165] In this light, Leach mentions:

> A number of readings, ranging from the meticulous to the clumsy, of his *Progetto e utopia* in all its editions and earlier incarnations -including the *Contropiano* articles 'Per una critica dell'ideologia architettonica' and 'Lavoro intellettuale e sviluppo capitalistico'- enmesh his intellectual history; the tangled voices at once demonstrate a high level of attention to and empathy with his 'strong' argument for the relationship between ideology and architecture, as well as a general agreement to flatten out the aforementioned complexities of this subject in order to raise him up as a hero of the 'cause'.[166]

3.3.3.1 Phenomenon of Tafuri's reception

In the light of this critique, Leach points to how Tafuri had been received and appropriated in architectural discourse especially in an "Italophillia"-inclined American audience led by Peter Eisenman, Diana Agrest and others, who assimilated

161 Leach, "Choosing History," 102.
162 Leach, *Manfredo Tafuri*, 158.
163 Leach, "Choosing History", 102.
164 Cohen quoted in ibid., 12.
165 Ibid., 102-03.
166 Leach, *Manfredo Tafuri*, 139.

his work in the pages of *Oppositions*.[167] The "Anglophone public," as Leach refers to, which is "an American academic public in particular,"[168] led to the "oft-repeated trajectory of a political Tafuri becoming, in time, a philological Tafuri" that leads to "less obviously politically engaged writing."[169]

Leach refers to Tafuri's letter to Ockman, as a demonstration of "the distance between Tafuri's view of his work and that maintained by his American readership," where "Tafuri admits to finding his 'image' in her book … completely alien to his self-perception."[170] Tafuri distances himself from this interpretation that is found in Joan Ockman's edited book project *Architecture Criticism Ideology* where Tafuri's work is portrayed as: "working on the Renaissance to be recognized as a vehicle for reconsidering his image as a politicized theoretician."[171]

Leach further elaborates on the distance between Tafuri's "intentions" which are more likely to lie in "the default characterization of Tafuri's critical program as inextricable from the political objectives of *Contropiano*," and his reception by the architectural theoreticians.[172] Leach points to the distance of Tafuri's intentions' from his interpretation by his North American audience, as it is reiterated with the gulf between his 1992 interview's translated edition that runs along the top half of each page of *ANY*'s monographic publication on Tafuri and the essays below.[173]

Referring to his engagement with this crowd and their capacity to transform the institutions they were found in, Tafuri says: "Above all, I have come to understand that it is impossible in the United States. In my view, it is always about closing ranks, the arroccamento of disciplines, the academy … This is the corruption that moved me to say I would try to accomplish these goals on my own."[174]

Tafuri protesting about his work's reception provides a pivot for future studies on

167 Leach, "Choosing History", 7.

168 Ibid., 102.

169 Ibid., 6.

170 Ibid.

171 Ibid., 7.

172 Ibid. 7-9.

173 Ibid., 7.

174 Tafuri, "History as Project," 48. Tafuri was invited to the 1974 conference at Princeton University which was organized by Diana Agrest: "Practice, Theory and Politics in Architecture" to give the lecture "A Theory of Criticism." Later, "L'Architecture dans le Boudoir" was published in *Oppositions*. Rem Koolhaas, Jorge Silvetti, Mario Gandelsonas, Adolfo Natalini, Peter Eisenman, Lionel March, Kenneth Frampton, Melvin Charney and Francho Raggi were some other speakers at the conference. See Manfredo Tafuri, "L'Architecture dans le Boudoir: The Language of Criticism and the Criticism of Language," *Oppostions* 3 (1974); an edited version appears as Manfredo Tafuri, "L'Architecture dans le Boudoir: The Language of Criticism and the Criticism of Language," in *Architecture Theory since 1968*, ed. K. Michael Hays (Cambridge: MIT Press, 1998): 148-173, 146-147.

the phenomenon of Tafuri's reception. I believe that this phenomenon was most fiercely raised as a problem of/in the English-speaking audience of Tafuri, by Diane Ghirardo with her critique of Eisenman, Jameson and Hays in "Manfredo Tafuri and Architecture Theory in the U.S., 1970-2000."[175] Diane Ghirardo reminds us

175 In 1994, Diane Ghirardo polemically and viciously attacked Peter Eisenman as a "bogus" avant-garde in her paper "Bogus Avant-garde". Her paper attracted more attention than it deserved according to Rosalind Krauss, in "Eisenman (and company) respond," in *Progressive Architecture* 76, no.2 (1995), 88-91. Ghirardo argues Eisenman and his persona as an 'avant-garde,' demonstrates Eisenman's prominence as the "preempting the notion of the radical." For the younger generation of architects to be able to challenge and explore "the network of power relations that sustain the entire institution of building as a panacea for the upheavals of deindustrialization and unemployment," Ghirardo argues, Eisenman represents a figure to be tackled and to an extend that needs to seize to exist. Apart from demonstrating a showcase for how those power relations operate in academia, as Rosalind Krauss reminds of John Searle and Jacques Derrida quarrel in the 1980s, Ghirardo's polemical attack, I must say, is a righteous one, and that is worth mentioning. Ghirardo's hostility towards Eisenman and his persona can be argued to date back to Ghirardo and Eisenman's debate regarding the relevance of politics to architecture. Referring to Giuseppe Terragni's Casa del Fascio, Eisenman insists, as Ghirardo reports, the work should be completely understood without any reference to Fascism. This is to some extent Tafuri's criticism of Eisenman where in an interview in 1986 he would publicly denounce interest in Eisenman's as he would state:

> The work of Eisenman and Hejduk was much mire interesting ten years ago than it is today because it showed a curious problem of Americans looking to Europe, and what they chose to look at was an "Americanized" Europe -Eisenman's Terragni is an architecture without human history. Using the theoretical percepts of Chomsky and Lévi-Strauss (rather than the more characteristic American pragmatism), they succeeded in emptying their historic sources of the human subject. Tafuri, "There is No Criticism, Only History," 10.

Gail Day also mentions an essay which was commissioned by *Oppositions* as the Introduction to the Eisenman's planned volume on Giuseppe Terragni that was not published by MIT in 1979 until it appeared as *Eisenman 2003*. Day, "Manfredo Tafuri, Fredric Jameson and the Contestations of Political Memory," 50. This delay, Day suggests, was due to the "souring of relations between Eisenman and Tafuri." Ibid.

I believe Ghirardo's polemical essay possesses the precursors of her inquiry into Manfredo Tafuri's reception by his North American audience in her 2002 essay to contest Eisenman and his "company's" response to Ghirardo in 1995. In their responses, they hardly go beyond the rhetoric of "if everything is political, what is political after all?" -as Rem Koolhaas argues quite bluntly: "Even more problematic than the definition of the formal today is the definition of the political. Bush? Balladur? Berlusconi? The political is now everywhere and nowhere." It is also worth mentioning that in an interview given in 2011, Rem Koolhaas argues with reference to the case of HafenCity, regardless only "the upper 10 percent live there," one should "take notice the fact that these upper 10 percent are completely happy with this type of architecture." Rem Koolhaas, "We're Building Assembly-Line Cities and Buildings," interview with Rem Koolhaas, in *Spiegel Online*, December 12, 2011, http://www.spiegel.de/international/zeitgeist/interview-with-star-architect-rem-koolhaas-we-re-building-assembly-line-cities-and-buildings-a-803798.html, In the same interview, he elaborates on CCTV in Beijing saying their involvement in the process was very democratic, "even there," he adds as "the buildings' users are involved in the process [of design and use of space]. We listen to them and their suggestions." Ibid. This interview in 2011 seems to be addressed in Ghirardo's 2002 paper, where she posits architects divorcing

of the future depicted in Manfredo Tafuri's *Architecture and Utopia* as she argues "architectural theory machine" in the United States; while embracing Tafuri's critique and position, gave hardly any emphasis on Tafuri's book *Architecture and Utopia*'s political dimensions.[176] She makes a rather simple but a valid observation: with the future Tafuri posited as bleak and all actions inevitably compromised by capitalism, one would not build at all as it would not be possible to do anything when every act is only a repeat of the initial capitulation.[177] Her cynical fascination with the audience of Tafuri in the U.S. comes from the "misreadings of Tafuri, and the cues for a new attitude toward architecture erroneously deduced from his critique."[178]

Instead of going back and exposing the political dimension that she herself posits to be fundamental to Tafuri's critique, however, Ghirardo only contests the "intellectual baubles of university faculty, graduate students and journal editors"[179] who do not necessarily penetrate the realm of practice.[180] Referring to Eisenman, Jameson and Hays, Ghirardo problematizes the phenomenon of Tafuri being represented as a wicked critic; a nay-sayer; or an ineffectual pessimist; suggesting Manfredo Tafuri's point was to call for political choices to be made and acted upon.[181]

"architecture from the contamination of the real world," except she refers particularly to the North-American audience of Tafuri.

The same audience is contested in a more substantial and relatively more subtle way with Gail Day. Day does so, by acknowledging Ghirardo's earlier attempt as she refers to her work and elaborate on the American audience of Tafuri as with "the misapprehension of Tafuri's 'gloom'," legitimatising a retreat into "autonomous architecture." Day, "Manfredo Tafuri, Fredric Jameson and the Contestations of Political Memory," 49. This, actually is affirmed by George Teyssot, a former student of Tafuri who is a victim of "Tafuri's pointed and permanent abandonment," along with Eisenmann, as Leach calls them to be. Leach reports that Teyssot admits they were able to "'explain' Tafuri from the position of privileged insight, but paint … mere portraits." Leach, "Choosing History," 8.

176 Ghirardo, "Manfredo Tafuri and Architecture Theory in the U.S., 1970-2000," 39.

177 Ibid.

178 Ibid., 40.

179 Ibid., 39.

180 Ibid., 40.

181 Ghirardo's preoccupation in her critique seems to be to contest and confront Tafuri's audience, rather than providing a different insight to approaching Tafuri. For this reason, I believe her efforts are more unique and true to Tafuri's project, even if they can come across as attacks on a group of academics. Following lenghty quote is a demonstration of her rhetoric in a case where her cynicism towards a group of academics can be intuited:

> Even though architecture became instrumental to late capitalism, this need not be its only result, nor did this mean that the architect should retreat into contemplative games … In a 1976 interview by Françoise Véry, Tafuri spoke of 'architecture without a capital A' as the most interesting because it does not wallow in its crises and problems; instead of talking, it acts.' Acting, or movement, Tafuri insisted, mattered more than results, and the movement that 'tends toward something' constitutes the 'rectitude of all political activity.' It is

For Ghirardo, *Architecture and Utopia* proposes an "interpretation of history roughly from the Enlightenment to the Modern Movement," that understood history as a sequence of "events, contradictions, dialectics, ideas, and actions" which implies the "absorption of architecture into the process of capitalist rationalization."[182] It can be suggested that this perception of Tafuri, a figure who, according to Ghirardo, used criticism "to expose a view of that history at variance with standard ones,"[183] urges the need to refer to the political dimensions and context of Tafuri's *Architecture and Utopia* as much as the reception of Tafuri by the audience who Ghirardo is critical of.

Ghirardo's argument rests upon the assumption that Tafuri's critique is appropriated by his contemporaries and subsequent generation of architects, theoreticians and historians to deploy and substantiate their own agenda. With reference to *Architecture and Utopia* Ghirardo portrays Tafuri's work as a mere attempt to be radical. It is questionable whether Ghirardo's harsh attack, in this instance, can be substantiated. As Jane Rendell's reading of Ghirardo's essay implies, "believing that architectural resistance to capitalism was impossible," while still sustaining a ground where an architecture which can attempt to redistribute "the capitalist division of labour" is conflicting if not an oxymoron.[184] If Tafuri perceives the work of Raymoond Unwin, Ernt May and Hannes Meyer as demonstrations of "realistic possibilities of a democratic administration" by the "drawbacks to work by these architects in their struggle to accomplish real projects for the middle and working class," as Ghirardo argues, then there is an implication of a blueprint or a method for architecture to achieve projects for the middle and working class.[185] This blueprint or method cannot be found in Tafuri's work, and, as Ghirardo herself agrees, his work is not a blueprint unless we collapse what the rest of his oeuvre carries along on top of his 1969 essay and his 1973 volume.[186]

In this light, her legitimate critique of the assertion "architecture is autonomous and therefore not instrumental to political ends covers the fact that architecture is deeply imbricated in politics" fails to overcome the instrumentality, which herself is critical of in the case of when Tafuri's views were "subdivided 'into little tasteless pieces

---

therefore puzzling that an astute critic such as Michael Hays could describe Tafuri's position as expressing the 'ineffectuality of any resistance [to modernism].' Even worse, Fredric Jameson excoriated Tafuri for his pessimism and for setting up a scandalous political impasse in his work. Ibid., 41.

182 Ibid., 44.

183 Ibid.

184 Ibid., 40. Also quoted in Jane Rendell, introduction to *Critical Architecture*: "Critical Architecture: Between Criticism and Design," in Mark Dorrian, Murray Fraser, Jonathan Hill and Jane Rendell, eds., *Critical Architecture* (London and New York: Routledge, 2007): 1-9, 3.

185 Ghirardo, "Manfredo Tafuri and Architecture Theory in the U.S., 1970-2000," 40.

186 Ibid., 39.

for consumption by the Anglo Saxons.'"[187] Ghirardo, however, is not the only one who asserts that there are problems with the way Tafuri is consumed "by the Anglo Saxons," while suggesting his work should be digested in a different way.

As mentioned earlier, Asor Rosa believes it is impossible to imagine today the context in which *Contropiano* occurred, yet argues it is crucial to revisit Tafuri, since Tafuri's project's fundamental role that "would be played by Marxist 'political theory'" is not clear anymore.[188] This aspect of Tafuri's project is what Ghirardo is pointing to without bothering to inquire deeper in her study. On the other hand, Gail Day returns to the moment Asor Rosa posits exchanges between different cultural fields, in order to demonstrate the problems with the audience of Tafuri who had adopted a political Tafuri as they approach Tafuri's works, yet failed to comprehend Tafuri's project in its completeness. Although both Leach and Asor Rosa refer to the significance of the context of *Contropiano*, it is most probably Gail Day's inquiry that delves into this context more deeply in order to identify the problems associated with Tafuri's audience with their (mis)interpretation of Tafuri's works' political implications.

3.3.3.2 Beyond the phenomenon of Tafuri's audience

Day suggests "most English-language reception of Tafuri was essentially blind to the specific political dimensions of his account," and treated him "as architectural historiography's generic representative of 'Marxism'."[189] In the light of this argument, Gail Day tackles Fredric Jameson, from a different critical point of view which Ghirardo's argument runs tangent to. According to Day, Jameson's 'pessimistic' Tafuri, "through the prism of Dialectic of Enlightenment,"[190] is charting "capitalism's progression to a state of 'total' bureaucratization," where "artists and thinkers of the avant-garde contributed to the critique of capital but to reinforcing its 'instrumentalizing and desacralizing tendencies'," as she quotes from Jameson's 1984 "The Politics of Theory."[191] Day argues that Jameson reads Tafuri's argument with the notion of capitalism as a 'total system' which he finds consistent with "the classical Marxist tradition," but remains "open to post- or anti-Marxist interpretation of the type associated with Marleau-Ponty, Horkheimer, the ex-Trotskyists of 30s and 40s, and ex-Maoists of the 60s and 70s."[192] Jameson's postulation of an ever-political image for Tafuri may demonstrate Jameson's representation of a figure, adopted

187 Wigley, "Post-Operative History," 53; quoted in Ghirardo, "Manfredo Tafuri and Architecture Theory in the U.S., 1970-2000," 46.

188 Alberto Asor Rosa, "Manfredo Tafuri, or, Humanism Revisited," 29

189 Gail Day, "Manfredo Tafuri, Fredric Jameson and the Contestations of Political Memory," 37.

190 Ibid., 44.

191 Ibid., 45.

192 Ibid., 46.

by Michael Hays, Joan Ockman, and Hal Foster. This is what Day refers, citing Ghirardo, as displaced and disembodied versions of Tafuri.[193] But Day goes further and portrays Jameson's agenda for reading Tafuri was:

> not simply as a diagnostic of late capitalism's unique cultural logic, but, more significantly, as a political prognosis, which treated postmodernism as the horizon against which contemporary political resistance must be set. ... The world was entirely 'within the culture of postmodernism'; the radical project, he insisted, was no longer to make 'absolute moralizing' or 'global moral judgments' but to focus on the more limited task of assessing the culture before us.[194]

It is the implications of the politics ascribed to Tafuri, for the sake of demonstrating the limits of Tafuri's version of Marxism in comparison to Jameson's own version of Marxism, which Day contests. Jameson's reading of Tafuri as a pessimist, "which reverberated through the Anglophone reception," does more than portray Tafuri as a "grumpy 'naysayer,' ... 'anti' this-and-that," Day argues; it "brings to the fore the question of political and social transformation."[195]

The problem with Jameson's reading goes hand in hand with a crucial point in Tafuri's 1969 essay as Day reports Jameson arguing that Tafuri was convinced "nothing new can be done," by positing "the impossibility of any radical transformation of culture before the radical transformation of social relationships themselves."[196] Day seems to understand this through Jameson's description of Tafuri's vision of history along with

193 Ibid., 49. To some extent, Jameson's reading of the political project and Tafuri's subsequent engagement with Cacciari and "negative thought" is accurate in the light of the discussions I will refer to in Chapter Four: He refers to Tafuri as a representative of "anti-modernist" and "anti-postmodernist" and suggests that "Their 'anticapitalism' ... ends up laying the basis for the 'total' bureaucratic organization and control of late capitalism, and it is only logical that Tafuri should conclude by positing the impossibility of any radical transformation of culture before a radical transformation of social relations themselves." See Fredric Jameson, "The Politics of Theory: Ideological Positions in the Postmodernism Debate," in "Modernity and Postmodernity," *New German Critique* 33 (Autumn 1984): 53-65, 61. I believe his identification of Tafuri's anti-capitalism is able to depict some aspects of the discourse Tafuri adopted in the 1970s. However the problem with Jameson's identification comes from the fact he fails to challenge the seminal critique Tafuri's project is founded upon by overlooking the 1960s discourse that *operaismo* delivered. The lack of confrontation with the discourse operaismo developed from the early 1960s until 1968, allows Jameson's version of Marxism to be prone to the orthodox criticism that re-introduces the fear of Stalinism into the twenty-first century discourse with a fear of utopia, cf. Andrew Milner, review of *Archeologies of the Future* by Fredric Jameson: "Jameson's Utopia or Orwell's Dystopia?" in *Historical Materialism* 17 (2009): 101-119.

194 Ibid., 60.

195 Ibid., 44.

196 Jameson, "The Politics of Theory: Ideological Positions in the Postmodernism Debate," 61; quoted in ibid., 45.

the notion of capitalism as a "total system" that is "necessarily concurrent with an 'apocalyptic notion of the total social revolution'."[197] According to Day, by opposing Tafuri's account, Jameson instead insisted "that something is possible this side of revolutionary rupture," in enclaves where "potential radical social forms that might be 'emergent' within capitalism."[198]

However, Day reminds Jameson that it is those enclaves of unsuccessful attempts, which Tafuri was aimed to reveal in his historiography.[199] While challenging the contestants to Tafuri's arguments via "hope" and "enclaves," she attempts to dismiss the image of Tafuri as a "despondent declarer of 'futility.'"[200] Day puts emphasis on the array of politics she formulates to be "initiated by workerism" in the 1960s which later in the 1970s developed as "autonomism," in order to provide a foundation for Tafuri's arguments.[201]

Day contests Tafuri's audience, including Jameson, with their assumption that Tafuri's "critical exploration of particular histories of European architecture and politics amounted to the total condemnation of *all* possibility."[202] She argues, instead, "the point he was making was not the inevitability of appropriation, but the problems that resulted from half-applied strategies, the limitations on social goals, in light of building programmes of Italy's red municipalities," as she quotes Tafuri from the 1976 interview with Françoise Véry:

> We know so much about the poverty of attempts to resolve the housing, but there is no doubt that the cooperative movement regroups and shapes a working class movement that is otherwise divided. So it's not so much what's done that is important, but the movement created in the process, something that cannot be seen or touched.[203]

Elaborated further by Day's inquiry into Tafuri's reading of Red Vienna, Day puts emphasis on Tafuri's 1976 account about those movements' significance in terms of their help or hindrance in the movements' struggles.[204] Day repeats Tafuri's statement: "historical experience can teach us things, but it's far from clear that history must always repeat itself."[205]

197 Ibid.
198 Ibid., 60.
199 Ibid., 57.
200 Ibid., 73
201 Ibid., 72.
202 Ibid., 60. Day's italics.
203 Ibid., 62.
204 Ibid.
205 Ibid.

Prior to elaborating on Red Vienna and the Karl Marx-Hof as oppositions to the "city of the bourgeoisie," regardless their twofold tragedies, Day refers to public initiatives that were launched by the schemes of the Fanfani Plan in the 1950s. Day argues, Tafuri's critique of the European social-democratic and Austro-Marxist projects for urban reform was shaped in light of the disappointment in The Vanoni Plan and INA-Casa's "ambitions for social reform through housing."[206] According to her, "the limitations of, and defeats encountered by, the early-twentieth-century projects that Tafuri addressed in a way that seems to be an allegory of contemporary policies on mass-housing."[207]

In contrast to Jameson's reading, Tafuri's attitude towards those historical experiences did not conclude that social practice was necessarily predestined for appropriation. The only prediction we could borrow from Tafuri, Day postulates, was that capital's success is predictable when "the opposition restricts its aim to delivering reforms or to ameliorating capital's effects, or when these come to substitute for the goal of social transformation."[208]

To substantiate her version of Tafuri, Day argues that Tafuri situates "avant-garde, social-democratic urban projects, and twentieth-century architectural practice in general," in a framework with which she refers to Tronti and Negri positing "the failure of the workers' movement to recognize this recalibration of the ruling classes' agenda put it at a strategic disadvantage."[209] "Within this framework," she continues arguing: Tafuri explored "how the avant-garde's practices of negation had – often

206 Ibid., 51. Tafuri understands the Vanoni plan through "the dream of equilibrium." He reports the Vanoni plan stated: "The policy of the building sector … will have to be to promote or restrain investments in the construction industries insofar as the demand for consumer goods unrelated to housing is respectively insufficient or excessive in relation to the possible process of expansion." Manfredo Tafuri, "The Myth of Equilibrium: The Vanoni Plan and INA-Casa's Second Seven Years," in *History of Italian Architecture 1944-1985*, trans. Jessica Levine (Cambridge and London: The MIT Press, 1989): 41-49, 42.

With projects such as INA-Casa, GESCAL and IACP, Christian Democrats were meant to address the Party's weakness in civil society in contrast to its "over-dependence on the mass organizations of the Catholic church and its lack of efficient organization when compared to the Communists."Ginsborg, *A History of Contemporary Italy*, 167. According to Ginsborg, those "public interventions" would signify examples of "what could have been achieved had government policy been different." Ibid. 247. As Tafuri notes: "Italy's building policy took shape through a collage of arrangements defined by sector, rather than by way of programmatic declarations." This would have consequences of decay and congestion in urban centers, due to the migration of the new class with the new housing schema, which would be reabsorbed back to the industry by providing the "untrained reserve labor" while a luxury market was being created for historical centers. See Tafuri, *History of Italian Architecture 1944-1985*, 41-49.

207 Ibid., 51.

208 Gail Day, "Manfredo Tafuri, Fredric Jameson and the Contestations of Political Memory," 61.

209 Ibid., 58-59.

contrary to the intentions of its practitioners – become isomorphic with capital."[210]

Day holds being a "leverage for capitalist developers" true for the avant-garde cultural activists, as Tafuri did argue "without a radically anti-tragic politics and the broader perspective of revolutionary social transformation, what was intended as 'anticapitalist' practices … would turn against their authors and end up serving the needs of capital."[211] But for architects, the public initiations by the DC along with the urban projects of the Austrian Marxism, do imply a potential for progressive architecture that would be applicable when reforms are not applied to a single sector, housing as in the case of Red Vienna. However this is only possible if the external factors were fixed, which means a true revolution in the economic, political and social structures that initiate those reforms.[212]

What was raised as a critique in 1969: progressive architecture that lacks an apprehension of the primacy of a radical change in the economic, political and social structures; is narrated by Day in 2012, in such a way that the arguments which are reiterated no longer confronts architects, and almost takes no notice of the 1969 critique that aimed at the architectural ideology with which architects disillusioned themselves with.

Where she is critical of Jameson, who she convincingly argues to be "less interested in the possibility of enclaves as actual challenges to spatial hegemony than he is in preserving just the idea of them," with her contestation to Jameson, her argument seems to avoid pushing the wider implications of Tafuri's works' political dimensions just for the sake of refuting the image Tafuri the pessimist, without necessarily arguing political dimensions of Tafuri's work had implications that are overlooked. In this picture, Day's dismissal of the "social practice as necessarily predestined for appropriation" as a "favorite theme within the left-postmodern debates"[213] is hardly any more substantial than Jameson's dismissal of Tafuri's arguments as "rhetorical mode of dialectical writing" reduced within a superficial "classical Marxist tradition."[214]

Day brings the politics initiated by *operaismo* to today, under the influence of Micheal Hardt and Negri's collaboration in the twenty-first century and its relevance with "theme of precarious labour, the fight to protect workers from the toxicity of their employment, and the resistance to the practice of subcontracting (with its structural

210 Ibid.

211 Ibid.

212 See ibid., 67-68.

213 Ibid., 60. See Jameson, "The Politics of Theory: Ideological Positions in the Postmodernism Debate," 61-62.

214 Ibid., 69.

evasion of responsibility)" to the contemporary debate on Tafuri's legacy.[215] However, in her application of returning to the political framework of 1960s and 1970s Italy, in order to have a better apprehension of Tafuri's project, she seems to filter *operaismo* and its subsequent movement *autonomia* through a calibrated perspective that overlooks the significance of those movements in the Italian Radical Left.

At the end of the day, Day's construction of Tafuri is not any less prone to refutation than Jameson's or others'. In Day's case, the problem with Tafuri as an ever-political figure comes to surface, as Tafuri's works all together being attached to one line of his political inclination is hardly substantial, even if this is a useful way to approach Tafuri and his 1969 essay when we are not willing to confront the implications of the essay.

3.4 Conclusion to Chapter Three

We may read Tafuri's "Toward a Critique of Architectural Ideology" with reference to Italy in the 1960s in order to place the essay and the magazine *Contropiano* within their proper political framework. Once we do so, though, we might feel we are deceiving ourselves if we suggest the suspicion present in the critique of Tafuri is only towards modern architecture with its social agenda that promises a critical (and/or "class") architecture. With his critique, Tafuri's reservation about architectural practice being restructured as a consequence of the reconfiguration of capitalist structures in late capitalism is noticeable. However the role of the architects, theoreticians and architecture historians who take part in the formation of the discipline, and their lack of acknowledgement of their actual role within capitalist development deserve a fair amount of cynicism, as well.

Within this cynicism; the pessimism found in Tafuri's essay can not be ignored but instead should be emphasized and embraced, if we believe the political context "Toward a Critique of Architectural Ideology," is relevant to the way that we approach the essay. As within this pessimistic outlook for architecture is where the architect would ever challenge the state of things along with the antagonistic political subjects whose struggles were intensifying the social conflict against the State and capitalist society while Tafuri was developing his critique. It is this agitating aspect of the essay which appears to be relevant once we return to the political framework it was written and published in; more than anything.

With *Architecture and Utopia*, Tafuri tones down the implications for architects who are confronted with their role within the capitalist development. It should not come as a surprise that architects, who were confronted in the essay, and later in the

215 Gail Day, "Manfredo Tafuri, Fredric Jameson and the Contestations of Political Memory," 72.

book with the challenging analysis of their roles in capitalist society, adopted the less provocative version to approach their inherent and necessary relationship with capitalist structures, compared to the more agitating version which was open ended in terms of its implications. In 1999, George Teyssot, a former student and colleague of Tafuri, would identify Tafuri as a radical thinker with reference to the consequences of Tafuri's arguments.[216] However he would do so in the light of his complete oeuvre as a historian, which allowed Teyssot to constrain the implications of Tafuri's arguments to a smaller set of architects in Italy, who were both architectural historians and practicing architects and involved in restoration and conservation projects in the 1960s and 1970s:

> Tafuri would deny architectural history's connection to practice. This critique of history as instrumental disturbed many academic luminaries. ... The fact is that many so-called "historians" of architecture were also running private architectural practices, with significant building production ... In Italy many of these tenured professors, running at the same time large offices, felt in a way threatened by Tafuri's plea for a separation between scholarly pursuits and professional activities.[217]

By returning to "Toward a Critique of Architectural Ideology" as it is, without introducing Tafuri's future career as a historian, his further works, or articulations of the arguments in his essay; we should be able to see that Tafuri's critique applies to a greater set of architects which comprises those who believe their practice is progressive and assume there is value in struggling against capitalist development in the 1960s.

Tafuri's reflection on the attention his essay attracted after being published in *Contropiano*, suggests there is an inclination to ignore the actual political discourse Tafuri was adopting in his inquiry, hence his critique is treated as a prophecy of death of architecture that needs to be addressed to sustain the role of the architect and architecture as a discipline. Today, we see that the problem Tafuri refers to with his work's reception has only grown bigger and also became more obfuscating than before, as we are losing our sight in order to approach the framework in which Tafuri's project was initiated at the first place. The political dimensions of Tafuri's works need to be revisited with an awareness of how significant strands of his projects are being (and had been) particularized and contained within the "particular context of Italy in the given particular period of time" while simultaneously certain aspects are (and had been) "universalized" in order for a certain critical cultural theory to

216 See Georges Teyssot, "One Portrait of Tafuri," Paul Henneger interviewing George Teyssot, in "Being Manfredo Tafuri," special issue, ed. Ignasi de Solà-Morales, *Architecture New York*, nos. 25-26 (2000): 10-16, 10.

217 Ibid.

appropriate the work within the context they project to, say the United States for the Anglophone critical cultural theory.

Tafuri himself and his subsequent career as a historian do not make things any clearer for architectural circles either. Tafuri's own problematic relationship with his own work from the 1960s, especially "Towards a Critique of Architectural Ideology," can understandably form the basis for approaching to Tafuri's essay within the context of his complete historiography, in order to reveal what Tafuri actually meant in his essay, rather than what the arguments are. However why would one need to interpret the arguments present in the 1969 essay, through later works of Tafuri, especially if the essay is not written in a cryptic fashion, is in need of an explanation. I believe we need to consider the fact that it is the consequences of the implications present in the arguments, which architects did not want to confront hence leading to the obfuscation of the essay and as the political framework it was found in, became more and more obscure in the post-1960s rhetoric.

On one hand, in the light of the problems that are revealed within the ongoing debates on Tafuri's legacy, by returning to the context of the "Toward a Critique of Architectural Ideology," we can only expect to locate Tafuri's work in its proper historical and political context from the contemporary efforts. Only after that such efforts would be critical and open to confront the failure of architects, architectural historians, theoreticians as well as intellectuals in addressing the critique and the implications of it.

On the other hand, contemporary attempts to return to *operaismo* to study the political framework of Tafuri's works pathologically fail to address the relevance of returning to this context outside the disciplinary limits of Tafuri or architectural discourse. As returning to this context will substantiate the treatment of "Toward a Critique of Architectural Ideology" as lying within the limits of architectural theory, overlooking the moment it occupies within the transformation of the *operaisti* discourse in the late 1960s. Treating the essay as more than an agitating piece that challenges architects as well as artists and intellectuals, results in the context's relevance to the arguments present in essay not only becoming obfuscated but bastardized and benumbed.

Today, 1960s and 1970s Italy accompanies somehow contemporary interest and "revived and updated as the theory of 'exodus'"[218] through works and collaborations of Italian *operaisti* and autonomist figures with French intellectuals, especially after Micheal Hardt and Negri's *Empire* as of the beginning of 21st century. With the incarceration of Negri in 1979 *autonomia* movement received international attention, which quickly became distorted and focussed merely on one individual, reducing both *autonomia* and also the seminal *operaismo* movements to Negri's ideas. What is

218 Day, "Manfredo Tafuri, Fredric Jameson and the Contestations of Political Memory," 72.

more, as Wright notes on Negri's later collaboration with French intellectuals in his exile days: with *autonomia* "filtered via French theorists such as Deleuze and Guattari, … as became fashion in certain circles, the resulting melange -if not unfaithful to Negri's own thought- served only to obscure often fundamental disagreements that existed between different tendencies within both workerism and *autonomia*."[219]

In the non-Italian speaking left, "the memorialist-autobiographical tradition and the widespread production of perfunctory and often dismissive accounts"[220] along with the lack of translations of those accounts, limited the success of *operaismo* to influence struggles outside Italy.[221] Today under the label of autonomist-Marxism, however, the global anti-capitalist struggle; within the agenda of direct action protest and insurrectionary politics, concepts such as grass roots politics, construction of identity, precarious labour and civil disobedience find their precursors in the literature which is more accessible, at least to English-language readers via anthologies published in the late 1990s. Still, Wright notes "the equation … of workerist and autonomist theory with Negri and his closest associates remains a common one,"[222] whereas *operaismo* and *autonomia* are two different movements as *operaisti* and autonomists can not emphasize enough, but also connote different movements and eras to a contemporary audience, although they share same seminal theory and critique.[223]

---

219 Wright, *Storming Heaven*, 2.

220 Sergio Bologna, review of *Storming Heaven: Class Composition and Struggle in Italian Autonomist Marxism* by Steve Wright, trans. Arianna Bove, in *Strategies: Journal of Theory, Culture and Politics* 16, no.2 (2003): 97-105, 97.

221 Except Zerowork, Wages for Housework movements as Wright exemplifies. What is more, *autonomia* in the 1970s, did attempt to go beyond the context of Italy, with the interest of Black Panthers and such movements in the States; and as Cleaver covers under the "autonomist-Marxism" label, there are movements outside Italy which made similar critiques of orthodox-Marxism, with similar strategies and emphasizes autonomous struggle of working class.

222 Ibid.

223 Especially for some, the *autonomia* movement is a reminder of an era of political violence equated with attacks by Red Brigades. See Alexander Stille's reply to Antonio Negri's response to Stille's review of Antonio Negri and Micheal Hardt's *Empire*: "'Apocalypse Soon': An Exchange," http://www.nybooks.com/articles/archives/2003/feb/27/apocalypse-soon-an-exchange. On top of that, for some it was "disarming of the Left in Italy and general depoliticization of postmodern society." See Aureli, *The Project of Autonomy*, 85. Counter to their perception, Sylvère Lotringer and Christian Marazzi argue *autonomia* movement spoke and developed a different language other than what Red Brigades appropriated, that lead to the arrest of almost the entire Political Science Faculty of Padua University in 1979 and the staging of dubious trials. Lotringer and Marazzi, "The Return of Politics," 20. Stille and to some extend, Aureli perceive Red Brigades as the "rigid screen" of *autonomia*, where Marazzi and Lotringer argue this is a result of "the logical delirium of the State" which failed to respond to the language *autonomia* spoke by developing "forms of organization and subjectivity against which there exists no "classic" response." Ibid. What is more, the group formed around *autonomia* and their criticism towards late 1960s' PCI are received as *autonomia* is an anti-communist movement in contrast to *operaismo* which had a communist theoretical framework Alexandra Brown, "Operaismo, Architecture & Desing in Ambasz's New Domestic Landscape," 54. *Autonomia: Post-political Politics* provides a

What Tafuri's audience suffered as portrayed as the phenomenon of Tafuri's reception, was a tendency to overlook the political framework in which Tafuri's project started taking shape. However, as I tried to portray in this chapter, this framework does not necessarily dominate Tafuri's personal politics nor complete oeuvre if we are willing to "learn" from Tafuri as a historian. As Leach, Asor Rosa, Ghirardo and Day demonstrate, until recently, Tafuri's radical critique of architectural ideology dominated his project yet it is only a component of Tafuri's historiography. Then again, in the light of their inquiries, and given the limitations of Tafuri, Tafuri the historian and his project to resolve the problems he identified in 1969, returning to the political project he adopted in 1969, without being willing to move on from Tafuri, is bound to submerge us in the same impasse that assailed Tafuri himself.

Similar is true for the *operaisti* project itself. As Wright quotes Roberto Battagia: "The best way to defend workerism today is to go beyond it,"[224] which should remind those who uncritically approach *operaismo* to grant themselves a position in academia to argue for; a more accurate understanding of Tafuri's works. Wright elaborates on this with reference to Bologna: "Having helped to force the lock obstructing the understanding of working-class behavior in and against capital, only to disintegrate in the process, the workerist tradition has bequeathed to others the task of making sense of those treasures which lie within."[225] As Mario Tronti reminds us, *operaismo* does not entail a moment where the political intellectual, or university lecturer, doctor, physicist, sociologist, lawyer, architect were actually able to fight against the capitalist development, but instead served a social role within the capitalist power that is later referred as their moment of defeat as capitalist exploitation increased arguably via their reformist roles.[226] Tafuri and his persona as a historian stand out as examples for architectural circles that resonate with what Bologna attributes to the *operaisti* thinkers of the 1970s, referring to their role at *Primo maggio*; as he says:

> We aimed to change the rules of the status of disciplines; we were interested in innovating in the areas of the methodology of history, sociology, economics and political science … we did not think of ourselves as new Braudels or Einsteins or Webers, we … felt that in the end the most important objective was that of changing the 'social role' of the university lecturer,

compilation of essays and pieces that allows a reassessment of some assumptions regarding militancy *autonomia* favored and limits it possessed against capitalist development.

224 Wright, *Storming Heaven*, 227.

225 Ibid.

226 Tronti refers to Panzieri's limitations as well as to his limitations he depicts in 2012 as not really being able to organize anything regardless their intentions to go beyond from "being an organizer of *operaismo* to being the organizer of workers' culture." He then acknowledges their "culturally advanced struggle" actually "ushered in a vengeful capitalist resurgence." Tronti, "Our Operaismo," 123-128.

> doctor, physicist, sociologist, lawyer, architect and so on. On this premise the role of the political intellectual needed to change too, from being a new Lenin or a new Robespierre, into being a 'service provider' for the decentralized movement, capable of offering the movement a better understanding of itself, of opening up new possibilities.[227]

For this "social role" to be claimed by the intellectuals to provide the services Bologna lists above to the, working class movement had to be decentralized by the same intellectuals, from the early 1960s onwards. In this picture, Tafuri's 1969 "Toward a Critique of Architectural Ideology" needs to be considered as an agitation directed towards architects, as well as intellectuals, artists, academics, historians and so on, rather than attributing to it a role that it can only possess via the 1970s rhetoric with which intellectuals were able to rationalize their impasse.

Similarly, Bologna reminds *operaisti* saying that "working-class struggle accelerated capitalist development" in relation to the "wars" won and lost by *operaisti* back in 1960s and in the aftermath of 1970s:

> The seed of *operaismo* can still be fertile, precisely at a time when – revenge of history!- FIAT collapses, destroyed by an inept and irresponsible management and withered away by a passive and subaltern labor-force, accomplice of a political and union left that, with the helping hand of center-left governments that pushed to the extreme the 'financialization' of the economy, settled for small returns with the strategic decisions of the Italian capitalist class. Fiat came out of 10 years of class conflict (1969-1980) full of innovative energies. Now, after 22 years of social peace (1980-2002), it emerges in pieces. Bologna, Review of *Storming Heaven*, 104.

227 Bologna, Review of *Storming Heaven*, 103. *Primo maggio* was a workerist journal from the 1970s.

SECTION II

Examining the Relevance of the Work in the Context

CHAPTER FOUR

POLITICAL FRAMEWORK OF "TOWARD A CRITIQUE OF ARCHITECTURAL IDEOLOGY"

4.1 Introduction to Chapter Four

"Toward a Critique of Architectural Ideology" is a product of 1960s Italy in which Tafuri adopts the *operaisti* discourse in his critique of architectural ideology. It was written, published and circulated at a moment when the *operaisti* were confronted with the consequences of the discourse they adopted in their earlier analysis and critique of Marxism in relation to the Italian society and labour movement. If we take the context it was found in into our consideration, without collapsing further articulations of that discourse in the 1970s on top of the essay and its political framework, the essay can be approached as a piece that confronts architects with their attempts to contest and struggle against capitalist development.

To do so, we first need to acknowledge the shift in the rhetoric *operaisti* adopted in the early 1960s in comparison to the late 1960s and 1970s as it represents more than a dichotomy between *operaismo* and *autonomia*. From the early 1960s and onwards, with the discourse *operaisti* constructed, intellectuals attempted to align themselves with working class struggle with the intention to confront capitalist structures and institutions in order to abolish them. With the late 1960s the *operaismo* dissolved as *autonomia* formed. With this transition a fundamental shift in the *operaisti* discourse is observed; which needs further articulation than the identification of the dichotomy between *operaismo* and autonomia.[1]

The more we inquire into the debates amongst the *operaisti* of the 1960s and the paths they assign themselves with the 1970s, the less likely it becomes to approach Tafuri's 1969 essay with later articulations of the arguments it contains. Having said that, unless we are willing to move on from the already existing trajectories "Toward a Critique of Architectural Theory" is assigned to, there seems to be no reason to go beyond approaching the essay via its later edition *Architecture and Utopia* and/

1 Bologna refers to intellectuals approaching struggle in the 1960s and the consequences of their earlier attempts in the 1970s: "It was much easier to be an intellectual in the seventies, because basically you had before you such a wealth of subversive behaviors, of rebel fantasies, of desires, of innovation etc. that, when all is said and done, your behavior was that of formalizing things a bit." Bologna, in *Futuro Anteriore*, interview with Sergio Bologna, trans. Steve Wright in "Back to the Future," 279.

or through "negative thought," which *Contropiano* gave Cacciari the medium to articulate. At the end of the day, negative thought and its implications for the built environment professionals convincingly demonstrate how Tafuri approaches *Architecture and Utopia* as well as the rationale behind the impasse to which Tafuri's project as a historian and as a critic was bound. However if we do not attempt to go beyond the existing trajectories assigned to Tafuri's project and his critique, we find ourselves bound to what we find the *operaisti* thinkers in today: a state of ever-impasse and repentance over the state of things.

After reminding us of the questions that *operaismo* posed back in the 1960s "stubbornly" refusing "to go away," Sergio Bologna raises a question addressing those who take up the history of *operaismo*:

> Is it possible to apply the category of continuity to this movement? Doesn't continuity belong to the traditional methods of writing history? Is it not proper to the history of dynasties and parties? Those who, from the beginning, positioned themselves outside of a party perspective, who regarded the revolution as a lifeblood rather than an event, do they have a right to continuity, do they have to be subjected to it?[2]

In response to Bologna's reminder to those who do acknowledge *operaismo*'s radical threads and yet still apply the category of continuity to the history of it, I propose that one can raise the following question: how come can we consider *operaismo* as diverging from any other Marxist traditions given the consequences of the trajectories *operaisti* thinkers chose to take from 1970s on?[3]

---

2 Sergio Bologna, Review of *Storming Heaven*, 104-105.

3 Especially when Mario Tronti suggests reconsidering the elitist critique of democracy in his 2009 essay "Critique of Political Democracy," and Antonio Negri re-situates the *operaisti* and their "revolutionary" attempted-praxis with reference to the tradition of Western philosophy through positing Gramsci as a figure who puts the philosophy (of Giovanni, to be more precise) back to its place: amongst ordinary people. See Tronti, "Towards a Critique of Political Democracy," trans. Alberto Toscano in *The Italian Difference: Between Nihilism and Biopolitics*, ed. Lorenzo Chiesa and Alberto Toscano (Melbourne: Re.press, 2009): 97-106; and Negri "The Italian Difference," trans. Lorenzo Chiesa in ibid.: 13-23. As mentioned before, Tronti is one of the figures who is most apologetic about the *operaisti* experience in the 1960s and that is not only evident in his interview in *Futuro anteriore* but also in his most recent memoir "Our Operaismo." Sergio Bologna puts emphasis to the need to move on and go beyond *operaismo* while echoing Tronti as Bologna repeats what he says in his interview in the book *Futuro anteriore* in the quote above which is from his review of Steve Wright's book *Storming Heaven*. To some extent in Asor Rosa's dismissal of the *autonomia* movement, represents the general perception on *autonomia* as a mistook step from the split of *Contropiano* and formation of *Potere Operaio*. Asor Rosa explains this via Negri's romanticized imagery of the student revolts in 1968s and his optimism while Bologna argues autonomists such as Negri have "washed their hands of the mass worker's recent difficulties," by introducing the social worker as rising from the ashes of the mass worker in the

I seek the *operaisti* implications found in Tafuri's 1969 essay in the light of Bologna's reminder and I argue those implications are not exhausted with Cacciari's "negative thought"; Tafuri's future career as an internationally acclaimed architectural historian; nor Negri's *autonomia*.

By observing how the disconnections between intellectuals and their theoretical interventions make their way through the intellectuals' further inquiries into radicalization of struggle or a retreat from their role as agitators; it is easy to approach and appreciate Tafuri's essay as an agitating piece that was written in the middle of those conflicting threads. The *operaisti* implications of the essay come from its agitating aspects and their foundations within the context the essay was found in, not from the method or the tactic it offers architects to follow in order to confront capitalist development. If we return to the context of the essay, and provide a history of the *operaisti* critique and how it evolved to the point when Tafuri's essay was written, published and circulated, we will be able to locate the essay in its proper place, rather than assigning it another role to avoid confrontation with Tafuri as an

---

factories with their post-operaisti rhetoric. Alberto Asor Rosa, "Critique of Ideology and Historical Practice," 28-33; and Bologna quoted in Wright, *Storming Heaven*, 170-171. This perception is also commonly accompanied by mentioning of Negri's strong personality along with his intellect. Given the *operaisti* critique itself was a critique of Left, or rather orthodox-Marxism and such projects' lack of critical self-interrogation; debates happening today do not come as a surprise. Yet *operaisti* themselves also fail with their self-interrogation as their dominant apologetic agenda demonstrates today: a form of justification for their roles in the 1960s and 1970s.

What is more, one can easily regard *operaismo* and *autonomia* as historical movements that are no longer able to provide a critical analysis for today, as their analysis of the 1960s and 1970s are no longer applicable to contemporary forms of networks, power, oppression and structures we can understand the contemporary society. Although their analyses might have foreseen this transition, with their attempts to translate their analyses into antagonism, they were not only benumbed by a violent state intervention that lead to mass arrests and imprisonment, but also failed to respond to such interventions as well as to the advancement of capitalist development, regardless their commitment to their strategies. It is common to argue that they, autonomists particularly, introduced counter-revolutionary elements into the working class struggle that lead further constrains to the workers' struggle and advanced capitalist development in the favour of the capitalists, as Pier Vittorio Aureli does. However Tronti also mentions their contribution to the capitalist development which they were initially critical of and were antagonising via their assumption that as great reactionaries they would be able to subvert it within in "Our Operaismo" and the interviews he has given to *Futuro anteriore*. For further elaboration on *operaismo* and *autonomia* with reference to their impact on the Left, as well as *operaisti* and autonomists' contemporary "reformist" grounds within academia, see Aufhaben, Review of *Storming Heaven: Class Composition and Struggle in Italian Autonomist Marxism* by Steve Wright and *Reading Capital Politically* (2nd edn.) by Harry Cleaver: "From Operaismo to Autonomist Marxism," in *Aufhaben* 11 (2003) http://www.prole.info/texts/automarx.html; Aufhaben, "'Must try harder!': Towards a Critique of Autonomist Marxism," in *Aufhaben* 13 (2005) http://libcom.org/library/aufheben/aufheben-13-2005/must-try-harder-towards-a-critique-of-autonomist-marxism.

On this note, for a contemporary debate on intellectual work, academia and the role of intellectuals with reference to social conflicts, the controversy around *Aufhaben* and its role within struggle against sovereign structures: see Sam FantoSamotnaf, "cop-out-the significance of Aufhebengate," *dialectical delinquents* (blog), January, 2013, http://dialectical-delinquents.com/?page_id=9.

agitator.

4.1.1 A note on autonomist-marxism and *operaismo* [4]

We are limited with approaching the Italian *operaismo* and *autonomia* movements which are inevitably colored coming after: "the arrests of 1979 onwards, led by Judge Calogero (himself close to the PCI)," which "put the final nail in *autonomia* as a mass phenomenon, and marginalized *operaismo* as a current within Italy's cultural and political life."[5] Wright reminds us of a general tendency to approach 1960s and 1970s political framework of Italy, in the posthumous light of this marginalized version of *operaismo* to which Negri is credited with being the leading figure after his arrest and trial in the late 1970s and 1980s. However, as stated before, this is problematic as:

> Negri's work is far from the sum total of *operaismo*, just as

4 Cleaver argues that he coined the term autonomist-Marxism after the 1979 publication of *Reading 'Capital' Politically*, in the preface to the same book's second edition in 2000. By using the autonomous-Marxism instead of autonomist-Marxism, I thought I would make an ingenious move to overcome the criticism autonomist-Marxism encounters as I intend to revisit Tafuri's work and its relevance to today. The attempt to invent a common thread within the Marxist tradition which puts emphasis on the autonomy of working class, is a contemporary trend, and to an extent, it might confuse rather than making things clearer: as in my case it is particularly the Italian context Tafuri's work is found. Unfortunately, most probably due to a misunderstanding rather than a typo, Zanny Begg's article on autonomist-Marxism coined the phrase with her contestation of Cleaver in *Reading 'Capital' Politically*. Begg is an architect and artist from Sydney, and the critique she raises against autonomist-Marxism was published in Green Left Weekly, which was run by the Democratic Socialist Party of Australia. Begg refers to "'autonomous organizing' of the oppressed" and their "tactical discussions about the best path towards liberation for groups such as women, gays and lesbians, and indigenous people," are affirmed via "autonomous Marxism" being the theoretical justification of their autonomous organizations. Zenny Begg, "Autonomous Marxism – DIY revolution," in *GLW* 384 (November 10, 1999) http://www.greenleft.org.au/node/18943. Cleaver responds to their article via *libcom.org* (Libcom.org is a database "for all people who wish to fight to improve their lives, their communities and their working conditions" kept running by a collective of individuals who are referred as "libertarian communists based mainly in the UK and the US," see "About," libcom.org, September 11, 2006, http://libcom.org/notes/about.) and corrects Begg's use of autonomous-Marxism:

> > The term "autonomous Marxism" suggests that this Marxism is autonomous from something, but from what? From "orthodox marxism"? Certainly. But it was to avoid such interpretation that I coined the term "autonomist Marxism" (-ist not -ous) to describe a thread within the Marxist tradition in which the idea of working class autonomy was central to both theory and politics. Harry Cleaver, "Response to Sergio Fiedler's Attack on Autonomous Marxism," *libcom.org*, August 10, 2005, http://libcom.org/library/response-sergio-fiedler-attack-autonomous-marxism-cleaver.

For me, the interplay of the words autonomous and Marxism would have been with reference to *operaismo* and *autonomia* movements' critique of *Marxisms* preceeding them. Tafuri's 1969 essay was a product of this critical approach and probably this aspect of operaismo was the most convincing and influential aspect of the *operaisti* discourse for Tafuri.

5 Wright, "Children of a Lesser Marxism?" 261.

> his politics of the seventies hardly exhausted the range of views then to be found either within *Potere operaio* or the later movement of *autonomia*. More to the point, workerism's preoccupation with workers' efforts to overcome the divisions imposed upon them in a given time and space by capital make its precepts of ongoing interest in this age of dynamic class relations.[6]

Keeping in mind the problems with the context of the 1960s and 1970s Italy, along with the complex and diverse intertwined threads of *operaismo* and *autonomia*, today, autonomist-Marxism suggests a reference to contemporary struggles via *autonomia* and *operaismo*, as:

> for many of those dissatisfied with the versions of Marxism and anarchism available to them ... the notions of 'autonomy' and 'autonomist' have positive associations ... 'anti-capitalist' mobilizations of J18 and Seattle both drew on themes and language associated with *autonomia*, such as autonomous struggles and diversity.[7]

However, appropriating the label "autonomist-Marxism" with reference to the implications that I argue to be present in Tafuri's essay, when it is approached as a piece that confronts architects in relation to their practice and its innate relationship with the capitalist structures, would be too hasty and overlook certain aspects of both autonomist-Marxist discourse as well as the *operaisti* discourse of the 1960s Italy.

Harry Cleaver label "autonomist-Marxism" addresses the line of Marxism that diverged from the ones he was espousing until his revisit of Marx. This line of Marxism becomes evident as he undertakes an archeology of the evolution towards

> an extension of the political appreciation of the ability of workers to act autonomously, toward a reconceptualization of crisis theory that grasps it as a crisis of class power, toward a redefinition of 'working class' that both broadens it to include the unwaged, deepens the understanding of autonomy to intraclass relations and also recognizes the efforts of "workers" to escape their class status and to become something more[8]

---

6 Wright, "Children of a Lesser Marxism?" 262.

7 Aufhaben, "From *Operaismo* to Autonomist Marxism."

8 Harry Cleaver, preface to *Reading 'Capital' Politically*, 2nd ed. (Leeds, Edinburgh and San Francisco: AK Press, 2000): 9-21, 18. In order to understand and intervene to the dynamics of struggle, Cleaver says, he reworked and interpreted Marx's value theory and knitted which "took the form of a manuscript organised around the first three sections of chapter one of volume one of Capital -- in many ways Marx's most pedantic yet also most systematic exposition of the theory"

Cleaver deepens his research as Keynesian growth management was being replaced by policy makers with "a more repressive use of money: cut backs in social spending, flexible exchange rates, financial deregulation and eventually severely tight monetary policies and an international debt crisis."[9] From 1975 to 1979 Cleaver studies this shift and starts becoming familiar with whom he refers as "autonomist-Marxists."[10] Cleaver explains his efforts as attempts to "situate the theory within the history of Marxism" after he studies Marx's 1844 *Manuscripts*, the *Grundrisse*, *Capital* and other fragments and notes by Marx on value theory.[11] It is the failure of the existing interpretations of Marx to respond to the early 1970s in the US that lead Cleaver to undertake his inquiry into Marx as he observed:

> The introduction of new agricultural technology in the Third World had been a reaction against peasant struggle, so too was the shift from Keynesianism to monetarism a reaction against popular struggle, in this case the international cycle of struggle that swept the world in the late 1960s and early 1970s, a cycle of which Vietnam was only one moment.[12]

In order to understand and intervene in the dynamics of struggle, Cleaver says, he reworked and reinterpreted Marx's value theory and knitted these into his own work which "took the form of a manuscript organized around the first three sections of chapter one of volume one of *Capital* -- in many ways Marx's most pedantic yet also most systematic exposition of the theory" that later was published in 1979 as *Reading 'Capital' Politically*.[13] Cleaver's affiliation with the North American *Zerowork* brings the Italian Marxists into Cleaver's attention, which he reports that he was unfamiliar before.[14] His attempt to understand this new thread with reference to his own project,

---

that later was published in 1979, the first edition of the book *Reading Capital Politically*.

9 Ibid., 10.

10 Ibid.

11 Ibid., 12-14.

12 Ibid., 10-11.

13 Ibid.,

14 Ibid., 12-13. *Zerowork* is a North American journal that published two issues between 1975 and 1977. In the introduction to their first issue in 1975, editors make a similar critique *operaisti* make:

> The contemporary Left sees the crisis from the point of view of economists, that is, from the viewpoint of capital. The Left is basically *for* work. It cannot grasp either in theory or practice that the working class struggle *against* work is the source of the crisis and the starting point of organization. Hence the Leftist image of the crisis is still mired in the Paleo-Marxist view that sees the crisis as the product of capital's lack of planning of production. The 'anarchy of production' is an external irrationality of the capitalist mode of production that dooms it to crises of inter-capitalist competition and imperialist wars.

and various other threads he became familiar since the early 1970s, along with his study of historical material such as Rosa Luxemburg, Anton Pannekoek, Paul Mattick as well as "anarcho-communists like Emma Goldman and Peter Kropotkin," and "the early tradition of British 'bottom-up' Marxist theory," revealed the recurring theme "in the work of diverse Marxist writers and militants" as the "common perception and sympathy for the power of workers to act autonomously."[15] He acknowledges the problems with commonality, as there were "substantial differences among them about many key issues including crisis theory, through those works and their definition of the working class, attitudes toward work and the notion of the future in the present."[16] Regardless, Cleaver's studies allow him to label "autonomist-Marxism" as a thread in the political and strategic reading of Marx.

Autonomist-Marxism, in Cleaver, refers to a tradition of Marxism that emphasizes not only the autonomy of the working class but also autonomy of various groups in relation to others of their class; which can easily be understood as a shift of attention to the middle class or an equation drawn between the working class and the middle class within the contemporary structures.[17] Despite such problems which have not been overcome yet, "Autonomist-Marxism" had been used by others and found itself a place in Marxist literature today. Nick Dyer-Witheford, for example, adopts "autonomist-Marxism" even if he would be critical of an assumption that would suggest the way working class used to be understood before the advancement of

> For the Left the working class could not have brought about the crisis; it is rather an innocent victim of the internal contradictions of capital, a subordinate element in a contradictory whole. This is why the Left is preoccupied with the *defense* of the working class. Introduction to *Zerowork: Political Materials* 1 (December 1975), http://zerowork.org/3.1Introduction.html. Emphasis by them.

15 Ibid., 14-17.

16 Ibid., 15.

17 This is a critique raised by Aufhaben in their review of Cleaver's Reading 'Capital' Politically :

> The 'middle class' is a label largely absent from *Reading 'Capital' Politically,* which is because for Cleaver it largely doesn't exist, except perhaps sociologically. The 'autonomist Marxist' argument seems to be that, in conditions of the 'social factory', the middle classes are just a sector of the working class. ... Some groups, such as the professionals - doctors, lawyers, academics - who retain control of entry into their profession, should obviously be defined as middle class. But there are other groups for which the situation is less clear-cut. For the most part dealing with the thorny issue of class, and in particular the status of the middle classes, is inevitable messy. This is because class is a process not a box into which we can simply categorize people, as in sociology. Aufhaben, "From *Operaismo* to Autonomist Marxism."

post-industrial or mode of productions no longer exists.[18] For him, with reference to Cleaver's mapping of the theoretical positions and historical unfolding of autonomist-Marxism as showing "how the work of the Italian stream discussed here was overlapped and influenced by that of the American Johnson-Forest tendency and the French *Socialisme ou Barbarie* group," the term finds its application in theory.[19] Wright's use of "Autonomist-Marxism," concertizes the term to refer to *operaismo* and *autonomia* movements in the 1960s and 1970s Italy with his book *Storming Heaven: Class Composition and Struggle in Italian Autonomist Marxism*, which is argued, at some instances, to posses the odd case that "seems wrong and confusing"to put different traditions of Italian *operaismo* and subsequent movements in the same basket.[20] Nevertheless, autonomist-Marxism is in circulation today amongst academic and activist circles.

A strategic reading of Tafuri's essay as an agitation directed towards architects to question their role in relation to working class struggles could be referred as identifying autonomist-Marxist threads in "Toward a Critique of Architectural Ideology" in the light of Cleaver's intentions as a "return to what [Cleaver believed] was Marx's original purpose: he wrote *Capital* to put a weapon in the hands of workers."[21] Having said that, what autonomist-Marxists facilitate today with the discourse they construct is not necessarily equivalent with the political project I intend to refer to, and I do not have any intention to make the connection between the two. Although it is important to acknowledge autonomist-Marxism as a guide to approach the relevance of the political framework of Tafuri's essay to contemporary discourse, it is neither my intention nor what I am doing.[22]

---

18 See Nick Dyer-Witheford, "Cyber-Negri: General Intellect and Immaterial Labor," in *The Philosophy of Antonio Negri,* ed. Timothy S. Murphy and Abdul-Karim Mustapha (London: Pluto Press, 2005): 136-162.

19 Nick Dyer-Witheford, *Autonomist-Marxism and the Information Society* (Canberra: Treason Press, 2004), 5. This essay which is accessible at http://multitudes.samizdat.net/Autonomist-Marxism-and-the.html (Accessed December 4, 2012).

20 Bologna, review of *Storming Heaven*, 103.

21 Claver, introduction to *Reading 'Capital' Politically*, 23.

22 On this note, even though I try to diversify my narration of the period with other studies, especially when I refer to the particular context of *Contropiano*, Wright's take on on the period, is significantly dominant in my apprehension of the period. As mentioned earlier in Chapter One, his book *Storming Heaven* is seminal for English-speaking audience to approach 1960s and 1970s Italy in relation to *opreaismo* and *autonomia* movements. Considering the fact that architectural theoreticians and historians who return to the political framework of the 1960s and 1970s Italy refer to Wright's work as a 'reliable history' without necessarily providing a study of the period in relation to his narration, my limitations in diversifying the resources can be legitimized, yet needs to be overcome. Before looking at the works by Aureli and Day in the next chapter, providing a repost of the period with reference to Wright's work can help to establish a ground for us to consider those authors' approach to the period, given they both suggest the reader to see Wright's *Storming Heaven* without actually telling why or for what purposes. See Aureli, *The Project of Autonomy* and Gail Day, *Dialectical Passions: Negation in Postwar Art Theory* (New York:

4.2 *Operaismo* as a Political Project in Italy

As mentioned above, it is most likely to be via the label autonomist-Marxism that *operaismo* and *autonomia* movements can be perceived today as precursors to contemporary struggles around identity politics, queer movement, grassroots, insurrectionary politics, and so on. Steve Wright suggests this connection with the contemporary struggles and *operaismo / autonomia* is "consigned to oblivion along with the turbulent sixties and seventies of rebellious youth, women, and factory workers (first and foremost, the 'mass workers' of assembly line production)."[23] He further elaborates on the contemporary interest around *operaismo* and *autonomia* as follows:

> A large part of this curiosity is a consequence of the attention recently paid, in academic but also activist circles, to the work of former *Operaisti* such as Antonio Negri and Paolo Virno, as well as associated thinkers like Giorgio Agamben. Having once been treated primarily as a footnote to the intellectual phenomenon that is Deleuze and Guattari, such authors (and Negri above all) have become increasingly the subject of attention in their own right, through the publication and circulation of texts such as *Empire*, *Multitude*, *Homo Sacer* and *Grammar of the Multitude*.[24]

Within this picture, "in an epoch where the worker movement in crisis was dominated by excessively 'ideological' debates'," says François Matheron, "*operaismo* was characterized essentially by proposing a 'return to the working class'."[25]

The *operaismo* and *autonomia* movements shared the seminal reformulation of Marxism.[26] Yet they are perceived radically different, and not only by the *operaisti* and autonomists. Especially within the debates on armed struggle and actions of Red Brigades in the 1970s, amongst Italians and those who study the Italian left in the 1960s and 1970s; *operaismo* represents a legitimate and rational critique of the orthodox left and capitalist structures. On the other hand *autonomia* is likely to be

---

Columbia University Press, 2011).

23 Steve Wright, "Back to the Future," 270.

24 Ibid. For a comprehensive analysis of how *operaismo* had been received within English-speaking circles, see Steve Wright, "*Operaismo*, *Autonomia*, Settantasette in Translation: Then, Now, the Future," in *Strategies* 16 (2003): 107-120.

25 François Matheron, "Operaismo," trans. Nate Holdren, in *multitudes*, http://multitudes.samizdat.net/Operaismo; originally published as François Matheron, "Operaïsme" in *Bensussan-Labica: Dictionnaire Critique du Marxisme* (Paris: Presses Universitaired de France, 1999).

26 Sylvère Lotringer and Christian Marazzi, "The Return of Politics," conversation between Lotringer and Marazzi in *Autonomia: Post-Political Politics*, ed. Sylvère Lotringer and Christian Marazzi, 2nd ed. (Los Angeles: Semiotext(e), 2007): 8-21, 9.

perceived through the filters of accusation of autonomists with terrorist activities.[27] Transition from *operaismo* to *autonomia* and disengagement of certain *operaisti* figures, such as Tronti, from the autonomists, happen as discussions on theory and praxis of resistance advance and sharpen the differences to approach working class struggle amongst intellectuals who, in the early 1960s, joined the workers' struggle in the factories and "sought the factory as a point of identification."[28]

Beneath the limits of theories and strategies *operaisti* critique addressed, there lies a fundamental problematic of the intellectual formation and its relation with the labour movement and the working class. Whether believing that they were going through the immediate prelude -"April days"-to an Italian revolution[29] or not; today the *operaisti* acknowledge their limitations and to some extent failure with their radical critique of the left in the interviews they have given to students of Romano Alquati which were published in 2002.[30] The *operaisti*'s self-interrogation, which constituted

27 Timothy S. Murphy draws our attention to this way of approaching operaismo and autonomia with reference to Richard Drake's account of the period. cf. Richard Drake, *The Revolutionary Mystique and Terrorism in Contemporary Italy* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1989). Drake's narration evolves from a rhetoric that uncritically appropriates the language of the Italian state and the prosecution, Murphy argues. Those accusations were proven to be illegitimate after the year his book was published. Along with Drake's, Dyke's and Sterling's *The Terror Network: The Secret War of International Terrorism* (New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1981) demonstrates the circulation of rumor, innuendo and slander that do not have any historical evidence or court verdicts to support, but regardless exist to this day. Murphy argues that Drake, in 1995, first acknowledges his book's limitations and then in 2003 admits: "The extra parliamentary left movement was not always or even mainly terroristic. … Tactical differences of the sharpest kind separated Panzieri, Negri and the Red Brigadists." Drake, *Apostles and Agitators: Italy's Marxist Revolutionary Tradition* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2003), 226; quoted in Timothy S. Murphy, editor's introduction to *Books for Burning: Between Civil War and Democracy in 1970s Italy* by Antonio Negri (London and New York: Verso, 2005): ix-xxviii, xxvii.

28 Antonio Negri, *The Politics of Subversion: A Manifesto for the Twenty-First Century*, trans. James Newell, (Cambridge: Polity Press, 2005), 48.

29 Antonio Negri quoted in Michael Hardt, "Into the Factory: Negri's Lenin and the Subjective Caesura (1968-73)" in *The Philosophy of Antonio Negri: Resistance in Practice*, ed. Timothy S. Murphy and Abdul-Karim Mustapha (London: Pluto Press, 2005): 7-37, 7.

30 At least two of those figures who dominate the literature the most do so: Antonio Negri and Mario Tronti. In 1986, Negri's account on the transition *operaisti* and the consequences of this is approached from an optimistic retrospective outlook: "we have witnessed the emergence of a new social subject: an intellectual subject which is nonetheless proletarian, polychrome, a collective plot of the need for equality; a subject that rejects the political and immediately gives rise to an ethical determination for existence and struggle." Negri, *The Politics of Subversion*, 47. Today, Negri insists on this and seems to be one of the *operaisti* who "moved on" from their experience in the 1970s.

Where Tronti's reflections on the 1960s and the 1970s are bitter than Negri's; they still contain a sense of nostalgia as present in his 2012 memoir: Tronti, "Our Operaismo." Also see the series of interviews conducted between 1999-2002 with operaisti thinkers, activists and intellectuals of the 1960s and 1970s Italy, which later constituted the *Futuro Anteriore* and *Gli Operaisti* as part of the series on history of operaismo published by *DeriveApprodi*. This project is accessible via internet as well: http://www.autistici.org/operaismo/index_1.htm. In those interviews, Alquatti, Tronti, as

a primary aspect of the *operaisti* critique, needs further attention than it has gained so far amongst intellectuals and academics.

4.2.1 The new left and the *operaisti*

We can trace the *operaisti*'s project back to Panzieri's break from Socialist Party (PSI) and his evaluation of the orthodox Marxism. This is the task what Robert Lumley has called "the New Left" set themselves to in the 1960s. "New Left" who initiated a review of the existing Left, is argued to be composed of "groups of people peripheral to the political parties, who teach in universities, often on a temporary basis, or in a liceo[school]."[31] Lumley cites Giovanni Bachelloni and explains this group's significant marginality as "the result of a choice that involves an alternative intellectual route, which is cosmopolitan."[32] Bachelloni describes their task as

> a political culture which aimed to break with the heritage of idealism (a heritage which appeared in the thinking of the Left parties in the shape of historicism, Gramscianism, neo-realism and the philosophical Marxism); to do this, it re-read Marx as the sociologist of capitalist society, but the return to Marx was characterized by a tension between theoretical inquiry and political commitment.[33]

Within the social, political and economic conditions of Italy in the 1950s and in the aftermath of the 1956 events in Hungary; the "new levy of Italian Marxists," sought "to escape the political hegemony of the PCI."[34] PSI faiclitated this escape for a period of time as Negri suggests, Socialist Party was a variance from the politics of Togliatti and Stalinism.[35] *Mondo operaio*, The theoretical review of PSI, provided a vehicle for critical self-reflection of the left to Raniero Panzieri who already noticed

---

well as Negri talk about their limits and sometimes adopt a rhetoric that comes across as only if they had done that and not this. For example Alquatti implies the knowledge or discourse *operaisti* articulated needed to be more self-reflexive by intellectuals constantly reminding themselves of the reason why such kind of an intellectual intervention which they appropriated was needed. See Romano Alquatti, *Gli operaisti*, interview with Romano Alquatti, 44. Beyond such an 'only if' rhetoric, Asor Rosa puts emphasis on the fact that the consequences of the *operaisti* and the autonomists' intervention do not exhaust the project of the *operaisti*; yet concertize the limited way we approach to the project by assuming that the outcome of the struggles happened in the 1960s and 1970s Italy had to be as they had been and the *operaisti* knew it from the start; reminding the reader about the post-1968 discourse and the readers' limitations to approach to a revolutionary discourse in the aftermath of 1968. See Segio Bologna, *Gli operaisti*, interview with Sergio Bologna, 61.

31 Lumley, *States of Emergency*, 34.

32 Ibid.

33 Giovanni Bechelloni, *Cultura e ideologia nella nuova sinistra* (Milan, 1973), xii, quoted in ibid.

34 Wright, *Storming Heaven*, 15.

35 Negri, *Gli operaisti*, interview with Antonio Negri, 237-38.

by then, according to Wright, "the much vaunted 'organic intellectuals' of Gramscian memory were now in practice organic only to the party machine."[36] According to Panzieri, an "examination of 'the reality of the political and organizational movement of the popular classes'",[37] was needed. Under Panzieri's co-direction, *Mondo operaio* examined works by such as Lukács, Luxemburg and Trotsky: who were "long passed over by the socialist left."[38]

In 1958, Panzieri with Lucio Libertini, published "Seven Theses on Workers' Control": a study on the contemporaneous historic experience of the left, particularly FIOM's defeat in 1955 election of the grievance committee at the FIAT.[39] The institution of the grievance committee itself was already being questioned by young communists and workers themselves for being too far from the concerns of shop-floor workers and hence lacking power to negotiate agreements with management and the knowledge necessary to implement the new policy of contracting all aspects of the work relationship in every shop.[40] Asor Rosa recalls the discussions in the aftermath of the defeat of the 1955 elections in FIAT happening along with the debates mainly focussing around the nature of the State and of Soviet society to underpin the reasons for degeneration of the socialist system with reference to the 1956 revolts in Hungary.[41] To which, Asor Rosa argues, Panzieri and Libertini responded with the idea of formation of a proletarian democracy.[42] For the labour movement to be renovated "from below and in forms of total democracy:"[43] "new institutions were needed, ones which must find their roots in the economic sphere, 'the real source of power'," so that "the 'democratic road' would not become 'either a belated adherence to reformism, or simply a cover for a dogmatic conception of socialism'."[44] This needed particularly the revolutionary autonomy of the working class to be expressed since "the demand of the workers' control … could not be 'a literary motivation for

36 Wright, *Storming Heaven*, 17. See the footnote 232 in this chapter for an account of Gramsci and his concept of "organic intellectual."

37 Ibid.

38 Della Mea, "Panzieri tra 'Mondo Operaio' e 'Quaderni rossi'," *Giovane Critica* 15-16 (1967): 98, quoted in ibid., 17-18. FIOM (Federazione Impiegati Operai Metallurgici) was part of the CGIL (Confederazione Generale Italiana dei Lavoratori: the biggest trade union organisationin Italy back then, which was composed of mostly Communist and Socialist party members). FIOM was composed of engineering manual and white-collar workers.

39 Lucio Libertini and Raniero Panzieri, "Sette tesi sul controllo operaio," in *Mondo Operaio* (February, 1958).

40 Grant Amyot, *The Italian Communist Party: The Crisis of the Popular Front Strategy* (London: Biddles, Guildford and King's Lynn, 1981), 121.

41 Asor Rosa, *Gli operaisti*, interview with Asor Rosa, 56.

42 Ibid., 57.

43 Raniero Panzieri, *La crisi del movimento operaio: Scritti interventi lettere, 1956-60* (Milan: Lampugnani, 1973), 102; cited in Wright, *Storming Heaven*, 18.

44 Ibid.

re-exhumations, much less a miracle cure,' but 'must emerge and make itself concrete within the reality of the working class."[45]

With the 33th congress of PSI, "the goal of a joint government of Socialist-Christian Democrat government was brought one step nearer."[46] In the midst of the transformation of PSI into a party of government, Panzieri was removed from *Mondo Operaio*, as Wright puts it as "one of the minor causalities of the new line" PSI was taking.[47] Leaving PSI, Panzieri moved to Turin, believing in "'full and direct political action,' that a new, revolutionary role for intellectuals could finally be realized."[48] Wright articulates on Panzieri's departure from the Party as follows:

> If the crisis of the organizations -parties and union- lies in the growing difference between them and the real movement of the class, between the objective conditions of struggle and the ideology and policy of the parties, then the problem can be confronted only by starting from the conditions, structures and movement of the rank-and-file. Here analysis becomes complete only through participation in struggles. [49]

In this chapter, I am approaching the dissolution of the *operaismo* through this postulation which can be followed by the question: to what extend "participation in struggles" becomes legitimate for a complete analysis by those who commit themselves to deliver such an analysis?

Before moving forward, prematurely, I would like to draw the reader's attention to my argument that I conclude this chapter with: for the *operaisti*, the limit intellectuals draw for their participation in the struggles between 1967-1970 appears to be the defining feature for the rhetoric they start to adopt after May 1968 and 1969. In the light of this reading, I argue that Tafuri's 1969 essay, which delivers an analysis yet lacks a method or a blueprint, should not be expanded to the whole of *Architecture and Utopia* as that would dilute the original impact and possibly the intent of the essay in 1969. The 1969 essay is an example where Tafuri adopts and applies the *operaisti* discourse, before drawing its limits. It is by 1973, when the analysis Tafuri delivers points to a direction, which will be towards the "negative thought" Cacciari articulates via *Contropiano*. Hence the essay should be considered in relation to the emphasis given to the 'participation in struggles' for the analysis to be completed.

As we revisit the late 1960s, we are forced to acknowledge the fact that even if the

45 Ibid., 19.

46 Ibid., 19-20.

47 Ibid., 20.

48 Ibid., 21.

49 Panzieri, *La crisi del movimento operaio,* 254; cited in Wright, *Storming Heaven*, 21.

limits of the degree of participation had been drawn historically by the predominant *operaisti* figures, the trajectories which they adopted in the late 1960s and 1970s can not exhaust the implications of the political framework which I align Tafuri's 1969 essay with. In fact, intensification of the social conflict and struggles were directly linked with such further implications of the discourse *operaisti* constructed. We see the trajectories intellectuals adopt were not found in a vacuum, but surrounded by agitated and antagonistic subjects whose struggles within the growing social conflict forced intellectuals to reassess their role as agitators. This can not be emphasized enough as they have direct consequences on the intellectual intervention the *operaisti* initiate with *Quaderni rossi*.

4.2.2 *Quaderni rossi*

Quaderni rossi, "an experiment which was to have enormous repercussions for the development of the Italian new left,"[50] as referred to by Wright, was born through the mediations amongst groups which Asor Rosa identifies as: the Romans who were communists from Faculty of Arts and Philosophy at La Sapienza of Rome, including Asor Rosa himself along with Mario Tronti, Umberto Coldagelli, Gaspare De Caro with radical "Gatto selvaggio" (wildcats) such as Rita di Leo; the Northerns who were Romulus Gobbi and Pierluigi Gasparotto from Milan and Turin forming a group around Panzieri, to whom Antonio Negri would join; and young communists and sociologists like Rieser, Mottura, De Palma, la Beccalli, and Romano Alquati.[51] As both Asor Rosa and Negri imply; this peculiar and young group all together allowed a rich experience to the central axis of labour movement that were previously dissatisfying.[52]

Breaking the traditional monolithic of socialists and communists, *Quaderni rossi* utilized what is referred as "parallel sociology," that was formed at the "intersection between the group's rediscovery of *Capital* and its examination of certain recent developments in radical social science."[53] The group's concern for utilizing "bourgeois' sociology as means to understand the reality of the modern working class" constituted the "great theme *Quaderni rossi* appropriated from the dissident Marxism of the 1950s," along with "autonomy" of the struggles from the institutions of orthodox-Marxism.[54] The importance Wright ascribes to Panzieri in this picture is his "openness to a critical use of sociology," which, after his death in 1964 would be lost.[55] Panzieri's criticality with "his critique of technological rationality, reveals a debt to Adorno,"

50 Wright, *Storming Heaven*, 21.

51 Asor Rosa, *Gli operaisti*, interview with Asor Rosa, 57.

52 Ibid.; Negri, *Gli operaisti*, interview with Antonio Negri, 238.

53 Wright, *Storming Heaven*, 21.

54 Ibid.

55 Ibid., 21, 62.

Wright argues.[56] However precursors to Panzieri's theoretical and political framework are found in Italy: "its direct inspiration lay much closer to home … what might loosely be termed an Italian sociology had already emerged after the war."[57] On those grounds "the 'novelty' of *Quaderni rossi* consisted in the *inchiesta operaia* (workers' enquiry)," says Sergio Bologna and continues:

> To the pressing question of where to start from, this publication replied: 'from an understanding of the working class, of the 'new' working class, and more precisely of the mentality of the new generations that, fighting the police in the streets in July 1960, had defended a democracy from the new outbursts of fascism'.[58]

Departing from the existing struggles in the factories, the common view the editors of *Quaderni rossi* shared as "Marxism being itself a theory of capitalist society."[59] Yann Moulier says the knowledge of Italian Marxism, which was mostly shaped by Togliatti to that day, was through Gelvano Della Volpe and Lucio Colletti's works along with the "legend created around Gramsci."[60] However it was mostly Della Volpe's works that influenced the editors of *Quaderni rossi* in their understanding of the class struggle.

According to Asor Rosa, Della Volpe and Colletti's lectures in Istituto Gramsci, were rare examples of theoretical discourse, cultural, analytical, literary criticism and filmography.[61] They were on the same lines with Lukács, who was also opposing Gramsci's historicist vein with *History and Class Consciousness*, a publication that was not widely circulated among Italian readers back then, as Asor Rosa reports.[62] Della Volpe set the political and theoretical problems in reading Marx while he was invoking the idealistic mould around Hegel and demolishing the hypothesis of dialectic.[63] "The inability of the dominant class to exclude from its enquiry the subjective assumption that capitalist production relations were both natural and eternal," allowed Della Volpe expressing a "general admiration for the progress under capital which positive science … had achieved in developing coherent explanations of

56 Ibid., 21.

57 Ibid., 21-22.

58 Sergio Bologna, review of *Storming Heaven*, 98.

59 Wright, *Storming Heaven*, 25.

60 Yann Moulier, introduction to *The Politics of Subversion: A Manifesto for the twenty-First Century*, by Antonio Negri, Philippa Hurd, trans., (Cambridge: Polity Press, 2005): 1-44, 4.

61 Asor Rosa, *Gli operaisti*, interview with Asor Rosa, 59-60. Complete version of Asor Rosa's interview is found at www.autistici.org/operaismo/asor/.

62 Ibid., 60.

63 See "Intervista ad Alberto Asor Rosa – 24 Ottobre 2001: 5" in *Conricerca* interview with Asor Rosa on October 24, 2001, http://www.autistici.org/operaismo/asor/5_1.htm#7.

natural phenomena."[64] Wright continues arguing:

> To Della Volpe's mind, the abandoned 1857 'Introduction' to *A Contribution to the Critique of Political Economy* possessed a fundamental importance in this regard, for within it Marx could be found scrutinizing the basic building blocks of that conceptual apparatus later applied 'with maximum rigor and success' in *Capital*.[65]

From an Italian left which was not familiar with the critique of postulation of "ideological" and "economical"; the actuality of *Capital* for a critique of political economy was crucial to Panzieri and Mario Tronti, as well as for the circles formed around them.[66] Tronti, who submitted a thesis on the logic of *Capital* at the University of Rome in the mid-1950s, echoes Della Volpe as Wright quotes Tronti via Asor Rosa:

> If the logic of '*Capital*' is again substantiated today, it is because for working-class thought, the objective necessity of an analysis of capitalism has returned to the fore. The instruments of analysis are revised when the object of this analysis is rediscovered. If the object is capitalist society in the concrete -the modern world moment of capitalism- then the instrument can only be Marx's method that has provided the first and only scientific description of this object. One returns to *Capital* each time one starts from capitalism, and vice versa: one cannot speak of the method of *Capital* without transferring and translating this method into the analysis of capitalism.[67]

4.2.2.1 Constructing the *operaisti* discourse

Later to be referred by Asor Rosa as breaking down dogmas of the intellectual tradition and proposing a version of Marxism that is different than the dominant ones,[68] Tronti introduced one of the innovative lines of thought operaisti opened up within the struggle of the worker class in Italy: the plan of the capital. With the essay "The Plan of the Capital" in *Quaderni rossi*,[69] Tronti put emphasis on Marx's distinction between "the direct process of the production of the capital" and "the total

64 Wright, *Storming Heaven*, 26.

65 Ibid.

66 Ibid., 28.

67 Ibid., 28.

68 Asor Rosa, *Gli operaisti*, interview with Asor Rosa, 60.

69 Originally published as "Il piano del capitale," in *Quaderni Rossi* 3 (1963): 44-73. Translated into English from as "Social Capital." *Telos*, no. 17 (Fall 1973): 98-121.

process of its reproduction":

> Capital's process of socialization is the specific materials base upon which is founded, on a certain level, the process of development of capitalism. The determinate formation of a capitalist society presupposes the production of social capital as an already accomplished historical act, which is already acknowledged as a natural fact.[70]

According to Tronti, the capital depended on the production, which was not merely physical but social as well: in late capitalism, the factory was extended to life. Hence productive power of waged labour, reproducing the capital, constituted the capitalist development. This capitalist development was able to thrive through capitalist structures' response to improve treatment of the working class with workers' struggles and labour's pressure, which actually served as implementing waged-labour in every aspect of society as capitalist development advanced. Working class' revolutionary agency was being subsumed in late capitalism under the organization of working class by capital through the labour movement which was institutionalized under research institutions, parties and unions. Under the umbrella of "the rights of labour" capitalist modes of production exploited the working class:

> The growing rationalization of modern capital must find an insurmountable limit in the workers refusal to political integration within the economic development of the system. Thus, the working class becomes the only anarchy that capitalism fails to socially organize. The task of the labor movement is to scientifically organize and politically manage this labor anarchy within capitalist production.[71]

From a similar perspective, Panzieri challenged orthodox Marxism that favours the "techno-romantic image" in his essay "The Capitalist Use of Machinery"[72]: "The process of industrialization, as it achieves more and more advanced levels of technological progress, coincides with a continual growth of the capitalist's authority."[73] The despotic political power that capitalism holds is founded in capitalism's mastery of production with advancement in technology, which is not a

70 Tronti, "Social Capital," 98.

71 Ibid., 119.

72 Originally published as "Sull'uso capitalistico delle macchine nel neocapitalismo," in *Quaderni rossi* 1 (1961): 53-72. Translated into English as "The Capitalist Use of Machinery: Marx versus the Objectivists," by Quintin Hoare, in *Outlines of a Critique of Technology,* Phil Slater, ed., (London: Atlantic Highlands, 1980): 44-69.

73 Ibid., 48.

distortion or a deviation of "some 'objective' development that is in itself rational."[74] It was argued that via "the science, the gigantic natural forces, and the mass of social labour" that were "embodied in the system of machinery:" what presented itself as the technological development, which constituted the power of the "master," was in fact capitalist development itself.[75] Panzieri suggested that in order to avoid working-class activity from being reabsorbed into capitalist development become degenerated by the already established institutions of the labour movement, which were already absorbed in the capitalist development, taking control over the means of production which workers were alienated from, was problematic:

> Workers' control expresses the need to bridge the chasm which exists today between even the most advanced working-class demands at the trade-union level and the strategic perspective. It thus represents, or rather can represent, in a non-mystified version, a political line that is a direct alternative to those currently being put forward by the working-class parties.[76]

The critique Panzieri raised came from the relationship between the development of capitalism and worker class' struggle. By shifting the perspective of capital and its reproduction, *operaismo* and *autonomia* would later evolve around the attempt to theorize Marxism from the perspective of the workers and their potential to subvert power.[77] The underlying premise was that the advancement of capitalist structures and worker's conditions were not separable, or extraneous from each other. Historical reality in which the working class movement found itself was the accomplishment and implement of capitalism's plan, which did not transcend workers' struggles as neither workers' struggles did transcend the plan of the capital. What was crucial for the working class struggles was to see how capitalist development was advanced with workers' struggles as long as struggles were organized under the control of the capital.

4.2.2.2 Critique of the limits of the intellectuals' interventions to the working class struggle

To explain their radical approach to class struggle via the discourse they were advancing with their engagement to *Quaderni rossi*, Tronti reflects on Della Volpe's

74 Ibid., 47.

75 Ibid.

76 Ibid., 68.

77 For an analysis of refusal of work, see Kathi Weeks, "The Refusal of Work as Demand and Perspective" in *The Philosophy of Antonio Negri: Resistance in Practice*, Timothy S. Murphy and Abdul-Karim Mustapha, eds., (London: Pluto Press, 2005): 109-135 and for a further elaboration of Weeks' analysis more in relation to contemporary struggles, see Weeks, *The Problem with Work: Feminism, Marxism, Antiwork Politics and Postwork Imaginaries* (Durham and London: Duke University Press, 2011).

influence on him and Italian dissidents of the late 1950s as:

> Della Volpe took apart, piece by piece, the cultural line of the Italian Communists, paying no heed to orthodox allegiances. To be honest: we freed ourselves from the PCI's Gramscian 'national-popular', but a certain intellectual aristocratism clung to us still. Understanding was more important than persuasion; toiling over the concept created difficulties with the word.[78]

Where "Della Volpe's efforts to return directly to Marx cleared the ground for a new appropriation of the latter's thought able to bypass the dominant traditions of the Communist Party altogether," Wright also reminds us "the debt owed Della Volpe by the Italian new left, and *Quaderni rossi* in particular, remains a controversial question."[79] Being referred as a marginal figure within PCI before 1956, Della Volpe's critics attacked *dellavolpism*. According to them "by marking Marxism a materialist sociology, that is a science of the modern bourgeois social-economic formation," the common features among the advanced capitalist societies were emphasized more than "'particular' and 'national' features that distinguished one country from another."[80]

In the case of Tronti and Asor Rosa, their dissatisfaction with Della Volpe came from the critique of Della Volpe's "own failure to follow through the radical thrust of his thought."[81] Wright refers to Coletti to explain Della Volpe's avoidance of party politics being "true to his self-image as an 'intellectual of the old style."[82] Instead of claiming to be an antagonist himself, Della Volpe's critique only remained in the academic exercise, shaped by his admiration in positive science coming from application of Galileo's experimental method constituting his "Galileanist" morals.[83] However even outside the party, if expunged Marx from its "ambiguities and flaws" was crucial for confronting the vulgar interpretations of Marx within the labour movement itself on the way to a critique of political economy's actuality, equally if not more crucial was the internal critique. Wright poses with what he quotes from Tronti: "'An ideology is always bourgeois,' … to it the revolutionary must counterpose Marx's proletarian science and its 'ruthless criticism of all that exists."[84]

The problem of this critique not being sustained within academia performed by

78 Tronti, "Our Operaismo," 121. Tronti continues: "Today the opposite is true—ease of discourse means dispensing with thought."

79 Wright, *Storming Heaven*, 27.

80 Bedeschi quoted in ibid.

81 Ibid., 29.

82 Ibid., 26.

83 Ibid.

84 Ibid., 29. Wright's emphases.

"pure Marxists," as Asor Rosa refers to "unnamed 'scholars' who in recent years had 'dedicated their whole activity to reaching a more exact reading of Marx's thought'," needed to advance in a "real notion," if theory could step "down from its ivory tower and present itself within the class struggle, since 'the only way to understand the system is through conceiving its destruction'."[85] Having said that, addressing this, in *Operai e capitale*, Mario Tronti would later conclude: "the autonomous organization of the working class … is the real process of demystification, because it is the material basis of revolution."[86]

Apart from establishing the *operaisti* critique of the theoretical endeavors in relation to class struggles, *Quaderni rossi* supplied the experiment to study how the large modern factory working was understood through "the essentially social character of capital's power" and "the determining role of the working-class struggle in the dynamism and ruptures which lie at the heart of capitalist relations of production," which constituted essential discoveries of *operaismo*, as Moulier suggests.[87] Romano Alquati, with Romolo Gobbi and Gianfranco Faina laying down the "methodology of conricerca (joint research)"[88] in their studies of two major Italian firms FIAT and Olivetti, unfolded the "public myths" attached to those firms.[89] Having rather traditional political outlooks in the first piece by Alquati with studies on FIAT, which was published in the first issue of *Quaderni rossi*, Wright suggests Alquati was shied back from "extremist conclusions, locating the main problem not in the union's function or organizational structure as such, but in the distortions introduced into

85 Alberti Asor Rosa, 'Il punto di vista operaio e la cultura socialista,' in *Quaderni rossi* 2 (1962), 122-3, 125; quoted in ibid.

86 Tronti, *Operai e capitale*, 37 quoted in ibid. Wright argues *Quaderni rossi*'s critique of Della Volpe is incomplete as they failed to see how Della Volpe's use of Marx's 1857 "Introduction" to *A Contribution to the Critique of Political Economy* was flawed. As a consequence of the uncritical use of "Introduction" by Panzieri and other workerists, Wright explains the "continual difficulties in disentangling the logical and historical moments of the critique of political economy." Ibid., 30. Wright argues that nevertheless the insistence on categories being historically determinate was a line of thought Della Volpe's reading of Marx provided; -referring to Alquati- allowed *operaisti* to theorise many "determinate abstractions," which Wright suggests dividing the group later. Sergio Bologna, however, suggests Wright's reply to why Panzieri's group was divided as "curt, but the little he says is true." Bologna later touches on Panzieri's disapproval of the methods rest of the group was willing to undertake as a determinate factor, which would also define the determinate factor of his break from *autonomia*. Bologna, review of *Storming Heaven*, 98-99.

87 Moulier, Introduction to *Politics of Subversion*, 15.

88 Bologna, review of *Storming Heaven*, 98. Bologna argues Faina's contribution to the joint research was crucial, yet not mentioned. Faina, Bologna reports, "took part in the experiences of *Classe operaia*," the publication where Tronti and Alquatti were major figures after *Quaderni rossi* ceases to exists as Panzieri dies in 1964, and its last issue issue is published in 1966, Faina had relations with anarchist groups who were involved in armed struggles during the 1970s, and put in jail where he dies in 1981.

89 Wright, *Storming Heaven*, 53.

these by the interests of the PCI and PSI leadership."[90] On the other hand, with his work on Olivetti workers, enriched by Tronti and Panzieri's "reflections upon the labour process," the new emphasis was placed upon "the relation between workers and machines."[91] The abandoned view of proletariat as "a class whose rightful place in command of the labour process had been usurped by a parasitic bourgeois," was replaced with the worker who "appears as executor only in the role of 'fulfilling' the plan, a role delineated in an abstract, global, generic, but political way."[92] Alquati continued arguing, "if workers today are 'executors', the sense of this word refers only to their political reification."[93] Similarly, what Mario Tronti refers to dialectical materialism's' "fables" in *Operai e Capitale*, formulated as "the 'socialist' mode of production will follow the capitalist mode of productive forces (science, technology, the accumulation of capital) bursts through the chrysalis of obsolete superstructures, particularly juridical and political ones,"[94] was inverted. With their analyses in the early 1960s, *operaisti* emphasized the "theme of the refusal to work" as a fundamental dimension of the class struggle along with the rejection of the utopia of "liberated labour" with an "image of a working class which is exploited but 'not submissive.'"[95] This would be elaborated in the "Initial Thesis" in Tronti's *Operai e Capitale* as "The Strategy of Refusal" as

> working class articulation of capitalist development: at first as an initiative that is positive for the functioning of the system, an initiative that only needs to be organized via institutions; in the second instance, as a 'No', a refusal to manage the mechanism of the society as it stands, merely to improve it - a 'No' which is repressed by pure violence.[96]

With the strike at FIAT in 1962 and the first major spontaneous strike in Porto Marghera in 1963, the assessment of what to do after those gigantic strikes leads the groups' first major political crisis. Back then, Tronti saw the biggest threat as "the true organic integration of the labour unions within the programmed development of capitalist society."[97] The group formed around similar sentiments, appointed themselves the roles in those struggles, in terms of their role as intellectuals, to organize workers' newspapers in order to go beyond making theoretical breakthroughs that lack the connection with the actuality of the working class

90 Ibid.

91 Ibid., 55.

92 Alquati quoted in Ibid., 56.

93 Ibid.

94 Moulier, Introduction to *The Politics of Subversion*, 19.

95 Ibid., 24.

96 Tronti, "The Strategy of Refusal," 34.

97 Tronti, "Social Capital," 109.

struggle. *Classe Operai* appeared first in Genoa as a newspaper distributed in front of factories along with *Potere operaio* in Milan, *Potere operaio di Porto Marghera* in Padua, *Gatto selvaggio* in Turin.[98] This moment signified the break up with Panzieri. Even though "he had nonetheless reconciled himself to the view that the existing unions and parties were no longer 'a valid instrument for the generation of struggle';"[99] Panzieri distanced himself from "the 'biological hatred' of some in the Turin group for the left parties and unions."[100]

On the other hand, for those who wanted to organize local "workers" editorial staffs and factory newspapers, the great strikes had opened up a process of a certain nature that had "more advanced forms of organizations ... ones which could break the confines of the individual workplace."[101] Bologna argues Negri was the most willing to undertake an "experiment with a new way of doing politics with the working class," in contrast to Panzieri whose political objective is argued to produce "a shift 'within' the workers' movement."[102] Negri tried hard to convince Panzieri, Bologna reports. Regardless, Panzieri would break from the group and continue with *Quaderni rossi*. Bologna recalls: "the definitive break occurred at the beginning of September 1963 in my room in Milan, in a flat that I shared with other two comrades from the *Quaderni rossi* group," which would later reiterate itself with the formation of movement *autonomia operaia* (Worker's autonomy) and dissolution of *operaismo*.[103]

4.2.3 *Classe operaia*

According to Bologna, *Quaderni rossi* was the place where the language of *operaisti* was established, and with *Classe operaia* this language was taken one step further in terms of *operaisti* thinkers' participation in the struggle.[104] Negri, on the other

98 Bologna, "Workerist Publications and Bios," Lawrence Venuti, trans., in *Autonomia: Post-political Politics*, ed. Sylvère Lotringer and Christian Marazzi 178-181, 179.

99 Wright, *Storming Heaven*, 61

100 Panzieri, quoted in ibid. On this note, Negri suggests that despite Panzieri's engagement and endorsement of the culture of the Left which peaked with Panzieri as, at some point, a leading figure of the party and had connections with workers' movements outside Italy; Panzieri had little practical experience and individual practical involvement in the labour movement. Borio et al., eds., Gli operaisti, 240.

101 Wright, *Storming Heaven*, 58-60. Wright specifically refers to Romolo Gobbi, who elaborated on sabotage that was preceded by wild cats as:

> open struggle was blocked by the unions, the workers, consciously and collectively coordinated by the worker-technicians, immediately intensified sabotage within decisive areas identified through collective discussion. After the separate agreement they CONTINUED THIS STRUGGLE IN MORE HIDDEN BUT POLITICALLY RELEVANT FORMS [*sic*]. From *Gatto selvaggio*, 1963, quoted in ibid.

102 Bologna, Review of *Storming Heaven*, 99.

103 Ibid.

104 Bologna, "Intervista A Sergio Bologna – 21 Febbraio 2001: 2," interview with Segio

hand, refers *Classe operaia* as a training which formed and extended the language of *operaismo* and led it spread without major theoretical interventions.[105] He attributes those inventions of *Classe operaia* to theoretical and political influence of *Quaderni rossi* which were infatuated with *Socialisme ou Barbarie* at most.[106]

According to Tronti, however, *Classe operaia* would serve to unite the theory with "all its exponents: the identification of the working class with the labour subsumed to the immediate process of production; an emphasis upon the wage struggle as a key terrain of political conflict and the insistence that the working class was the driving force within capitalist society."[107] What Panzieri would criticize as "very Hegelian": the reversal of primacy between capital and labour was set out, argues Wright, for the first time with "Lenin in England":

> A new era in the class struggle is beginning. The workers have imposed it on the capitalists, through the violent reality of their organized strength in the factories. Capital's power appears to be stable and solid. ... the balance of forces appears to be weighted against the workers ... and yet precisely at the points where capital's power appears most dominant, we see how deeply it is penetrated by this menace, this threat of the working class. ... Capitalist exploitation can impose its political domination through a hundred and one different forms — but how are we going to sort out the form that will be taken by the future dictatorship of the workers organized as the ruling class? This is explosive material; it is intensely social; we must live it, work from within it, and work patiently ... We too have worked with a concept that puts capitalist development first, and workers second. This is a mistake. And now we have to turn the problem on its head, reverse the polarity, and start again from the beginning: and the beginning

---

Bologna on 21 February 2001 in *Conricerca*, http://www.autistici.org/operaismo/bologna/2_1.htm.

105 Negri, *Gli operaisti*, interview with Negri, 242.

106 Negri, "Intervista A Toni Negri – 13 Luglio 2000: 7" interview with Antonio Negri on 13 July 2000 in *Conricerca*, http://www.autistici.org/operaismo/negri/7_1.htm.

Socialisme ou Barbearie (1949-1965) was a review published in France as an opposition to Communist Party of France with Cornelius Castoriadis and Claude Lefort being predominant figures. Like *Quaderni rossi*, the review was interested in the factory and its advancement as the industrial mode of production was advancing to a social one. In 1958 the group formed around the journal would split around debates on the praxis of theory and militancy, again like *Quaderni rossi* does. Later *operaismo* would dissolve as a movement with similar debates. See Andre Liebich, "Socialisme ou Barbarie: A Radical Critique of Bureaucracy," in *Our Generation* 12, no.2 (Fall 1977): 55-62; Marcel van der Linden, "Socialisme ou Barbarie: A French Revolutionary Group (1949-65), in *Left History* 5, no.1 (1997): 7-37.

107 Wright, *Storming Heaven*, 63.

> is the class struggle of the working class.[108]

The detachment from the project of *Quaderni rossi* comes to the surface as within *Classe operaia*, as the group starts seeking ways to translate their critical theories into the existing working class struggle. This new era brings the problem that sought answers to how and why intellectuals have been analyzing the "formation of the industrial proletariat of the 1960s, the passage from countryside to factory," and using the theory as a weapon "both as a scientific lever and as a practical club," as in the case of classical *operaismo*.[109] What was 'revolutionary' with their attempts in comparison to prior or already existing class analysis and Marxist schools which *operaisti* did not align themselves with? The significance of going beyond the history capital had already, was addressed in Negri's 1967 paper "Keynes and the Capitalist Theory of the State post-1929," after *Classe operaia* ceases, but before the determinate split between the *operaisti*:

> Unless we grasp this class determinant behind the transformation of capital and the state, we remain trapped within bourgeois theory. We must go beyond banal descriptions of "the process of industrialization"; our starting point is the identification of a secular phase of capitalist development in which the dialectic of exploitation was socialized, leading to its extension over the entire fabric of political and institutional relations of the modern state.[110]

To address the problems with theories the *operaisti* were working with, Negri was developing the substratum for analyzing the contemporary autonomous class. His articulation on the possibility of antagonism beyond the ones that were already bound to be trapped within bourgeois theory was found in his critique of the bourgeoisie thought, which would be published in 1970 as *Political Descartes*. For Tronti, on the other hand, it was clear that "the existence of groups such as *Classe operaia* was symptomatic of the labour movement's current weakness, and could only be short-lived."[111] The discourse *operaisti* articulated was meant to confront and subvert the Party or the unions. In his 1964 essay "Class and Party" Tronti suggested:

> Beyond all the chatter on the concept of autonomy, one

108 Mario Tronti, "Lenin in England," in *Working Class Autonomy and the Crisis: Italian Marxist Texts of the Theory and Practice of a Class Movement: 1964-79*, ed. Red Notes (London: Red Notes/CSE Books, 1979): 1-6, 1. Originally published as "Lenin in Inghilterra," in *Classe operaia* 1 (January 1964): 89-95. Also a version of the essay can be found as Mario Tronti, "Lenin in England," in *marxists.org*, http://www.marxists.org/reference/subject/philosophy/works/it/tronti.htm

109 Wright, *Storming Heaven*, 81-82.

110 Negri, "Keynes and the Capitalist Theory of the State in 1929," 9.

111 Wright, *Storming Heaven*, 86.

> cannot deny that there are some completely current occasions where tying the union to the party as its transmission belt seems again the most feasible method of class struggle. But it is clear that with the exception of these occasions, the belt tends to break and the relationship [tends to reverse] itself.[112]

By 1967 Tronti started putting emphasis on the previous entryist policies of the dissident communists to the party that were lacking a "general perspective truly alternative to the official one," while observing that "the class was neither strong enough nor mature enough to overthrow the capital relation, although it was now possible to manage the latter through the party."[113] As the working class intensified their struggle against the State and capital, the form of antagonism Tronti proposed shifted "from the earlier strategy of workers within and against capital, and revolutionaries within and against the party," to "the party inside and against the state."[114]

Classe operaia, a time of apprenticeship according to Negri,[115] ended with the debate on "entryism": what Asor Rosa calls as vague internal discussions on the representation of the working class and renewed relationship with the Communist Party.[116] At the end of which, Tronti and his closest associates returned to PCI, including Cacciari, who, Negri adds, built a political career with a total cynicism toward the Party after 1969.[117]

Negri's perception of the debates happening in *Classe operaia* on non-existent lines as theory hardly confronted "things"[118] would later be the defining feature of *autonomia* with his interest in applying the theory with the militancy in factory to distinguish his trajectory from his former *operaisti* circle. However, "while the Northern workerists were more sanguine than Tronti about the prospects of their continued organizational autonomy," Wright argues, "they too saw the revolutionary renovation of the historic left as an unavoidable task."[119] Wright refers to Negri's autobiography where he reflects on this as follows:

---

112 Tronti, "Class and Party," Alex Diceanu, trans., in *libcom.org* (2006) http://libcom.org/book/export/html/30013. Originally published as "Classe e partito" in *Operai e capitale* (Torino: Giulio Einaudi editore, 1966): 110-120.

113 Wright, *Storming Heaven*, 87.

114 Ibid.

115 See Negri, *Gli operaisti*, interview with Negri, 242-44.

116 Ibid., 60-61,

117 Negri, "Intervista A Toni Negri – 13 Luglio 2000: 6" in *Conricerca*, http://www.autistici.org/operaismo/negri/6_1.htm.

118 Negri, *Gli operaisti*, interview with Negri, 242.

119 Wright, *Storming Heaven*, 87.

> Throughout those years our conviction was that, given a determinate level of consistent crises and the construction of [new] moments of organization, the official labour movement would line up within the revolutionary process. It would be forced to. What a frightening error! How ingenious and myopic on our part.[120]

Tronti would refer to the error, on behalf of Negri's, as "the radicalization of discourse on the autonomy of the political from the early 70s was born from this failure of the insurrectionary movements, from the workers' struggles to the youth revolt, that had spanned the decade of the 60s,"[121] and says:

> 'Workers without allies', cried the title of *Classe operaia* in March 1964, which had an editorial by Negri. That was a mistake. The system of alliances—employees, middle classes, Red Emilia—that the official workers' movement had built on the basis of an advanced pre-capitalism certainly needed to be criticized and opposed. But a new system of alliances was coming into view within developed capitalism, with the new professionals emerging from the context of mass production, the consequent expansion of the market and spread of consumption, and the civil transformations and cultural shifts under way in the country.[122]

4.2.4 *Contropiano*

In the midst of such debates *Contropiano* was found by -with Mario Tronti in the

120 Negri, *Pipe-line: Lettere de Rebibbia* (Turin: Einaudi, 1983), 98; quoted in ibid.
Similarly, Bologna recalls their self-assigned roles as 'service providers' for the decentralized movement, since they assumed as intellectuals they would be capable of offering the movement a better understanding of itself. However there are traces of regrets coming from the fact that they were convinced within the body of the working class there was already full knowledge of liberation, wisdom, solidarity, cohesion, rebellion. See Bologna, "Intervista A Sergio Bologna – 21 Febbraio 2001: 12," interview with Sergio Bologna, in *Conricerca*, http://www.autistici.org/operaismo/bologna/12_1.htm. In the light of Bologna's comments, the apologetic voice of Negri seems to join the *mourning* over the intellectuals' biased perception of the working class and their struggle. On this note, for those who are cynical about Negri's and/or Bologna's contemporary reflections on their relation with the movement *autonomia*, it is worth reminding that, in addition to Negri's career as an academic, Bologna was working as a director at Pubblicitá e Stempa della Olivetti in Milan; the forefront in Europe for graphics and advertising back then: a company that is argued to be writing the history of advertising in Europe by Bologna. He suggests he left the company voluntarily after being transferred twice for indiscipline and maladjustment in the same interview where he refers to the lack of knowledge of liberation, wisdom, solidarity, cohesion, rebellion amongst the working class.

121 Tronti, "Our Operaismo," 134.

122 Ibid., 138.

background-: Asor Rosa, who was a member of PCI back then, and had always committed "to an *operaista* direction within the party;" Negri, who would leave the journal after its first issue; and Cacciari who was in his mid-20s, being the youngest member of the editorial board, known to have been actively involved in "factory agitation and other working-class fights since 1968."[123]

Tronti refers *Contropiano* as the completion of the cultural framework of *operaismo* with reference to the articulation of the "negative thought" and the culture of crisis, which were opened by *Classe operaia* and his *Operai e capitale*.[124] Especially by Cacciari, Tronti's use of intellectual inquiry as a negative thought was grown, deepened, brought forward and revisited in a unique way.[125] This and the question of the real significance of the Italian 1968 and 1969 characterized the cultural project of the magazine in the longer term clearer than former *operaisti* publications. Later, those would pin down the dissolution of the group in terms of their understanding of what was opened up in Italy after 1968 as well as the roles the members of the editorial board and contributors ascribed themselves to within the state of things in Italy.

Negri's departure from the magazine is reported by Asor Rosa as a consequence of 1968 which "shook the world upside down."[126] Negri eventually perceived the journal merely as "a tool of long-term debates."[127] Asor Rosa elaborates on Negri's departure from the magazine as follows:

> The pretext was the publication, on the second issue, of an essay by Mario Tronti [The Party as a Problem]. Negri, to stay in the group of editors, demanded that this essay should not be published: coherently, when the other two editors defended and imposed the opposite, he left ... what had divided us was the interpretation to give to the students' and workers' struggles which had started in Italy and in Europe. Negri explicitly considered these to be the beginnings of a pre-revolutionary process: we on the other hand, while accepting their importance, thought that the fortress of bourgeois and capitalistic defense demanded a far longer and articulated process, to be built also by means of theoretical argumentations

123 Patrizia Lombardo, introduction to *Architecture and Nihilism: On the Philosophy of Modern Architecture* by Massimo Cacciari: "The Philosophy of the City," (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1993): ix-lviii, xv-xvii.

124 Tronti, *Gli operaisti*, interview with Tronti, 301-302.

125 Ibid.

126 Asor Rosa, "Critique of ideology and historical practice," 29.

127 Ibid.

(plus or course of militant organization).[128]

According to Asor Rosa, after Negri's departure from the editorial group, *Contropiano*, which was emerging without an editorial statement nor any explanation of its aims, "took on the violent and exhilarating overtones of the movement then underway."[129] In the second issue published without Negri amongst the editors, Asor Rosa and Cacciari postulated two lines of research *Contropiano* with "Primo Bilancio," ("First Assessment") via their description of the status of the magazine.[130] They insisted on "the analysis of the questions to do with class struggle, both at an historical-theoretical level and at a contemporary-militant level … and on the other hand, the analysis of the ideal and cultural superstructures of mass capitalistic society:" the former being referred as "workers' science" and the latter "critique of ideology."[131]

Contropiano published its last issue with a set of indices in the very last pages of the magazine.[132] "Index of Articles by Theme," and "Index of Articles by Author," were revealing "the political and social climate out of which *Contropiano*'s articles emerged and how the magazine responded to its contemporary context."[133] However, apart from positing the editors' "commitment to the grounding of the theoretical in the material;"[134] what those indices revealed by the way the editors conclude the magazine: it was the case that *Contropiano* was shaped mostly by addressing its contemporary context, rather than a plan which the editors committed themselves to from the start, unlike prior publications of the *operaisti* such as *Quaderni rossi* and *Classe operaia*.

Contropiano was the magazine where Manfredo Tafuri along with Cacciari, Francesco Dal Co not only adopted but also contributed to the *operaisti* discourse, while the movement of the 1960s was undergoing substantial shifts.[135] While the magazine was

128 Ibid.

129 Ibid.

130 See "Primo bilancio," in *Contropiano* 2 (1968): 237-244. With this "first assessment" the editors, Cacciari and Asor Rosa make, bringing attention to the class issues was set as the initial goal. Apart from Negri's second and last essay published in *Contropiano* was in this second issue: "Marx sul circlo e la crisi: note," in *Contropiano* 2 (1968): 247-296.

131 Asor Rosa, "Critique of ideology and historical practice," 29.

132 Colomina, et. al., eds., *Clip Stamp Fold*, 125.

133 Ibid.

134 Ibid.

135 In 1969, Paolo Portoghesi founded *Controspazio*, which is referred as the "principal go-between in Italy for the diffusion of Postmodernism." (See Valentina Croci, "The Italian Architectural Press," trans. Paul David Blackmore in *Architectural Design* 77 no. 3 (2007): 106-107. It is a fair call to suggest that Tafuri's intellectual activity greatly influenced *Controspazio* and Portoghesi in their ideological opposition to *Contropiano*. Editorial style in this magazine "demonstrated a precise editorial approach in the selection of topics dealt with and their own recognizable

not particularly an architecture magazine, however with contributions by Cacciari, Dal Co and especially Tafuri, the magazine would later have "a profound influence on the architectural debate in Europe and in the United States."[136] With the debates on praxis of fighting against and within capitalism; the magazine and its editorial board re-visited the *operaisti* discourse and provided the ground for their further engagement as intellectuals in the1970s.

Cacciari believed the magazine to be the "Trojan horse of *Potere operaio* into the walls of the organized labour movement."[137] Ironically, this analogy which is used to describe how Cacciari perceived *Contropiano*, is similar to how Tronti perceives the aftermath of their efforts in the late 1960s after *Classe operaia*. Except in Tronti's 2012 version, intellectuals and their efforts are the Trojan horses of neo-capitalism:

> Capital would need a new levy of political professionals, armed with a different cultural tradition—yet to be constructed—and with new intellectual tools. This would be a figure brought up to date for neo-capitalism, a combined specialist-cum-

---

critical style." (Ibid.) Tafuri, in his 1969 essay, refers to *Controspazio* indirectly as he argues that "there can be no proposals of architectural 'anti-spaces': any search for an alternative within the structures determining the mystification of planning is an obvious contradiction in terms." (Tafuri, "Toward a Critique of Architectural Ideology," 33). As Stephen Sartorelli reminds us, the Italian word used by Tafuri for "anti-space" was *controspazi*, which was an "obvious polemical reference to the polemical contemporary architectural journal, *Controspazio*" (Translator's note in ibid., 35).

136 See the *Contropiano* entry in Colomina, et al., eds., *Clip Stamp Fold*, 106. Before Tafuri, Dal Co had published an essay on the critique of ideology of modern architecture: "Note per la critica dell'ideologia della architettura moderna: da Weimar a Dessau," in Contropiano 1 (1968): 153-170 (Asor Rosa draws our attention to the particularly significant titles of Dal Co's piece and Tafuri's essay) and also "Riscoperta del marxismo e problematica di classe nel movimento studentesco tedesco: Rudi Dutschke," in *Contropiano* 2 (1968): 423-446. Some of Cacciari's early essays published in *Contropiano* are "Dialettica e tradizione" in *Contropiano* 1 (1968): 125-152; "Forza lavoro e/o classe operaia nel revisionismo italiano," in *Contropiano* 2: 447-454; "La Comune di maggio," in ibid.; "Sviluppo capitalistico e ciclo delle lotte. La Montecatini-Edison di Porto Marghera," in *Contropiano* 3 (1968): 579-628; "Sulla genesi del pensiero negativo," in *Contropiano* 1 (1969): 131-200; see also "Vita Cartesii est simplicissima," in *Contropiano* 2 (1970): 375-399. As Day notes, his essay on negative thought: "Sulla genesi del pensiero negativo," becomes the basis of his book *Architecture and Nihilism: On the Philosophy of Modern Architecture.* Marco De Michelis also contributed to the architectural strand of the magazine with Marco Venturi "Il centro direzionale di Bologna: la gestione del problema urbano nel P.C.I.," in *Contropiano* 3 (1968); "La via urbanistica al socilaismo," in *Contropiano* 1 (1969).

137 Alessandro Carrera, introduction to *The Unpolitical: On the Radical Critique of Political Reason*: "On Massimo Cacciari's Disenchanted Activism," (New York: Fordham University Press): 1-44, 6. *Potere operaio* was an organization and a newspaper which Negri would actively participate in their foundation from 1969 to 1973. According to Negri, Contropiano was an attempt to hold together the intellectual discourse that was, to some extent, independent from *Potere operaio* and the factory, and regardless the almost-academic discourse of the magazine- even with relays of the university- was still considered extremely important in the production of a cultural discourse. Negri, "Intervista A Toni Negri – 13 Luglio 2000: 6" in *Conricerca*, http://www.autistici.org/operaismo/negri/6_1.htm.

> politician, able to operate skillfully within the contingencies of the disorder to come.[138]

"Modernization of 1968 and the dawning post-modernity of 1977," was already anticipated by the workers in the factories of Olivetti and FIAT in the early 1960s.[139] Tronti argues that "the appearance of 1968," which was anti-authoritarian in character, was extinguished and absorbed in individuals and got diverted and bastardized in groups.[140] Similarly, apart from its successful attempt to break with Marxist orthodoxy, *operaisti*'s attempt at a cultural revolution, which was mostly significant through *Contropiano*, hardly went beyond producing "significant intellectual figures" rather than determining historical events:[141] "To criticize power is one thing, to put it in crisis is another."[142] As in his reflection to the 1960s, "emancipation of the individual led to the restoration of the old balance of forces, now burnished with some new reforms:" Tronti suggests *operaisti* were the "sacrificial victims in this process."[143] Referring back to *operaismo*, he accepts defeat, saying:

> It emerged at the exact moment of transition when the tragic greatness of the century turned on itself, moving from a permanent state of exception to new 'normal', epochless time. Looking back on the 1960s, we can see those years had a transitional function. The maximum disorder renewed the existing order. Everything changed so that everything essential could stay the same.[144]

4.2.4.1 Beyond *Contropiano*

Intellectuals were not blind to the roles they were ascribed by the capitalist development back then. In fact what lead to the dissolution of *operaismo* in the late 1960s and the early 1970s can be understood in relation to the intellectuals' acknowledgement of their roles and their theoretical endeavors which were shaped within the discourse of the *operaisti*. *Operaismo* versus *autonomia* dichotomy is mostly approached via Tronti and Negri in terms of strategies and tactics they adopt and promote after 1968. However to demonstrate the split between the *operaisti*, the conflicting views of Cacciari and Negri, which *Contropiano* facilitated for those views to come to surface, is equally important. This does not only provide us a deeper insight to the political framework of the Italy in the 1960s and the 1970s,

138 Tronti, "Our Operaismo," 136.
139 Ibid., 138.
140 Ibid., 133.
141 Ibid., 131.
142 Ibid., 127.
143 Ibid., 127-28.
144 Ibid., 126.

but also a better apprehension of the fundamental departure of the *operaisti* with the transformation of the project *Contropiano* is assigned to.

The debate between Cacciari and Negri culminates with Cacciari's decision to join the PCI, however their conflicting views date back to an earlier debate after Negri's departure from *Contropiano* and advancement of his thoughts on mass worker in the aftermath of 1968. This debate demonstrates the two predominant figures' opposing stance regarding their attempts to agitate the workers in front of the factories from the early 1960s until the events of 1968. It is worth mentioning, as it also demonstrates how *operaisti* diverged in their understanding of their intellectual endeavors within a political framework that was determined to expose contradictions of the working class struggle for being the protagonist of the capitalist development within the plan of the capital.

Negri publishes *Political Descartes*, "immediately following 1968," as he says.[145] His book, which was written first for an academic qualification, came as a surprise to the fellow *operaisti* as it was not clear what a "Marxist" could do with Descartes.[146] On this note, Negri describes his concern prior to 1968 as "the analysis of the political movements of the workers and the critical excavation of Marxism."[147] By drawing the connection between his prior concern and the relevance of the context of 1968 to study Descartes, Negri posits that Descartes developed his own philosophy "in the very midst of that period of social and political transition that forms modernity."[148] Referring to the bourgeois, who confronted power of the State, Negri believed the context in which Descartes developed his philosophy constituted the "process of crisis which bears many analogies," to the one that was opened up after 1968:

> The historical period Descartes lived through is referred to as the epoch of the construction of the Renaissance and the first forms of bourgeois government and concluding with the definition of the Absolutist state. In that period, the revolutionary process of the bourgeoisie ... underwent a grave crisis ... the collapse of the ideological model that had nourished the first revolutionary insurgencies, accompanied however by the persistence of the unstoppable and irreversible productive and social force of the new historical subjects: whence the crisis.[149]

145 Negri, postface to the English edition of *Political Descartes: Reason, Ideology and the Bourgeois Project* (London and New York: Verso, 2006): 317-338, 317.

146 Ibid.

147 Ibid.

148 Ibid., 320.

149 Ibid., 320-321.

The relevance of the critique of ideology and Negri's interest in Descartes was found in the proposition that the hypothesis of the "reasonable ideology." This was in reaction to the crisis that defined the genesis of modernity and determined the autonomy of bourgeois reason "I think," via presenting itself as the "hegemonic class, capable of constructing a new civilization," as it recognized the foundation of that civilization as "a new productive force -that of labour."[150] The open and reformist project, Negri argues, "would allow bourgeoisie to develop the idea of progress and, little by little, to broaden its hegemony within new structures of the Absolutist state."[151] The idea of freedom which was introduced by the humanist revolution was under threat with the "overpowering arrogance of the reigning aristocracies and the continuity of the patrimonial and charismatic monarchical order, but also, and above all, by the uprisings and revolutions of the new peasant and artisan multitudes."[152] Descartes' philosophy in this picture was read as a reasonable ideology, "rooted in the awareness of the actual relationships of forces and the progressive possibilities that could potentially open up to that new social body and to that truth."[153]

In 1970, Cacciari would reject "Negri's framing of Descartes' relationship to Renaissance humanism," in his essay published in *Contropiano* "Vita Cartesii est simplicissima" ("'The Cartesian Life is the Simplest"): a joint review of "Negri's text along with Lacan's *Écrits*, Chomsky's *Cartesian Linguistics* and a text by Max Bense."[154] Matteo Mandarini and Alberto Toscano explain this due to the different methodological choices in the approaches of Negri and Cacciari to the history of philosophy, which were determined by the political motivations at stake.[155] Where Cacciari posed "the role of the party and workers' movement as assuming a kind of transcendent *potestas* over the process of rationalization," Negri affirmed "proletarian *potentia*, immanently creating its world" with his reading of real subsumption.[156]

According to Cacciari, Negri was maintaining "the thematic of a humanist nostalgia," which did not do justice to "Descartes's role in opening up the potent, affirmative movement of a rationalization and disenchantment of the world."[157] This was in response to Negri framing Descartes' relationship to Renaissance humanism to be the "formulation of the bourgeois project as an attempt to rekindle the Renaissance hope in a possession of the world whilst accepting the reality of defeat and the

150 Ibid., 322.

151 Ibid., 322-23.

152 Ibid., 322.

153 Ibid., 323.

154 Matteo Mandarini and Alberto Toscano, translator's introduction to *Political Descartes*: "Antonio Negri and the Antinomies of Bourgeois Thought": 1-25, 16.

155 Ibid., 18.

156 Ibid.

157 Ibid., 17.

new conditions this defeat had brought into being."[158] For Cacciari, on the other hand, confronting with the state of things in capitalism was meant to happen with a different approach than Negri's. Cacciari, "from an affirmation of the inevitable and irreversible character of the process of rationalization," according to Mandarini and Toscano, "drew the conclusion that the political task of the working class and its leadership was not that of affirming its own needs and constructing its own world through organization and revolution."[159] Cacciari believed, argue Mandarini and Toscano, the working class needed to prove itself as "more efficacious than capitalists in dominating the process of rationalization, establishing its political command over a process whose technological coordinates and demands were not immediately politicizable," which was "profoundly linked to a theme that would pit Cacciari and his cohorts against Negri throughout the 1970s and onwards, that of the autonomy of the political."[160]

Negri's attempts to "diagram the historical force-fields and antagonistic conjunctures wherein a given metaphysics is produced," was conflicting with Cacciari's treatment to political character of Cartesian caesura in terms of "epochal terms."[161] Espousing "Heideggerian epic of the metaphysics of modern subjectivity,"[162] Mandarini and Toscano argue, "Cacciari and other PCI intellectuals" depended on "the presupposition of an 'essential simple line running through the historical contexts,' on a metaphysics of 'the West' which is marked by radical disenchantment."[163] As according to Cacciari, in a state of mere nostalgia, autonomists like Negri, were refusing making the autonomy of the political confined in the metaphysical 'iron cage'.[164] On the other hand, "negative thought" which Cacciari articulated on predominantly, was "so resolutely committed to a Heideggerian understanding of the link between metaphysics, technology, mathesis and rationality that it takes on a decidedly determinist or necessitarian hue."[165]

Referring to Étienne Balibar's elaboration on the "philosophical panorama presented in Heidegger's Nietzsche," Mandarini and Toscano articulate the "standpoint of political ontology" that was found in *autonomia* with reference to Negri's *Political Descartes*.[166] Balibar argues, as reposted by Mandarini and Toscano, by referring to the tradition from Kant to Hegel to Husserl to Lukács: that the tradition

158 Ibid., 16.
159 Ibid., 18.
160 Ibid., 17-18.
161 Ibid., 18.
162 Ibid.
163 Ibid., 19.
164 Ibid., 19.
165 Ibid., 18.
166 Ibid., 19-21.

which "repeatedly asserts" Descartes for the philosophy of becoming conscious of "subjectivity" and putting "the subject" at the centre of the universe, "was forged by the systems, the philosophies of history and the teaching of philosophy in the nineteenth century."[167] Mandarini and Toscano argue that Negri touched on the "'epistemological' issue of separation and correlation of 'subject' and 'object' and transcended "Balibar's potent philological rectification."[168] By doing so, Negri identified that "the subject of science and of metaphysics which is isolated by Heidegger and Cacciari is in a sense a by-product of the precarious and ambiguous solution that Descartes gives to the problem of a historical and material subject: the bourgeoisie.[169]

In this picture, Negri's effort in the 1970s needs to be understood in terms of confronting the traces of the Cartesian solution in his own version of autonomy. His effort would reach to its limit by in April 7, 1979 Antonio Negri would be arrested on the charges including being the mastermind behind the assassination of the former Italian prime minister Aldo Moro. As of 1976, Negri's and Cacciari's political engagements diverge completely and Cacciari's career as a politician starts after joining PCI in 1976. But how does someone who adopts a critique of the institutions of capitalist development, and especially the Party become a successful politician in PCI?[170] The answer to this question lies within the articulation of "negative thought".

negative thought

Mandarini, in his paper "Beyond Nihilism," argues that by 1976 Cacciari's early articulations on "negative thought," which more or less started taking shape in his 1969 *Contropiano* article "Sulla genesi del pensiero negativo" ("On the origins of negative thought"), reached the concept of "pansiero debole" ("weak thought") and was adopted by some of the leading intellectuals of the PCI including Cacciari himself.[171] The contrasting position between Negri and Cacciari would reach its climax by this date, marking the "point of irreducible conflict between two tendencies within Italian communist philosophy and politics."[172]

Mandarini presents "negative thought" as the instrument articulated by Cacciari,

167 Ibid., 20.

168 Ibid., 21.

169 Ibid., 21.

170 In Chapter Three, I cited Tafuri about his decision to join PCI where he pointed out how unexpected it was for him and for Cacciari to do so in light of the critical attitude they had against PCI. However, contrasting with Cacciari, Tafuri joins the party after 1968 and leaves it before 1976; the year PCI starts considering the "historical compromise."

171 Matteo Mandarini, "Beyond Nihilism: Notes Towards a Critique of Left-Heidegerrianism in Italian Philosophy of the 1970s," in *Cosmos and History: The Journal of Natural and Social Philosophy* 5, no.1 (2009): 37-56, 38.

172 Ibid., 39.

along with Tronti, to rule out "any possible synthesis turned, in the 1970s, into an analysis of the means for the technocratic construction of 'new orders,' founded on nothingness and crisis."[173] He observes the *operaisti* thinkers' shift from the centrality of the working-class political subjects' antagonism towards capitalist society to "a 'revolution from above' for the management of development by the representatives of the working class."[174] He argues, the tendency which had been stitched since the late 1960s as a line "leading from Schopenhauer and Nietzsche through to Wittgenstein and Heidegger that wove together *Das Grundlose* of being with the trajectory of nihilism," transfigured "the foundation by stripping down being and, ultimately, authorizing philosophical mysticism and political opportunism."[175]

Both for Negri and Cacciari, the Hegelian dialectic represented the "highpoint in the victorious and expansive cycle of capitalist development, in which all contradictions, all conflicts are turned directly into productive moments of capital's advance as the self-realization of Spirit."[176] Mandarini suggests the concept of negative thought was developed in "the nineteenth century by bourgeois theorists such as Schopenhauer, Nietzsche and Mach, and in the twentieth century by Wittgenstein and Heidegger amongst others" in contrast to Hegel's "virtuous" dialectic.[177] Mandarini says Hegel's "positivation of the negative," was the engine of the production-consumption circuit as a disciplined moment, a systematic and integral moment of the "determinate negation," and argues that with the concept developed, the circuit of Geist was interfered. On this note, according to Mandarini, "negative thought" was coined in the late 1960s in order to differentiate it from that engine: Hegel's dialectic's "positivation of the negative."[178]

Alessandro Carrera provides an insight to Cacciari's 1969 essay "On the origins of negative thought," which was published in the same issue of *Contropiano* with Tafuri's "Toward a Critique of Architectural Ideology." In the essay, Cacciari posits Schopenhauer as the first philosopher who addressed "negative thought."[179] Through

173 Ibid.

174 Ibid.

175 Ibid., 38. Mandarini's paper is an elaboration on this mysticism of the "Left-Heidegerianism," a label he borrows from Negri. However, Mandarini does not necessarily posit Negri as a counter figure to Cacciari. Though at the time of debates happening in the 1970s between Negri and Cacciari; it is fair to assume them representing conflicting poles and different positions in terms of the application of "the negative thought." However after Negri's imprisonment and exile days, Mandarini suggests Negri's intellectual endeavor achieved a "thought and practice of the negative that would integrate the lessons of negative thought while refusing the logic of integration and the correlative state-terrorist repression." Ibid., 52.

176 Ibid., 40.

177 Ibid.

178 Ibid.

179 Carrera, "On Massimo Cacciari's Disenchanted Activism," 9.

Schopenhauer, who addresses all the ramifications of "negative thought," Cacciari understands "negative thought" as a mean to strive to develop "a system that aims to be more consistent than dialectics" that exposes the "contradiction" it possess (the Hegelian dialectics; the contradiction between subject and object) rather than attempting to "overcome" it.[180] Cacciari formulates: "The form of the dialectic is the form of the negative that is affirmed positively- the recoverable contradiction. The *whole* system posits itself and maintains itself in terms [*nel segno*] of negativity: a movement of *universal* alienation is true-real [*vera-reale*] totality."[181]

Hence contradiction is not understood as "an aporia" or "an anomaly" in Schopenhauer's "reactionary point of view:" "It can be denied only ideologically, by overlooking life's violent aspect."[182] For Schopenhauer, however, life results in self-denial where for Cacciari, and in his appropriation of the "negative thought," for contradiction is meant to be lived.[183] In this light, Cacciari turns to Kierkegaard as he demonstrates that "Schopenhauer, as long as he is still convinced that it is possible to achieve freedom from the evils of life, is still an optimistic bourgeois."[184] For Kierkegaard, the "man[*sic*]" needs no intention to "free the world from the evil," as it would be an "impossible abstraction."[185] Positing religious faith as the only moment of realization of dialectics with "not by reconciliation but by annihilating one of its opposites;" Kierkegaardian "individual" is still found within a society where faith has practical consequences both in personal and collective lives.[186]

Cacciari's narration of the story of "negative thought" reaches to its fulfillment only in Nietzsche, with the dialectical synthesis "once devoid of any moralistic or metaphysical value, is reduced to pure immanence without justification."[187] Along with Max Weber's "disenchanted intellectual," Nietzsche's Übermensch constitute the Nietzschean-Weberian system which "wants only power; it is the will to power incarnate."[188] The aristocratic distance of Nietzsche's Übermensch is annihilated in Weber's demand of "an active tole for his intellectual and/or politician.[189] Carrera narrates the formation of Cacciari's "negative thought" via Nietzsche as follows:

---

180 Ibid.

181 Massimo Cacciari, "Sulla genesi del pensiero negativo," in *Contropiano* 1 (1969), 131. Translation by Matteo Mandarini in "Beyond Nihilism," 39-40. Brackets and emphases by the translator

182 Carrera, "On Massimo Cacciari's Disenchanted Activism," 10.

183 Ibid.

184 Ibid.

185 Ibid.

186 Ibid.

187 Ibid.

188 Ibid., 11.

189 Ibid.

> The ruler of the Weberian "administered world" has no time for systems of values that are not functional to the stage reached by the capitalistic organization. The Protestant phase of capitalism is over, and the system is on the way of becoming a pure manifestation of power. Nietzsche knew that already. No transcendence is left outside the system. As a matter of fact, there is no outside. The situation is unprecedented, but it captures perfectly the tragedy of capitalism's mature phase. The will to power is the new substance, the new perfect form. Life is not synthesis, but will- toward domination and incorporation. ... This is the meaning of Nietzsche's eternal return: the capitalistic system has now taken the place of the tragic destiny.[190]

Even though Cacciari was able to give an account for the "history of negative thought," in his essay, Carrera says that from 1969 onwards for ten years, Cacciari struggled with his arguments' aporia.[191] Carrera points out that Cacciari's account of the "history of negative thought" was strongly deterministic; without any autonomy left to the authors he appropriates within the historical phase of capitalistic development; and it "annihilates the very possibility of theoretical and social antagonism."[192]

One of the lines of attacking to Cacciari's articulation on "negative thought" was in the incapability of his narration to explain the determinism embedded in the history of the negative thought. Against those who assumed negative thought possessing a mysticism of attempting to express what is inexpressible to reach what is unconditioned, Carrera reports that Cacciari accused Foucault, Deleuze and Guattari of being intellectually indecent "on the account of their claim to an immediacy of thought."[193] This is not what negative thought stands for, for Cacciari. Instead, Cacciari believed "every set is limited, but there is no game outside the game, no privileged position from which one can look at the whole system and decide to change it without being affected by the change."[194] Hence he concludes that "our language games cannot be 'situated' ... ontologically."[195] Mandarini reports that for Cacciari, "the rational lacks all exogenous foundation. There is no Ratio to be sought in the world -all we have is a proliferation of rationalities, of 'language games,' of ideological structures irreducible one to another, that are circumscribed by a

190 Ibid.
191 Ibid., 12.
192 Ibid.
193 Ibid., 12.
194 Ibid., 12-13.
195 Mandarini, "Beyond Nihilism," 41.

nothingness."[196]

The polemical objective of Cacciari's application of negative thought into his politics was "not-so-hidden" as Carrera argues: it was against "Negri's 'total autonomy' of the revolutionary subject- which Cacciari discarded as mere mythology."[197] In 1978 he would conclude that:

> Let us therefore, understand the autonomy of each technology, of each game, to mean that it possesses *only* one-law-of-its-own [*una-propria-legge*] (which is the result of an infinity of variations, which has been played and re-played, which is transformable and in-transformation because it is played). Let us understand the term 'autonomy' in this sense of *limit*.[198]

196 Ibid.

197 Carrera, "On Massimo Cacciari's Disenchanted Activism," 13.

198 Massimo Cacciari, "Critica della 'autonomia' e problema del politico," in *Crisi del sapere e nuova razionalità*, ed. V.F. Ghisi (Bari: De Donato, 1978): 123-35, 131. Translated and quoted in Mandarini, "Beyond Nihilism," 42. Brackets and emphases by Mandarini. Pier Vittorio Aureli's *Absolute Architecture* is praised and marketed with Peter Eisenman's review on the back cover of the book:

> What at first glance appears to be a book of architectural history is in fact a radical attack on theory, sweeping away the foundations of current thought in its wake. Aureli's work stands against the forces of an unlimited urbanization, proposing an idea of absolute architecture as a confrontation with the forces of global capital. A must read for those passionate about architecture and its future.

In light of the critique Tafuri delivered in 1969, and Tafuri's reiteration of his critique in the preface of *Architecture and Utopia* in relation to how it is approached by some of his readers: as a call to retreat to pure form; may first trouble us to be convinced by Eisenman's claim and also to convince ourselves what Eisenman is claiming can be Aureli's intention, considering the fact that Aureli neither confronts nor refutes Tafuri's criticism and analysis in any of his inquiries into Tafuri's works. However, in the light of Cacciari's elaboration on "negative thought," and the relation between Cacciari's and Tafuri's projects' which are drawn in the 1970s, and given emphasis on by Tafuri's audience, Aureli's notion of "absolute architecture" seems to find its precursors. Here is Aureli's definition of "absolute architecture," for the reader who might be interested:

> An absolute architecture is one that recognizes whether these limits are a product (and a camouflage) of economic exploitation (such as the enclaves determined by uneven economic redistribution) or whether they are the pattern of an ideological will to separation within the common space of the city. Instead of dreaming of a perfectly integrated society that can only be achieved as the supreme realization of urbanization and its avatar, capitalism, an absolute architecture must recognize the political separateness that can potentially, within the sea of urbanization, be manifest through the borders that define the possibility of the city. Aureli, *The Possibility of an Absolute Architecture*, 45.

"After the great tides of 1968 and 1969 began to recede, *operaismo* needed a strong theory of *counterplan* in order to oppose capitalistic planning," explains Carrera in their account of Cacciari's decision to join PCI later in 1976.[199] This, Carrera suggests, created even "more of a fuss than Tronti's retreat."[200] 1976 seems to be the "breakthrough" year for Cacciari as it is the year he would also publish *Krisis* (Crisis); first of Cacciari's "negative thought trilogy" the other two being: *Pensiero negativo e razionalizzazione* in 1977 (*Negative Thought and Rationalization*) and *Dallo Steinhof* in 1980 (Translated into English as *Posthumous Men* in 1996). The validity of the application of "negative thought" in the working class struggle was demonstrated through the "historical effectiveness of negative thought" as well as "its intrinsic rationality," in *Krisis*.[201] Against Cacciari and his *Krisis*, Carrera records that

> Marxists who grew up in the 1950s and 1960s reading Lukács and Adorno were outraged. Even worse, they felt bypassed. The respected poet and essayist Franco Fortini went as far as to call Cacciari and some other young philosophers the 'last Cains,' eager to prostrate before the violence of history in order to sole their Oedipal problems with their own bourgeois upbringing.[202]

In response to Cacciari, Negri would publish his critical review of *Krisis* in the Italian journal *aut aut*.[203] Echoing with Gianni Vattimo according to whom Cacciari chose "speculative abstraction at the expense of revolutionary praxis," Negri "accused Cacciari of mysticism pure and simple" as "it was based on an assumption of naturalness about the economic datum:"

> It celebrated the organization of labour as a pure game devoid of any values, but forgot to explain how the capitalistic division between value and labour was determined in the first place. Cacciari, in Negri's opinion, was turning into one of those negative thinkers he was writing about- a negative theologian of bourgeois humanism, ready to brush aside the question of labour because he was fearful of its revolutionary power.[204]

Mandarini argues that Negri makes it clear in response to Cacciari's *Krisis* that "what we are left with is a calculable and manipulable set of elements, circumscribed by nothingness that delimits the serialized elements into language-games or

199 Carrera, "On Massimo Cacciari's Disenchanted Activism," 6.

200 Ibid., 6-7.

201 Ibid., 9.

202 Franco Fortini, "Gli ultimi Cainiti," in *Questioni di frontiera*, 91-106; quoted in ibid., 9;

203 Mandarini, "Beyond Nihilism," 38.

204 Carrera, "On Massimo Cacciari's Disenchanted Activism," 13.

rationalization procedures, all of which are organized by a political decisionism."[205] Mandarini cites from Tronti to underline what Negri refers to with "political decisionism."[206] It determines:

> ... historical necessity ... of a political class and a professional political class to which the management [*gestione*] of power is to be entrusted ... In this way arises the moment of a war maneuver [*guerra manovrata*], made-up of successive moves, all of which are scientifically calculated [*previste*] and tactically prepared.[207]

Tronti's uncanny argument that sweeps away the seminal *operaisti* critique which was evolved around the centrality of the working class itself within working class struggles; along with Cacciari's almost total abandonment of radical politics of the 1960s; stand on a "de-ontologized, even skeletal grasp of actuality (Wirklichkeit)," Mandarini argues.[208] He asks:

> How else is the autonomy of the political to be understood if not as the decisionistic management of the multiplicity of fragmentary rationalities, as the working class -in the form of the PCI- taking control of the administration of the state, making up for a 'deficiency in rationalization ... the inefficiency of the political apparatus? [209]

In his answer, Mandarini refers to Sergio Givone and suggests that "it is only once one has abandoned faith in a political subject as foundation of revolutionary political change that one can rediscover a professional political class that can take over the administration of the actual to bring change from above."[210] In the light

205 Mandarini, "Beyond Nihilism," 45.

206 Ibid. *Political decisionism*, according to Negri, is what we are left with Cacciari's version of nihilism which is faithful to Heidegger with his denial of a whether ethical or logical pre-given. The "calculable and manipulable set of elements, circumscribed by nothingness that delimits the serialized elements into language-games or rationalization procedures" are organized by "Will to Power," "Will to Rationalization," that determine the political determinism. Mandarini refers it as "to employ 'mysticism' for the task of a political technics." Ibid., 44-45.

207 Ibid., 45; Mario Tronti, *Sull'autonomia del politico* (Milan: Feltrinelli, 1977), 17-18. Translation, brackets and emphasis by Mandarini.

208 Mandarini, "Beyond Nihilism," 42.

209 Ibid.

210 Ibid. Cacciari was successful to some extent in his politics after his departure from the radical threads of *operaismo*, as after joining PCI, he served as a representative to the Italian Parliament from 1976 to 1983. After the fall of the Berlin Wall, he saw "the broad ideological changes" which the official Left was "reluctant to accept" and he decided to act "at the grassroots level" and was elected as mayor of Venice from 1993 to 2000 and 2005 to 2010. See Carrera, "On Massimo Cacciari's Disenchanted Activism," 1.

of Mandarini's questions, I believe it is more than relevant to remind ourselves how Italian 1968 affected the revolutionary and radical project of the Italian New Left. The shift from the *operaisti* critique that put emphasis on the worker within and against the capital to the emphasis of the Party within and against the State is more comprehensible if we are willing to confront this rift *Contropiano* houses.

4.2.5 Italy 1967-1970

Italy was no exception with the May 1968 phenomenon in relation to the students coming out as political protagonists around the world. However, for Italy it was a "creeping May," more so than any other advanced capitalist society, as Wright translates "maggio strisciante" in English.[211] Francesco Santini explains the long 1968 in Italy with the cycle of struggles of 1967-1970 to which he refers as "a cycle heralded by an ostensible rejuvenation of the class struggle, held at by the PCI and the CGIL after 1960."[212]

Having said that, according to Lumley, *operaisti* had not necessarily contributed to this cycle until after the student movement in 1968 as the significance of agitators such as Panzieri or Tronti and their alternative organizations of the New Left had limited impact prior to 1968.[213] Regardless, Lumley acknowledges the fact that Panzieri and *Quaderni rossi* along with the emergence of the sociology of the workers' movement, did indeed give "significance to workers' opinions and experience."[214] What is more, one can not ignore the *operaisti* preceding, what Santini refers as the

---

211 Wright, *Storming Heaven*, 89. Lumley translates "maggio strisciante" literally as: "the drawn-out May," and suggests it pointed to "how the movement in the workplaces was a process stretching over months, rather than a phenomenon identifiable with a major event." Lumley, *States of Emergency*, 169.

212 Francesco Santini, Review of *Critica dell'utopia capitale* by Giorgio Cesarano: "Apocalypse and Survival," Alias Recluse, trans., in *libcom.org* (January 16, 2013) http://libcom.org/library/apocalypse-survival-reflections-giorgio-cesaranos-book-critica-dell'utopia-capitale-expe. Originally published in 1994 as "Apocalisse e sopravvivenza: Considerazioni sul libro *Critica dell'utopia capitale* di Giorgio Cesarano e sull'esperienza della corrente comunista radicale in Italia."

213 Lumley refers to Beschelloni who suggested that the intellectual culture of the 1960s was limited within intellectual circles without necessarily reaching out to the actual antagonizers such as workers whether they were militant or not. Lumley argues as follows:

> Most people, if they had been asked this question in 1967, would undoubtedly have dismissed as irrelevant the reviews and the alternative organizations of the New Left. The circulation of the former were highly restricted; in late 1967 *Quaderni piacentini* sold 4,000 copies, and *Classe operaia* sold a maximum of 5,000 before it ceased publication in 1966.The organizations were weak. An inquiry by the review Nuovo Impegno in 1967 found that they numbered eighteen, but they had 'virtually no workers inside them, and little effect on struggles or presence in the factories'. Lumley, *States of Emergency*, 38.

214 Ibid. 38.

phenomena of "revolutionizing the revolutionaries," and opened up the trajectories for practice beyond "the traditional schemas of tactics/strategy, economic struggle/ political struggle, party/trade union."[215]

No matter how underground this culture was, it was prior and also seminal to the 1968 discourse and practice. From that seminal critique and movement, "occupations, interruptions of classes, sabotage, the practice of free love and the revolt against the family," came out with which students demonstrated their discontent against authority via "the abstract demand of the right to hold assemblies in the schools, series problems affecting the entire educational system."[216] At the end of the day, what was underground prior to 1967-68 as "countercultural and communitarian groups" would later be "taken up, in other terms, by the revolutionaries, who incorporated it together with that of the Situationist International" and "would end up irreversibly changing the life of an entire generation, leaving its mark on all of society."[217]

We need to note that consequences of the transformation of the industry in Italy were peculiar to the Italian capitalism in the 1960s such as: "the growing homogenization of labour by age and gender;" "declining weight of skilled manual labour amongst workers as a whole;" and its effects on the apprentices; changing conditions of the skilled workers and so on.[218] In this context, the early months of 1968 saw the "development of a collective bargaining to a degree not experienced since 1960-1" says Lumley.[219] However with the workers' frustration with the unions and their incapacity to "articulate the demands of the workers," which was already attacked by the *operaisti* in the early 1960s; the struggles at Marzotto, at Fiat in Turin and at

215 See Santini, "7.The Content of Radical Communism" in "Apocalypse and Survival," http://libcom.org/library/sections-1-7.

216 Ibid. Tronti's comments could be mentioned here to compare his version of the seminality of *operaismo* to 1968 to Santini's:

> Those of us who had lived through the struggles of the factory workers in the early 60s looked on the student protests with sympathetic detachment. We had not predicted a clash of generations, though in the factories we had met the new layer of workers—especially young migrants from the South—who were active and creative, always in the lead (certainly compared to the older workers who were exhausted by past defeats). But in the factories, the bond between fathers and sons still held together; it was among the middle classes that it had snapped. Tronti, "Our Operaismo," 134.

217 See Santini, "4. International Precedents" in "Apocalypse and Survival," http://libcom.org/library/sections-1-7.

218 Wright, *Storming Heaven*, 108. See ibid.,107-130; and Lumley, *States of Emergency*, 167-180.

219 Lumley, *States of Emergency*, 170.

Montedison of Porto Marghera broke.[220]

By that time, many student activists, as Wright reports, "were then discovering, their efforts to support industrial struggles … met not only with frequent interest on the part of workers, but also hostility from union officials jealously protective of their 'turf'."[221] Until then, Potere operaio veneto-emiliano (Pov-e), a Workers' power group formed in Venice with Negri being one of the leading figures, was still "overwhelmingly working-class" in relation to students claiming their own role as political subjects.[222] Throughout 1968, Pov-e started responding to the direct contact efforts by the students with the working class. With the Porto Marghera strike, "while the ambiguities inherited from *Classe operaia*'s discourse on the historic left did not long survive the conflict … the chemical workers' struggles only confirmed the group in its interpretation of worker-student relations."[223]

Wright cites a Pov-e pamphlet on Porto Marghera, Montedison and 1968: "Only if the union between workers and students, under the leadership of the working class, becomes an organizational and continuous fact, will the student movement conserve its political weight and significance."[224] Where within *Potere operaio*, this rhetoric would evolve into the lines of an acknowledgement of the students as legitimate political subjects: "If we do not maintain a continuous relation between new forms of organization and mass struggles, we can safely say that the rank-and-file committees will end up as nothing more than one of the many articulations of the union in the factory."[225] With the student movement, prolonged amounts of struggles inside factories and outside factories in universities, art expositions, film festivals and so on; "the energy and creativity of the mass worker of 1969 was to bubble over into the early 1970s as the years of 'permanent conflictuality."[226]

Negri refers to 1969 as the year of the factory working class after which "the students, other social protagonists emerged to make their mark on the political scene."[227] Negri

220 Ibid 172-173. Lumley writes that on 19 April 1968

> workers from the textile factories of Valdagno in the Veneto pulled down the statue of Gaetano Marzotto from its pedestal in the town square," Lumley reports. The ongoing strikes at FIAT through out April and May; along with Porto Marghera petrochemical plant wildstrikes allowed workers to show themselves "ready to destroy plant by totally withdrawing their labour. Ibid., 173.

221 Wright, *Storming Heaven*, 98.

222 Negri quoted by Wright in ibid., 96.

223 Ibid., 99. Wright mentions that Tronti's closest supporters were still unclear about Pov-e at that time, and its efforts to maintain relations with the students.

224 Ibid., 100.

225 Ibid.,129.

226 Ibid., 131.

227 Antonio Negri, "Reviewing the Experience of Italy in the 1970s," trans. Ed Emery in

suggests, after the phase of Factory Councils, would come the "legislation of divorce, the implementation of regional decentralization, the recognition of conscientious objection," to argue "there were a variety of institutional responses to the continuos unfolding of struggles."[228]

Such social movements and the ascending antagonistic attitude against almost every established institutions of the State as well as the labour movement provoked counter-movements rapidly. John Pollard points at this as follows:

> Right-wing political violence most strongly manifested itself in the late 1960s and the early 1970s. This was a period of student and youth agitation, new social movements including women's and gay liberation, widespread social unrest and trade union militancy in Italy. This was accompanied by a massive increase in electoral support for the Communists - peaking at over a third of the vote in the 1976 elections. The neo-Fascist terrorists groups of this period were a backlash against all this left wing activity and also against the emergence of left wing terrorist groups such as the Red Brigades.[229]

Within this context, in the late 1960s what is today known as "Strategy of Tension" began a campaign of terror and murder, which itself was "designed to lead to a breakdown of law and order and a consequent collapse of public confidence in democratically elected government, precipitating a takeover by the army."[230] Using

---

LeMonde diplomatique (September 1998) http://mondediplo.com/1998/09/11negri.

228 Ibid. Negri explains this period and its projection towards the 1970s as:

> Beyond the simple exercise of that 'counter-power' which they had embodied since 1968, the social movements were also nurtured by the consequences of Italy's monetary deflation policies and by the industrial restructuring through which an initial - but definitive - 'emergence from Fordism' was taking place, in terms of Italy's systems of manufacture and production. As it happened, the 'historic compromise' was built around precisely these 'austerity policies' against which the social protest movements were being organised. Ibid.

229 John Pollard, *The Fascist Experience in Italy* (London and New York: Routledge, 2005), 136.

230 Ibid. Against Pollard's identification of "The Strategy of Tension," as a mere neo-fascist campaign, it is worth mentioning that the Italian State had not acknowledged this campaign until 2000. Even though Guido Salvini had been investigating the Piazza Fontana bombings since 1988, there had not been any one or any particular organization who had been charged or sentenced to the date. On this note, it is also worth mentioning approaching "The Strategy of Tension," as a campaign against the rise of the "Left" may also fail to see the complete spectrum. Sylvère Lotringer visits Italy in 1979, after the arrests of April 7, 1979 to meet with members of *autonomia*. In 2007, in the second edition of *Autonomia: Post-Political Politics*, Lotringer publishes some notes from his journal in the summer of 1979. In the notes on July 23, 1979,

the tactic to "blame their acts on the Left so as to legitimize more power" for the State and the government, on December 12, 1969 the bombing began in Milan and Rome.[231] Referred as Piazza Fontana bombings, the attack in Milan left seventeen killed and eighty-eight injured in Milan. Police, acting on the information from Military Intelligence and Security Service (SID), arrested two anarchists; one of them, Giuseppe Pinelli died as a result of falling out of the police station window.[232] It was not until October 1974 when "The Strategy of Tension" came to light in a number of dispatches sent to Lisbon by Italian correspondences of Aginter Press.[233]

From Carrera's perspective:

Lotringer mentions a meeting to denounce "the climate of violence caused by those who practice and advocate terrorism," in response to a young Somali who was burnt alive the night before. Lotringer, "In the Shadow of the Red Brigades," vii. Lotringer elaborates on this climate of violence as: "The PCI really wastes no opportunity to confuse the issue, playing down the fact that, between 1969 and 1974, a wave of fascist crimes encouraged by the secret service- it was blamed on the anarchists- was used to regain the ground lost in in 1968. They called it, euphemistically: "The Strategy of Tension." It is at that point that a fraction of the revolutionary Left went underground and that the RB (and a few other terrorist groups like Prima Linea) began their slow ascension into the sky of urban guerrilla warfare." Ibid.

231 Stuart Christie, *Stefano Delle Chiale: Portrait of a Black Terrorist* (London: Anarchy Magazine/Refract Publications, 1984), 26.

232 Ibid., 27-29. Police claimed it was a suicide, where it was the common belief that the police killed him, which later would be made famous by the play *Accidental Death of an Anarchist* by Dario Fo.

233 Ibid. 17. Aginter Press was founded by an ex-French army officer and a member of OAS, the pro-settler terrorist conspiracy within the French army in Algeria (1961-62) with an intention to

> counter nascent national liberation movements in Africa and Asia in such a way that while it might not be possible to prevent the emergence into sovereign statehood of the old colonies and dependencies it should be possible to keep them within the western 'sphere of influence' by securing the eclipse or demise of the more virulently nationalist leaders and their replacement by 'friends of the west.' Ibid.

The declared aims of this agency is reported by Christie as "to focus the attention of an anxious elite upon the perils of insidious subversion which slowly infiltrates through everyday reports, to denounce its methods and the mechanics of its manoeuvres." Ibid. In 1974 May, after the revolution in Portugal, the revolutionary investigators from the Portuguese Armed Forces Movement discover the true functions via such dispatches. In one of those dispatches, the intention is stated as

> the first phase of political activity ought to be to create the conditions favouring the installation of chaos in all of the regime's structures … That will create a feeling of hostility towards those who threaten the peace of each and every nation, and at the same time we must raise up a defender of the citizenry [*sic*] against the disintegration brought about by terrorism and subversion. Ibid., 17.

Also see "Gladio: The Strategy of Tension," in *Moonlight* 2 (Spring 1998) http://struggle.ws/freeearth/fe3_italy.html.

> After 1969, the magical moment that had brought together the radical groups and the traditional workers was over. The workers' unions were exhausted after the long struggle to force the government to sign the Statuto dei Lavoratori (Statute of Laborers). Right-wing reaction was mounting against the labour movement (a neofascist bomb in a Milanese bank on December 12, 1969, signaled the beginning of the terrorist era in Italy), and the gap between students and workers widened again.[234]

On the other hand, Francesco Santini points out December 12, 1969 is a date that concluded the cycle of 1968, only relatively. For Santini, for example, 1970 was equally, if not more significant in Italy once the international context was also taken into account.[235] Regardless the decline and considerable cessation of "hot autumn" after the 1969 events, 1970 was still a year of major social agitation: "The universities and the high schools were still occupied, while the core groups of the workers avoided being absorbed by the "extra-parliamentary" groups, creating their own autonomous networks for mutual contacts."[236]

---

234 Carrera, "On Massimo Cacciari's Disenchanted Activism," 5.

235 Santini, "9. The Retreat. Azione Libertaria and Invariance" in "Apocalypse and Survival," http://libcom.org/library/sections-8-102. He refers to the Polish revolt, Vietnam War and the famous events of Ohio which was violent demonstrations and confrontation with the police in Ohio between May 4 and May 8 as a consequence of Ohio National Guard murdering four students after a demonstration against the war; American invasion of Cambodia.

236 Ibid.

In this context, *Potere operaio* was published as the newspaper of the organization, which appeared in 1969 for the first time at the time of the extensive strikes at Fiat in Turin and after the worker-student assembly was formed, along with the organization 'Lotta continua'. Bologna, "Workerist Publications and Bios," 179. It was a project out of frustration that "combativity then expressed in the factory had not led to an explicit challenge to capital's rule." Wright, *Storming Heaven*, 132. Composed of Negri, Bologna, Piperno and other *operaisti* figures such as Cacciari, Asor Rosa; Wright identifies the project of the group that was initiated after *Classe operaia* as "not only to re-examine the relation between class composition and organization, but to reconsider the very meaning of its central category." The latter project was lent urgency especially after the December 1969 bombings. Ibid. From its factory-oriented stage, *Potere operaio* evolved into a *denial* of any necessary relationship between the labour process and class behavior, as the group started rejecting "the conception of the working class tied to the structure of production- by necessity therefore tied statistically to employment." Ibid., 137-38. Through interpreting the "political upsurge of 'Black Power' in the American ghettos;" "emergence of women as collective subjects of social change," and its elaborations on "the restlessness of Italy's Southern population," and migrant workers; *Potere operaio* broadened its initial "factoryist" mould to perceive working-class. Ibid., 132-35. Before dissolving in the mid-1973; Lotta continua and *Potere operaio* would start splitting on the concept of what were the "positive goals proletarians were pursuing in their struggle against capital," which had never been clear in *Classe operaia*, Wright notes. Where Lotta Continua was against what capitalist society produced as commodities, not social wealth; by abandoning the central category of labour and rejecting the essential category Marxists had traditionally assigned as "to the goal of labour freed from the domination of capital," was replaced

We need to acknowledge 1967-1970 as the period when we see the *operaisti* confronting the consequences of the rhetoric they promulgated until then. The increase in workers' struggles along with newly emerged political subjects against the State, the Party and the unions and the intensification of conflicts amongst the society would not have been possible without the apocalyptic vision the *operaisti* discourse delivered from the early 1960s.[237] This discourse spans from Panzieri's critique of technology in 1961 to the discourse which Tronti prompted "suppression of labor by the working class and the violent destruction of capital are one and the same," in 1966.[238] As Slater argues: "This apocalyptic vision was fundamental to the development of the Italian class struggle in the 1960s and 1970s, even if Tronti himself beat a hasty retreat to the PCI that he had earlier abandoned."[239] As the working class struggle intensified the *operaisti* was forced to either take things further or re-assess their discourse.

Tronti perceives the 1970s with an assumption which suggests: with *autonomia*, "a violent waste of precious human resources had passed hopelessly on the wrong side."[240] Instead of bluntly considering those who participated in *autonomia operaia* as placing themselves "dangerously against" the worker's movement,[241] we need to be able to be more open to understand why some *operaisti* had passed to the "wrong side" of the movement, where some did not and instead confined themselves in an impasse. This would not provide an answer, but allow us to approach to the trajectories which the *operaisti* assigned themselves with after 1968 with scrutiny.

The period of 1967-1970 is significant when we compare the discourse protagonists and antagonists including the *operaisti* and intellectuals such as Tronti, Negri, Cacciari, as well as Tafuri. The *operaisti* revisited their roles as activists, agitators and intellectuals as the *real* social conflicts of 1967-1970 started shaping the radical workers' struggles, rather than the operaisti's analyses. This is a significant period which can reveal us the limits of the intellectuals with their theoretical interventions

---

with an "ethic consumption unfettered by the dictates of accumulation. Ibid., 139. However in 1972, Negri's *Potere operaio* that was on its transformation to *Autonomia Operaia*, would declare "in order to break free, the tendency would be forced to refuse 'blind voluntarism' and confront 'the sour taste of crisis,'" with almost an insurrectional rhetoric. Ibid., 141. Negri would later refer as "the whole strategy of the extra-parliamentary groups -*Potere operaio* included- had been on the wrong side of the track since at least 1971." Ibid., 148.

On this note, Santini reports *Potere operaio* and Lotta contunia were occasionally allied with radicals and anarchists up until 1971. Santini, "9. The Retreat. Azione Libertaria and Invariance" in "Apocalypse and Survival," http://libcom.org/library/sections-8-102.

237 Phil Slater, "Introduction to Panzieri," in *Outlines of a Critique of Technology*, ed. Phil Slater (London and Atlantic Highlands: Ink Links and Humanities Press, 1980): 39-43, 42.

238 Ibid. See Mario Tronti, "Struggle Against Labor," in *Radical America* 6, no.3: 22-27.

239 Ibid.

240 Tronti, "Our Operaismo," 138.

241 Ibid. .

to the culture of struggle and the applicability of their own rhetoric for themselves as intellectuals.[242]

242 Robert Lumley refers to Italy in 1968 and 1969 as experiencing such a Gramscian "organic crisis:"

> There was a massive withdrawal of support and delegation with respect to the structures of representation, especially in the light of the failure of the Centre-Left government to live up to its promises. It was a clear case of the 'ruling class failing to achieve a noteworthy political enterprise for which it had demanded their approval'. Disappointment and disillusionment were registered in the general elections of May 1968 ·when the Socialist Party votes fell dramatically, and the small rival to the left, the PSIUP, won ground. However, the rift between representatives and represented went further." Lumley, *States of Emergency*, 43-44.

Antonio Gramsci, when he was in prison between 1929 and 1935, referred to organic crisis as identifying the moments when social classes come to a point where they no longer identify their traditional parties as their representatives. Party no longer constitutes, represents nor leads them as it is no longer recognised by its "class (or fraction of a class) as its expression."Antoni Gramsci, "State and Civil Society: Observations on Certain Aspects of the Structure of Political Parties in Periods of Organic Crisis," in *Selections From the Prison Notebooks of Antonio Gramsci*, ed. and trans. Quentin Hoare and Geoffrey Nowell Smith (London: ElecBook, 1999), 450. He further elaborates

> These situations of conflict between "represented and representatives" reverberate out from the terrain of the parties ... throughout the State organism, reinforcing the relative power of the bureaucracy (civil and military), of high finance, of the Church, and generally of all bodies relatively independent of the fluctuations of public opinion. ... The crisis creates situations which are dangerous in the short run, since the various strata of the population are not all capable of orienting themselves equally swiftly, or of reorganizing with the same rhythm. The traditional ruling class, which has numerous trained cadres, changes men and programmes and, with greater speed than is achieved by the subordinate classes, reabsorbs the control that was slipping from its grasp. Perhaps it may make sacrifices, and expose itself to an uncertain future by demagogic promises; but it retains power, reinforces it for the time being, and uses it to crush its adversary and disperse his leading cadres, who cannot be very numerous or highly trained. Ibid., 450-51.

Keeping in mind that since the early 1960s the *operaisti* were developing the discourse which was critical of orthodox-Marxism and Italian Left, including Gramsci and his version of the PCI; it might as well be assumed this organic crisis was an intentional consequence of the *operaisti* intellectuals. On this note, I found no particular critique of the *operaisti* in English, in terms of their approach to Antonio Gramsci. On the other hand, Negri's recent account on Gramsci is a portrayal of Gramsci as representing the "Italian difference." See Negri, "The Italian Difference," in *The Italian Difference*, ed. Lorenzo Chiesa and Alberto Toscano:13-23. Where it is clear how their understanding of class struggle and labour movement is quite critical of Gramsci and his notion of the "hegemony," I reckon most of *operaisti* in their post-operaismo discourse lose their distance to Gramscian thought yet simultaneously distance themselves from what I assume to be an intentional effort to confront Gramsci's critique of the intellectuals. Where I can not afford elaborating on this in my thesis, with my emphasis on the role of self-interrogation of the

The picture I draw in this chapter with regards to the *operaisti* of the 1960s suggests that the *operaisti* discourse for intelelctuals themselves was a mere intellectual intervention in the culture of struggle that had limited consequences for the working class struggle. *Quaderni rossi* is significant in this picture as it is where the discourse and the critique the *operaisti* articulated first. With *Classe operaia* the *operaisti* attempted to translate their theoretical analysis into the existing working class struggle, which meant agitating the workers with the magazines, newspapers and journals, which they edited, in front of the factories.[243] Finally, between 1967-1970, the *operaisti* were confronted with the consequences of the radicalism of their critique and the discourse they adopted. Within this confrontation, the *operaisti* dissolved into various tendencies amongst intellectuals; with *autonomia* being one of the threads that tried to project the radical *operaisti* project of the early 1960s by bridging its working class analysis with the newly emerging political subjects of the 1970s.

The *operaisti* discourse might have agitated workers, and students, but had not provided a method or a tactic to confront capitalist development in order to abolish the capitalist society. We need to remind ourselves this was a movement which was critical of the already existing culture and instead prioritized the central role of the working class in their struggle and resistance; in response to the discourse which lacked the emphasis on being the antagonist political subject as well as being the protagonist of the capitalist development. Hence not imposing a *counterplan* to capitalist development for that subject to follow is not a deficiency but an application of the rhetoric the *operaisti* constructed. As long as we do not attack the *operaisti* discourse from this aspect of their analysis, we can be content with their discourse being merely agitation directed at the protagonists of the capitalist development in order to affirm their subversive political subjectivity as they become antagonistic.

However for those who 'agitate,' it is a different story, especially when the agitators happen to be 'intellectuals.' If we choose to be as critical as the *operaisti* were to their precursors, like they were towards Della Volpe or even Panzieri; we are entitled to expect more self-interrogation that inquires into the role of intellectuals within the

---

intellectuals, I believe there is a missing thread I am leaving left-out and I hesitate this. For example, the critique Panzieri delivers in response to the Gramscian "organic intellectuals," in the late 1950s and his identification of those organic intellectuals as merely having their organic ties to the institutions of the working class such as the Party, rather than the working class itself; seem to be altered and progressively overlooked from 1968 and onwards. Wright, *Storming Heaven*, 17. For a contemporary effort to revisit Gramsci's critique of intellectuals, without necessarily being critical of the "organic intellectuals," see Emanuele Saccarelli, "The Intellectual in Question," in *Cultural Studies* 25, no.6 (2011): 757-782; or Boone W. Shear, "Gramsci, Intellectuals, and Academic Practice Today," in *Rethinking Marxism* 20, no.1 (January 2008): 55-67.

243 Tronti reports: "I have never forgotten the lesson we learned at the factory gates, when we arrived with our pretentious leaflets, inviting workers to join the anti-capitalist struggle. The answer, always the same, coming from the hands that accepted our bits of paper. They would laugh and say: 'What is it? Money?'" Tronti, "Our Operaismo," 120.

capitalist development. Given the radicalism of the *operaisti* critique back in the 1960s, intellectuals not being able to practice what they injected to the culture of struggle with their theoretical interventions is a symptom Negri, Tronti, Bologna, Asor Rosa, Cacciari and many others who today are respected as Italian influential philosophers and thinkers suffer from, including Tafuri. In their failure to address the limits of their own roles as intellectuals, we see that they had bitten off more than they could chew with their radical critique of the Left, Marxism, and the capitalist society in the 1960s.[244]

244 In his interrogation after his arrest Negri defines his role as "an intellectual who writes and sells books." See "Negri's Interrogation," trans. III WW and Phil Mattera in *Autonomia: Post-political Politics*, ed. Sylvère Lotringer and Christian Marazzi (Los Angeles: Semiotext(e), 2007): 188-194. For Aureli, Negri who was an 'academic', portrays a problematic image of an intellectual, in comparison to, for example, Tronti. Because Aureli believes, along with Panzieri, Tronti had no interest in "promoting their theories outside the context of political militancy," where Negri "has always been keen to cultivate his position in academia both in Italy and in France." Aureli, *The Project of Autonomy*, 84. Negri is the scapegoat in this critique, which is avoided to be raised to others who were not as enthusiastic and optimistic about the struggles as Negri was. Wright also refers to Negri's academic career ascending in the midst of the riots and protests in the late 1960s, as he was assumed the Chair of State Doctrine in the University of Padua and was "now busy establishing a foothold for the tendency within the academic world," which would later end up with almost all of the department of Political Science at the University of Padua getting arrested, "accused of 'subversion' for having organized and led a group called '*Potere operaio*' (dissolved in 1973!)" Cari, "April 7: Repression in Italy," in *Autonomia: Post-political Politics*, ed. Sylvère Lotringer and Christian Marazzi (Los Angeles: Semiotext(e), 2007), 172. Lucio Castellano in 1979, who was a member of *Metropoli*, refered to the contradiction in terms of intellectuals' takeoff of the antagonism with reference to studies conducted in England back then, that stated the obvious: "statisticians classified various professions on the basis of the life expectancy of the people practicing them ... miners have the shortest life expectancy ... while those with the longest life expectancy are professors, lawyers and politicians." He continues saying:

> It is an observation, in part banal, which should be brought to the attention of the recent glorifiers of manual labor, and which has been wrongly kept out of the ongoing debate on democracy, on violence and death, on the body and on personal daily needs. It could be caustically stated in this manner: the probability that Coletti will live longer than a large majority of his students is well grounded. See Lucio Castellano, "Living with Guerilla Welfare," , trans. Felicia Czin, in *Autonomia: Post-political Politics*, ed. Sylvère Lotringer and Christian Marazzi (Los Angeles: Semiotext(e), 2007): 228-233, 228.

Similarly, with a satirical tone though, Franco Piperno who was wanted by the police, back when he participated in the parodical interrogation to indirectly comment on "the 'seriousness' of the accusations and the theatricality of the media," suggests Negri was able to "pass off political punches that he writes as scientific publications. Something which is not accepted by me, being a physicist. With this system, he has gained the professorship, while I am stabilized." Franco Piperno, "The Naked Truth about Moro's Detention," in *Autonomia: Post-political Politics*, ed. Sylvère Lotringer and Christian Marazzi (Los Angeles: Semiotext(e), 2007): 202-205, 203. While he is ironic in his comments, to some extent, Deleuze actually does imply Negri's professorship needed to be acknowledged as "Negri is a political scientist, an intellectual of high standing in France as well as Italy," who faces a repression "that no longer feels the need to be juridically

4.3 Conclusion to Chapter Four

When we revisit the political framework of Tafuri's 1969 essay in relation to *operaismo*, we need to engage deeper with the context and the events which resulted with the dissolution of *operaismo* and the adoption of various revised readings of the seminal critique the *operaisti* delivered in the 1960s.[245] In the light of this critique,

---

legitimated -since its legitimation is carried out in advance by the Press, the media, 'the organs of public opinion'." Gilles Deleuze, "Open Letter to Negri's Judges," trans. Committee April 7 in *Autonomia: Post-political Politics*, ed. Sylvère Lotringer and Christian Marazzi (Los Angeles: Semiotext(e), 2007): 182-184, 184. None of those, however, answers the question what is the role of an *operaisti* thinker in comparison to the worker whose militancy is studied, appropriated and promoted.

245 On this note, we need to mention that elaborations on the limits of the movements *operaismo* and *autonomia* are haunted by what Gilles Deleuze criticizes in his critique of the legal basis of the arrests and trials that confined the movement. In "Open Letter to Negri's Judges," Deleuze touches on what today seems to be dominating the perception of the extra-parliamentary aspects of *autonomia*: "If we are to believe one French paper (Le Nouvel Observateur), we get the following result: even if Negri were not in the Red Brigades, he is an Autonomist, and 'we all know who the left Autonomists in Italy are'. Whatever the facts, the treatment of Negri becomes justified." Gilles Deleuze, "Open Letter to Negri's Judges," 184.

See, for example, "Interview with Steve Wright on Storming Heaven," in *Wildcat* no.70 (Summer 2004): 9-12. http://www.wildcat-www.de/en/wildcat/70/w70_steve_en.htm. Even though Wright claims he is critical of most of the *operaisti* because they shied away from following their "truly radical intuitions," his identification of the "rationals," who "kept trying to 'look for political content and strategy within class composition itself' – as opposed to the likes of Negri, who just 'took their dreams for reality'," fails to push us outside and beyond the project of *operaismo* nor touch upon the role of the intellectuals' in with their analysis and studies of the labour movement.

In his critique, Deleuze identifies the lack of engagement of those who with the context and events which resulted with assaults of people by armed groups and "Legge Reale." See Deleuze, "Open Letter to Negri's Judges," 182-184. This piece was originally published in La Repubblica, after the 1979 arrests. "Legge Reale" was a body of laws introduced in 1975 that extended custody period for up to four years before an actual trial and was reinforced by the referendum of 1978 with the joined forces of Christian Democrats and the Communist Party: "purportedly against terrorism, which severely curtails personal freedom giving the police the right to shoot individuals without any legal consequences." Lotringer, "In the Shadow of the Reg Brigades," v.

The dichotomy between *operaismo* and *autonomia* already fails to contain the complete spectrum of the culture of struggle the Italian Left experienced in the 1960s and the 1970s. Even within this dichotomy, there are a number of tactics and methods political subjects adopted, which are equally overlooked. Cuninghame's study on *Autonomia*, for example, demonstrates that *autonomia* as a political movement in the 1970s cannot be reduced to one but comprises many autonomies. Those autonomies ranging from "microfractons" that seek for a "party" hegemony to clandestine groups to protect members from police and fascists at demonstrations; from workplace militants to "a creative wing" that was preoccupied with the politics of subversive communication Steve Wright, "A Party of Autonomy?" in *The Philosophy of Antonio Negri: Resistance in Practice*, ed. Timothy S. Murphy and and Abdul-Karim Mustapha (London: Pluto Press, 2005):73-106, 76. Having said this, it would not be unjust to distinguish the *operaisti* from the autonomists of the 1970s from one another in light of the strategies and tactics autonomists theorized and applied in contrast to the rest of the *operaisti* group who instead believed in re-consolidating the working-class struggle within PCI. However it is equally, if not more, crucial to point out that from 1968 onwards, intellectuals' different approaches and understanding of the *operaisti* theoretical endeavors that was accumulated

the leap from 1969 "Toward a Critique of Architectural Ideology" to 1973 *Progetto e utopia* is a big one which is not substantial unless we inquire deeper in order to justify why we assume those two works need to be considered identical and why we equate their political frameworks to one another.

Within the reading of the period I provided with my narration of the *operaisti* project *Contropiano* stands out to be a medium which nourished growing ruptures amongst the *operaisti*. Negri's departure in 1968 marks the first fracture via *Contropiano* in the project, while Cacciari's debate with Negri and his articulation of "negative thought" as of 1970 mark further fractures. In this picture, the later version of Tafuri's 1969 essay in 1973 volume as well as his project as a historian find their proper context.

Once we re-visit "Toward a Critique of Architectural Ideology" and *Architecture and Utopia* from this perspective, we can see that Tafuri re-visits his arguments in his 1969 essay with the 1973 volume. In 1973 Tafuri posits that:

> 'Negative thought' had enunciated its own project for survival in its refutation of the Hegelian dialectic and a recovery of the contradictions this had eliminated. 'Positive thought' does nothing but overturn that negativeness on itself. The negative is revealed as such, in its 'ineluctability'. Resignation to it is only a first condition for making possible the perpetuation of the intellectual disciplines; for making possible the recovery for intellectual work (at the price of destroying its 'aura') of the tradition of its 'sacred' extraneousness to the world; for providing a reason, no matter how minimal, for its survival. The downfall of reason is now acclaimed the realization of reason's own historic mission. In its cynicism intellectual work plays its cards to the ambiguous limit of irony.[246]

Hence for Tafuri, the arguments he presented in his 1969 essay can not be perceived as asserting the prophecy of "death of architecture," but quite the opposite: a

since the early 1960s started to reveal the limits of the intellectuals that lead to the dissolution within the *operaisti*. What we fail to acknowledge is that the dissolution of the *operaisti* and trajectories opened up by 1968 were not happening in a vacuum that was only constituted of intellectuals' intervention to the culture of struggle. The social conflict that was reaching its peaks was encapsulating the political framework which we tend to reduce to an almost natural dichotomy between an early *operaismo* movement against a later *autonomia* movement.

246 Tafuri, *Architecture and Utopia*, 76. Tafuri's essay "Toward a Critique of Architectural Ideology" was published in the January-February 1969 issue of *Contropiano*; written somehow earlier as Tafuri says. December 12, 1969 bombings took place approximately ten months after Tafuri's 1969 essay, and five months before his 1970 essay "Intellectual Work and Capitalist Development" was published. Cacciari's essay on negative thought; and Tafuri's publication of *Progetto e utopia* are respectively in 1970 and 1973.

potential for the architect to continue practicing without relinquishing their professional ground. In the concluding chapter he addresses the *need* to embrace the roles assigned to the architects within the new forms of capitalist development to be able to move on from the analysis and the critique in the 1969 essay. Right before dismissing "hopes in design," he concludes his arguments in the conclusion of *Architecture and Utopia* as follows:

> Only at this point-that is after having done away with any disciplinary ideology- is it permissible to take up the subject of the new roles of the technician, of the planner, within the compass of the new forms of capitalist development. And thus also to consider the possible tangencies or inevitable contradictions between such a type of technical-intellectual work and the material conditions of the class struggle.[247]

The 1969 essay is an agitation where Tafuri adopts the discourse which influences his intellectual and academic formation. The essay is not a blueprint, nor a prelude to Tafuri's project as a historian. It is an utilization of the discourse which exposes the architectural practice's inherent relationship with capitalist structures in terms of materializing ideology of the bourgeoise project, and in terms of its own ideology as a discipline that is in the service of capitalist development. It also points to the architects' past, present and possible-future contradictions when they assume a role in the working class struggle. On the other hand, *Progetto e utopia* and/or *Contropiano*, do indeed fulfill the roles they have been granted by writers who return to the 1960s and the 1970s political context in Italy to have a more appropriate understanding of Tafuri's project. Both *Progetto e utopia* and *Contropiano* provide a political as well as a theoretical framework for Tafuri's pursue of the struggle which he, along with other intellectuals, granted themselves the roles on behalf of the working class as analyzing the questions to do with class struggle at an "historical-theoretical level" and at a contemporary-militant level (recalling the early 1960s sociology initiated with Panzieri and *Quaderni rossi*: workers' science) as well as the "ideal and cultural superstructures of mass capitalistic society" (critique of ideology).

It is the readers decision to judge whether such a role intellectuals including the one Tafuri assigned to himself, had delivered anything more than what *operaisti* intellectuals had foreseen with their analyses regarding workers' struggles contribution to capitalist development once workers' subjective political agency had been appropriated by institutions or other classes who claim and acquire rights to intervene to the working class struggle within labour movement. And in the light of the answer to this question, we might grant ourselves the right to assume the projects associated with the magazine *Contropiano* and the 1973 volume *Progetto e utopia* to collapse on

247 Ibid., 182.

top of the essay or not.

In this picture, approaching the essay via Tafuri, his later works and his later career as a historian is problematic. As it simply overlooks the particular context of Tafuri's 1969 essay; which we should expect the otherwise from those who return to the 1960s and 1970s Italy. In architectural discourse, this confrontation is possible via re-visiting Tafuri's 1969 essay as it stands out as a piece which loses its potential impact and becomes diluted as the 1960s *operaisti* discourse becomes equally diffused. From this perspective, Aureli and Day who revisit Tafuri and the political framework of the 1960s and 1970s Italy, fall short of what I expect. With their inquiries, they do not acknowledge the difference between the context of Tafuri's 1969 essay and his 1973 volume. Instead they take it for granted that those two works are the same, in spite of their return to the political framework encompassing *operaismo* and *autonomia*. Hence I approach their inquiries critically.

CHAPTER FIVE

WRITING THAT RETURNS TO THE POLITICAL FRAMEWORK OF THE ESSAY

5.1 Introduction to Chapter Five

To establish the connection between the 1969 essay and the 1973 volume, we first need to take into consideration the 1970 essay on intellectual work which Tafuri publishes in *Contropiano* and how he enmeshes his arguments in the 1970 essay along with the political project Cacciari and other contributors to *Contropiano* articulated from 1968 to 1971 in his 1973 volume. Unless we do so, and convince ourselves that the link we establish between the two works grants us the right to overlook the essay's particularity in favor of its later articulation, we have to confront the contents of the essay in relation to its particular context.

We can pragmatically establish the historical continuity between 1969 and 1973 Italy without confronting the factors which lead to the dissolution of *operaismo* between 1967-1970 and the significance of the transformation of the discourse the *operaisti* adopted in relation to those factors in the early 1970s. However this would still not substantiate reducing or expanding the 1969 essay and the 1973 volume with one another, as they stand out to be exclusive from one another within their proper contexts.

As I stated in the introduction to my work, I find it is crucial for my generation of architects, interns and architecture students to be able to approach the post 1960s architectural discourse from a critical perspective as the transformation of the contemporary economic, political and social structures signal a reevaluation of that discourse. The significance of identifying the particularity of the 1969 essay points out trajectories critiquing architectural ideology. Those are the trajectories that the preceding generation of architects, architectural historians and theoreticians overlooked. What is more, the discourse which is built on the rationalization of the inherent and implicit relationship of the architect with capitalist structures is not as useful as it was to overcome the crisis architects faced back in the 1960s. Re-visiting Tafuri's 1969 essay in its particular context may initiate an interrogative analysis and understanding of contemporary art and practice of architecture with a more critical approach to the preceding generations. In the light of this argument, in this chapter I look at contemporary writing which returns to the political framework of Tafuri's essay.

Pier Vittorio Aureli's long essay that was published in 2008 as *The Project of Autonomy: Politics and Architecture within and Against Capitalism* is a seminal text in twenty-first century architectural discourse for those who are interested in architectural theory and history of the 1960s and 1970s. It provides a comprehensive study of 1960s and 1970s Italian politics within architectural discourse. Except, he too hastily reduces *operaismo* to the work of one *operaista*: Mario Tronti. He tests *autonomia* against *operaismo* in order to demonstrate the irrelevance of *autonomia* to contemporary architectural debates and resistance to capitalist structures.

In his 2009 paper "Intellectual Work and Capitalist Development: Origins and Context of Manfredo Tafuri's Critique of Architectural Ideology," he pays attention to Manfredo Tafuri's 1969 essay and provides an important re-contextualization for Tafuri's work to find its proper political framework. With his account, however, the agitating arguments in the 1969 essay are neutralized as Tafuri's impasse as a historian of his kind is rationalized.

It may be the case that Aureli favours a Tafuri whose critique of the implicit and inherent relationship between the architect and the capitalist structures cannot have any further implications than what it already provided. The limit of those implications may lie in the limit Tafuri himself possess in relation to his project as an intellectual endeavour. What I find problematic with Aureli's position is not necessarily the rationalization of the impasse Tafuri's project, and it being yet another inquiry in order to legitimize the post-1968 rhetoric architectural discourse adopted.

I find Aureli's account problematic because he fails to address the distinction between the 1969 essay, and the 1973 volume, despite the fact that he returns to Tafuri and his 1969 essay while he is addressing its relation to Tafuri's 1970 essay "Intellectual Work and Capitalist Development." I argue that with his inquiry, the political framework of the essay is obscured and misinterpreted. In his attempt to tune the way architectural circles approach to Tafuri's 1969 essay, as we inquire more into Aureli's study on this context and Tafuri's works, it becomes clear that he shows no intention to contest or challenge the post 1960s architectural discourse and their reading of Tafuri.

In 2005 Gail Day publishes her essay "Strategies in the Metropolitan Merz: Manfredo Tafuri and Italian Workerism" which can be considered as another seminal work for architectural circles that return to the political framework of Italian *operaismo* and *autonomia* movements.[1] In 2011 she publishes her book *Dialectical Passion* where she further articulates her essay, which becomes a chapter in her book that deals with twentieth century post-war culture of art and theory that developed "in the wake

1 Gail Day, "Strategies in the Metropolitan Merz: Manfredo Tafuri and Italian Workerism," in *Radical History* 133 (September/October 2005): 26-38.

of the New Left."[2] Her study of the period is well-grounded, more substantial than Aureli's. She provides a well-sustained political framework for Tafuri's *Architecture and Utopia.*

Day approaching Tafuri can be compelling for those who intend to go beyond the pessimistic outlook Tafuri's work may possess. However her lack of emphasis on the difference between the political formation of Tafuri's project and the political project she ascribes to Tafuri in relation to 1960s and 1970s Italy is problematic. The more we try to apprehend Day's apologetic approach towards Tafuri and his project in order to find a relevance to his project in twenty-first century architectural discourse, the more we see that the political context of the 1969 essay is obscured while the agitating aspects of the essay are overlooked.

5.2 Pier Vittorio Aureli and his narration of 1960s and 1970s Italy

Aureli's inquiry in 2008 stands as a primary source for us to try locating architectural practice and theory in 1960s and 1970s Italy with reference to *operaismo* and *autonomia* movements. Unfortunately Aureli's work further obscures the political framework that *operaisti* thinking presented which is already hardly accessible to English-speaking audience at the time of writing.

To have access to the complete spectrum of pamphlets and publications is already limited for the English-speaking audience. Unless one is literate in Italian, one is bound to fail to grasp an objective apprehension of the movement. Only if we put extra-effort and insist on digging under the surface of readings of the period, we acquire a slightly less fixed and biased understanding of the period. On top of this already selective literature in English, Aureli prioritizes certain authors and aspects of the movement that draw a particular image of the period. If one is not willing to expand on Aureli's study to see a slightly bigger picture, it is hard for a generation who are not first-hand participants of that context to be able to return to such a context and find relevance of it to today. Especially with regards to *The Project of Autonomy*, Aureli's work needs to be approached with scrutiny.[3]

---

2 Gail Day, *Dialectical Passions,* 23.

3 I am not after reviewing Aureli's book in my thesis. However for a review of Aureli's book by another writer whose research interest overlaps with his, see Gail Day, review of *The Project of Autonomy: Politics and Architecture Within and Against Capitalism by Pier Vittorio Aureli* in "*Review Articles," Historical Materialism* 18 (2010): 219-236. Gail Day is also critical of Aureli's approach to the political framework of Italy in the 1960s and 1970s. Unlike mine though, her critique targets the centrality of Aldo Rossi in T*he Project of Auotonomy*, as she argues Aureli's preoccupation with Asor Rosi shadows the emphasis which Tafuri deserves. Day, review of *The Project of Autonomy,* 222. Regardless, Aureli's prioritization of one aspect of *operaismo* is problematic according to Day as well. She thinks Aureli fails to do justice to what Day refers as the "Trontian," perspective. For Day, Aureli is speaking from this perspective in terms of "its analysis of the present, and in terms of both its approach to questions of architectural

For Aureli, *operaismo* spans the decade 1961-1971, which encompasses journals *Quaderni rossi*, *Classe operaia* and *Contropiano*.[4] Aureli summarizes the sequence of three journals as follows:

> If the theoretical contribution of *Quaderni Rossi* had been focussed on the concept of autonomy as a critique of technological development, and if *Classe operaia* had taken autonomy to be a form of workers' initiative, Tronti's subsequent reflections on the autonomy of the political turned the Operaist approach to the level of State institutions, posing a Marxist-Communist 'counterplan' to the one of liberal capitalism. Around this hypothesis was launched the final journal of the Operaist movement, *Contropiano*.[5]

According to Aureli, the project set up by *Contropiano* was "to develop … a radical political class culture, which, instead of taking for granted the imminent revolution … opted for a longer-term, realistic counterplan to capitalism."[6] On this point, it is important to question whether *Contropiano* was an attempt to be a "counterplan" as itself, or attempted to provide a medium for this counterplan to be developed. I argue for the latter. However Aureli is not clear whether *Contropiano*, which eventually became an experiment for the effectiveness of "negative thought" as a method to confront neocapitalism, is itself the *counterplan* or not.

Aureli seems to automatically assign what *Contropiano* offered was along on the lines with Tronti's embracement of the autonomy of the political elite who he assumed would subvert the Party. This however, is to assume such intellectual interventions were happening in a vacuum which were only affecting the subjects of their inquiries, without being affected by their struggle and conflicts. *Contropiano* did acquire this role in time, as Cacciari developed his philosophy and as contributors to *Contropiano* aligned themselves with Tronti as well as Cacciari's philosophy.

---

historiography and to debates relevant to the emancipatory project." Ibid., 229. In the position which Aureli confines himself, however, the emphasis on Rossi misses the real contribution of Aureli's perspective would provide. Ibid., 230. Day suggests Aureli ignores the "more classical-Marxist" approach Rossi actually possessed and concludes "Rossi does not propose an architectural equivalent of the Trontian." Ibid, 229. Apart from partaking in "the mutations within Marxist cultural thought in the mid-twentieth century," Day finds it unclear what Rossi's approach share with "workerism" at the first place. Ibid., 228. What Aureli should have done instead was, Day argues, to confront "*discorso tafuriano* [Tafurian discourse] or bourgeoining academic industry of 'Tafuriana'" and give more attention to the key moment *Contropiano* was found after the split of the magazine and output of the Venice-school, which Aureli tried to sidestep. Ibid., 230. Day does not mention or refer to Aureli's 2009 paper where to some extent he does so.

4 Aureli, *The Project of Autonomy*, 84.

5 Ibid., 43-44.

6 Ibid., 45

However, *Contropiano*, in contrast to *Quaderni rossi* and *Potere operaio*; did not start with an objective, as I mentioned in Chapter Four. After the second issue it assumed for itself a role as an intervention on a cultural level, without necessarily contesting its elitist attitude to ascribe itself as a Trojan horse for the workers to the "walls of organized labour movement."[7] Besides this assumption at the time of publishing, it was not necessarily a "counterplan" that was aimed at the level of State institutions: it was a ground for analysis and critique for such a *counterplan* to be possible. Those debates which stayed on the level of intellectual endeavours were petrified as "the counterplan" in time, with the help of efforts similar to Aureli's. And this counterplan got eventually adopted in order to legitimize the postulation of yet another autonomous political class other than the one the operaisti were critical of in the 1960s to represent the working class struggle.

Clearly Aureli is not the only intellectual who approaches *Contropiano* as such. Aureli's account for *Contropiano* and the role he ascribes to it through Tronti's politics seem to resonate with Patrizia Lombardo's narration of the journal. Lombardo argues the second issue of *Contropiano* was crucial in terms of its significance in the debates on joining the party "in spite of disagreements with its main tenet" against reinforcing the *operaisti* thought of anti-state interventionist position.[8] Lombardo argues *Contropiano*

> insisted on the balance between theory and action ... Knowledge and action -or theory and practice- were perceived as equally impotent, but the emphasis on the priority of knowledge, description and analysis of phenomena implied the criticism of an agitation for its own sake. This criticism, particularly important coming from *operaisti* activists, shows a certain faith in institutional forms.[9]

Lombardo establishes the connection between Cacciari and *Contropiano* in a crooked way as she reports "after the first issues of *Contropiano* appeared, Cacciari joined the PCI."[10] We should note, however, it is reported that Cacciari would not join the PCI until 1976.[11] Although one can conclude that *Contropiano* as the "counterplan,"

7 Carrera, "On Massimo Cacciari's Disenchanted Activism," 6.

8 Lombardo, "The Philosophy of the City," xvi.

9 Ibid., xvi

10 Ibid., xvii.

11 Carrera, "On Massimo Cacciari's Disenchanted Activism," 1. Still, Lombardo would be correct chronologically, since 1976 is after the publication of first issues of *Contropiano* indeed, as well as the last issue, though. Lombardo does mention Cacciari waited until Berlinger's historic compromise to change the wind within the PCI to have a tendency toward a social-democratic position. Which is only after 1972, when he becomes the secretary and declares his party's autonomy from the Soviet Communist Party in Moscow in 1976. Tafuri, for example, on the other hand would leave the party after the congress of Communist Party in 1976 where Berlinguer's talk

which played a role in substantiating and developing the theoretical ground for some intellectuals to endorse PCI as a legitimate medium to contribute to the working class struggle, *Contropiano* can hardly be argued to have been launched around the agenda that *operaisti* approach should turn to the level of State institutions, especially the Party. It was more of a medium where articulation of such a hypothesis happened eventually. We also need to remember that what *Contropiano* is portrayed to be presenting as the "counterplan" was not only controversial amongst *operaisti* intellectuals, but also for the contributors to the journal itself, as it housed one of the last fractures amongst *operaisti* intellectuals with regards to their understanding of their roles as intellectuals. Even after the first issue the journal is assigned a role by the editors, its role was more related to its insistence on what Asor Rosa identifies as "analysis of the questions to do with class struggle;" and "analysis of the ideal and cultural superstructures of mass capitalistic society."[12] Today, we may look back and conclude that the role which *Contropiano* was assigned, was to test the Trontian hypothesis. "*Indici,*" published in the last issue of *Contropiano*, demonstrates this fact, as the editors assign a theme to every contribution made to the magazine by intellectuals as they list and index the articles.[13] However, it would be overreaching to grant this role to *Contropiano* as if the magazine was meant to be this sort of a counter-plan against the plan of capitalist development since the moment the magazine was conceived.

If we approach *Contropiano* in relation to the early 1960s *operaisti* discourse, we need to remind ourselves of how this discourse was constructed: it was through the identification of the problems with institutions and groups which were exterior to the working class imposing their strategies and tactics to the actual working class struggle. As readers, if we were satisfied with Aureli's narration, then we could be convinced that the conflicting positions of Tronti himself as an *operaista* demonstrated the general tendency amongst intellectuals. Hence the disconnection between the earlier *operaisti* discourse and the one Cacciari adopted could have been assumed as insignificant. Once we return to 1960s and 1970s Italy in order to study *operaismo* and *autonomia* movements, we can not help but become aware of the debates amongst intellectuals as well as the social conflict and struggles that encapsulate the social and the political context all together. It seems, however, Aureli is convinced that the Trontian perspective, in terms of its progress from the early 1960s to the 1970s needs no further articulation.

Aureli quotes Tronti in 1964 where he argues:

> the tasks of the workers' party are: not to support capitalism's

made Tafuri think that Berlinguer was negating all of their work. Tafuri, "History as Project," 61.

12 Asor Rosa, "Critique of Ideology and Historical Practice," 29.

13 See "Indici per autore e per tema (1968-1971)." in *Contropiano* 3 (1971): 679-.

> needs, not even in the form of worker's demands; to force the capitalist to present their objective necessities and the subjectively refuse them; to force the bosses to ask so that the workers can actively -that is, in organized forms- reply to them: no.[14]

After a few pages, he quotes Tronti from 1972 and later his 1996 book *La politica al tramonto* (The Sunset of Politics) in order to justify the position when Tronti literally turns his attention to the level of State institutions but now argues for workers to appropriate, as Aureli puts: "the very weapon that had so far been employed by the bourgeoise as a means of achieving their defeat: the notion of negativity as an extreme form of capitalist mastery."[15] Aureli appropriates from the first line of argument of Tronti to suggest how *operaisti* thinking allowed an alternative to the orthodox Marxism; which was indeed seminal for the *operaisti* critique: in order to legitimize Tronti's later commitment to the Party politics. Establishing Tronti's further articulation on his own politics as the *operaisti* project begs the question how convincing to treat Aureli's approach to 1960s and 1970s Italy as an objective inquiry.

Aureli returns to *Classe operaia*, Tronti's "Lenin in England," and Negri's "Workers without allies," in order to provide the foundations of Trontian perspective he favours. Between those texts, lies the fundamental difference of Tronti's autonomy of the political from Negri's in relation to working class and the Party, he argues.[16] This difference would come to surface in 1971 with the second edition of Tronti's *Operai e capitale*. As Aureli says:

> The second edition of Tronti's *Operai e capitale* ... concluded not with a discussion of the workers' strategy of refusal but with its counterpart: the political development of capitalism under Roosevelt during the 1930s, understood as the most advanced answer to the most advanced form of workers' struggle -the American working-class movement.[17]

In between two editions of *Operai e capitale* and Tronti's re-consideration of the "Strategy of Refusal;" in other words, between Negri and Tronti's concept of working class struggle, are the events and writing that Aureli does not mention. Indeed,

---

14 Aureli, *The Project of Autonomy*, 39. Aureli cites Tronti, "Forza-lavoro classe operaia," in *Operai e capitale*.

15 Ibid., 41. See ibid., 39-41 where Aureli spans the Trontian perspective from early 1960s with his *Operai e capitale* to to 1972; Tronti, Sull'autonomia del politico (Milan: Fetrinelli, 1977) which originally was articulated by Tronti as the autonomy of the political in 1972 at a seminar organized by Noberto Bobbio at the faculty of political science in Turin; and *La politica al tramonto* (Turin: Einaudi, 1998).

16 Aureli, *The Project of Autonomy*, 44.

17 Ibid., 42.

Tronti's analysis on the American workers' struggle may have affected his perception on the working class movement in Italy. Equally important are: the 1968 movement and Tronti's hesitation towards the new class in comparison to Negri's enthusiasm; the Party's and the Unions' approach to the new political subjects who started claiming the political domain from 1968 onwards in Italy; the intensification of the social struggles as of 1969 and the atmosphere of terror created by the "Strategy of Tension:" a few items which I tried to put relatively more emphasis on in Chapter Four to understand the dissolution of the *operaisti* critique in the late 1960s.

Without mentioning those other components of the political framework for Tronti's *operaismo*, it is too much of a reduction to imply that for the *operaisti*, Tronti's line of thinking was irrefutable and provided a rigid opposition to Negri's. Aureli resolves or embraces the possible problems or conflicting aspects of Tronti's politics a little too readily, but it does not stop him from endorsing it as he refers to Tronti's 1998 work in order to explain his autonomy of the politics in the 1970s:

> It was necessary to draw on what the great bourgeois thinkers had discovered in the relations between the bourgeoisie and capitalism, namely the role of crisis within the economic system and ability of capitalism to internalize the collapse of the rigid teleological foundations of modern politics by means of a culture that systematically turned negativity into an engine of its own reproduction.[18]

Within this picture, Tafuri's 1969 essay is assigned a place in *Contropiano* after Tronti's "Estremisti e riformisti" ("Extremists and reformists"). According to Aureli, in his essay Tronti "declared that neither reformist nor extremist political attitudes could be the weapon of the working-class movement with respect to the *negative modus operandi* of capitalism, since the latter had the capacity to absorb and finally resolve every crisis within its structures."[19] *Contropiano*'s project was, as Tronti believed, envisioning the possibility of the antagonistic culture's own institutionalization, according to Aureli. It was meant to be "a political critique of political economy and its stubborn assumption of economics as the primary determinant of historical development."[20] Therefore, within this narration of the project, Tafuri's 1969 essay was "meant to be the institute's methodological blueprint."[21] But the answer to the question, what it was meant to achieve with the blueprint, is unclear.

Tronti's aim to re-appropriation of the Party by the help of the intellectuals' instrumentalization of party politics failed in 1976 with the Historical Compromise.

18 Ibid., 41.
19 Ibid., 48.
20 Ibid.
21 Ibid., 49.

For Aureli it seems that the success or failure of the project that depended on "the radical political elite" of Tronti, "who acted outside the Communist Party but eventually taking it over and pushing it in the direction of a more radical political position,"[22] does not matter too much. Or at least, his intention is not directed towards giving an account of failure or success of this version of *operaismo*.

Instead Aureli contemplates the failure of "the post-Operaist Autonomia," as he seems to adopt an attitude a little too cynical towards the possibility of believing in the destruction of capitalist society and its institutions:

> Throughout the 1960s all the protagonists of the cultural project of autonomy had used theory as a strategic preparation for the new role that their disciplines were to play in the public arena. ... However, if the 1960s were characterized by a messianic expectation of a new revolutionary subject, the 1970s was a period in which many militants discovered that revolutions in the affluent countries of Western Europe could only take the form of isolated revolts. If this reality pushed militant creativity toward innovative but less politicized forms of struggle, it left unchallenged the whole political class dominating the ruling institutions ... What arose within this desolate scenario of the collapse and confusion of the political ... was a radicalism without any urgency.[23]

I do not argue for or intend to suggest Aureli's narration of *Trontian perspective* is wrong, biased or misleading. This would be quite a separate argument from the one I intend to make. However, in the light of what I tried to demonstrate in Chapter Four, what Aureli does not mention, and chooses to put emphasis on instead, exposes the problems with Aureli's position and approach to this context.

Aureli posits right from the start that "Tronti's notion of the autonomy of the political: the discovery of an autonomous dimension of political power within the tradition of working class" is "the most legitimate theoretical consequence of Operaism."[24] His argument stands on an assumption, which he is not troubling himself to substantiate.[25] On top of this assertion, he argues that the *autonomia*

22 Ibid., 45.

23 Ibid., 80.

24 Ibid., 9.

25 Except his footnote where he says, referring to Tronti's seminar in 1972 on the notion of political autonomy, "in my view, it is precisely the argument of autonomy of the political from economic determination- as presented by Tronti in 1972- that is the core and essence of Operaism." Ibid., 84. His argument stands on the "most detailed and precise reconstruction of Operaism," he refers to the interview with Rita di Leo in Giuseppe Trotta ed., "Per una storia di Classe Operaia," in *Bailamme* 24/2 (1999) 173-205.

movement was able to explain how "capitalism had changed and evolved into its present form," yet it is not able to explain how "the subject struggling against the Empire of capitalism had moved ... forward."[26] The *operaisti* of the 1960s had elaborated, pretty much solely, on this in their critique of orthodox Marxism: those two moments (advancement of capitalist structures and reforms through which antagonists' struggles were instrumentalized by capitalist development) are not distinguishable from one another; nor they are separate phenomena. This is the underlying premise on which Panzieri criticized the orthodox labour movement and demonstrated how capitalist structures depended on the workers as protagonists of the development; hence Tronti articulated the plan of the capital and agitated the workers in front of factories to say no to work; hence Negri believed in sabotaging the production line, and so on.

What Aureli misses, overlooks, or forgets is that the *operaisti* project, until its dissolution, was not a project to resolve the crisis the middle class or the bourgeoise was facing in the 1960s as intellectuals, academics or architects. Both *operaismo* and *autonomia* were projects, which sought to, literally, destroy capitalist society. Therefore if we are to expect something from those movements, beyond explanations of the *phenomenon of capitalist development*, it should be an endeavour which actually challenges or contests capitalist structures and the society. To some extent, after the experience at *Quaderni rossi*, Tronti proposed the ultimate answer which he later distanced himself from the militant version of this refusal: to say no to capitalist structures. And it was on this note that Negri perceived the debates happening in *Classe operaia* on non-existent lines as theory hardly confronted "things."[27] This would later be the defining feature of *autonomia* from *operaismo* with the interest in applying the theory with militancy in factory. Later to be appropriated by the autonomist-Marxist discourse in twenty first-century, as Kathi Weeks would argue: "the call to refuse the present system of work rather than simply reconsider or re negotiate a few of its terms and conditions:" would come from the perception of worker as a potential subjective political agent whose anarchy can subvert capitalist structures, the theoretical framework that was supported by grass root worker militancy in Italy depended on the tradition of civil disobedience.[28] She extends this analysis with reference to Hardt and Negri's *Empire*:

> The refusal of work ... as both activism and analysis, does not only pose itself against the present organization of work; it should also be understood as a creative practice, one that seeks reappropriate and to reconfigure existing forms of production and reproduction. ... Rather than being a goal in itself, 'The

26 Aureli, *The Project of Autonomy*, 10.

27 Antonio Negri, *Gli operaisti*, interview with Negri. 242.

28 Weeks, "The Refusal of Work as Demand and Perspective," 129.

> refusal of work and authority, or really the refusal of voluntary servitude, is the beginning of liberatory politics.'[29]

Regardless what trajectory Tronti adopted after 1968, it would not be unjust to suggest Tronti's take on the "autonomy of the political" aimed at the "liberatory politics." Then again, Tronti would refer to what Negri believed to be the praxis of *operaisti* critique as "the radicalization of discourse on the autonomy of the political from the early 70s."[30] For Tronti, this trajectory which was opened up by his analysis "was born from this failure of the insurrectionary movements, from the workers' struggles to the youth revolt, that had spanned the decade of the 60s."[31]

Operaisti targeted the capitalist society, capitalist structures, its institutions, its dominance. Regardless their conflicting approaches after a series of fractures, Negri and Tronti were part of this culture that was against the capitalist society. However, both Tronti and Negri would acknowledge their projects' failure. Unlike Tronti, however, Negri does so without necessarily calling the prevailing dominance of capitalist structures as a defeat:

> The victory of the authorities in the late 1970s did not reaffirm the old system but, on the contrary, profoundly modified it, making possible new forms of resistance and struggle, new lines of flight. … This was a moment, then, of great historical changes: the transition from Fordism to post-Fordism, from the modern to the postmodern.[32]

In short, *operaisti* critique was aimed at capitalist society, in order to relinquish it, but failed. For Aureli, such a project must be incomprehensible. That might be why he is confusing the limited tactics and strategies of the *operaisti* with their intentions. On this inflected approach to the project of the *operaisti*, Aureli structures his version of the narration of those projects. By doing so, Aureli can be considered as returning to their political context for mere pragmatic reasons one can argue and as an academic inquiry.[33]

---

29 Ibid., 122.

30 Tronti, "Our Operaismo," 135.

31 Tronti, "Our Operaismo," 134.

32 Antonio Negri, *Negri on Negri*, 41-42. I guess it would be a more fair to call Tronti would probably agree with the "victory of the authorities" and the historical significance of the moment, rather than Negri's articulations on the new forms of struggle and resistance which he had been elaborating on with Hardt since the bestseller *Empire*. To repeat what I cited from Tronti earlier: "The maximum disorder renewed the existing order. Everything changed so that everything essential could stay the same." Tronti, "Our Operaismo," 126.

33 Or we can be more cynical and suggest he is intentionally delivering an ideological endeavour. As Aureli suggests, in his demonstration of two different types of autonomies he depicts in his narration of the period, he argues "these two types of autonomy projects -one applied to

One year after he publishes *The Project of Autonomy*, Aureli returns to the same context in his essay "Intellectual Work and Capitalist Development: Origins and Context of Manfredo Tafuri's Critique of Architectural Ideology." In this piece Aureli specifically focuses on Tafuri within the context which he had already established in *The Project of Autonomy*.[34] It is via Tafuri's work on intellectual labour, Aureli posits Cacciari's "negative thought" to encapsulate the political project at stake in Tafuri's two essays published in *Contropiano*: "Toward a Critique of Architectural Ideology," and his 1970 article "Lavoro intellettuale e sviluppo capitalistico" ("Intellectual Work and Capitalist Development"). Within this framework Aureli explains -or rather justifies-, along with other writers who study Tafuri, Tafuri's impasse as an intellectual.

Aureli says, Tafuri's 1970 article "Intellectual Work and Capitalist Development" remained in the shadow of his 1969 essay "Toward a Critique of Architectural Ideology." It is the connection between two articles Aureli wants to expose. He proposes that if we re-approach Tafuri in the light of his 1970 essay where he reflects on the nature of intellectual work itself, we see that Tafuri's critique "was not only directed towards architecture and its project, but also concerned with the theme of 'intellectual work' and with culture in general."[35]

To some extent, it would be unfair to suggest Aureli misses the crucial aspect of the debates on the role of the intellectuals. In *The Project of Autonomy* under the subsection "Autonomy and Intellectuals," Aureli touches on this issue with reference to Italo Calvino and Pier Paolo Pasolini who, Aureli argues, "accepted … their own position vis-à-vis the social relationships imposed by the new system of production," in contrast to Franco Fortini who "went beyond the myth of cultural consumption in order to question the role of intellectuals as producers of culture, and eventually of an autonomous position within capitalism."[36] Fortini, as Aureli cites perceived this group's "initial and radical refusal of the historical 'reality' that surrounds them," resembling certain aristocratic societies.[37] Aureli takes this notion of intellectual

politics, one applied to the city- were not about the destruction of capitalist culture and bourgeois history per se but on the contrary, their deep analysis and instrumental use." Aureli, *The Project of Autonomy*, 14. Readers may recall an earlier footnote on Aureli's efforts in 2011 with his book *Possibility of an Absolute Architecture*. I will not inquire into his 2011 work, and it should be at reader's discretion to decide whether Aureli's work brings about what Eisenman suggests.

34 Aureli, "Intellectual Work and Capitalist Development: Origins and Context of Manfredo Tafuri's Critique of Architectural Ideology" in *SITE* 26-27 (2009): 18-23. The essay is re-visited and re-circulated through the internet portal The City as a Project in 2011. See http://thecityasaproject.org/2011/03/pier-vittorio-aureli-manfredo-tafuri/.

35 Aureli, "Intellectual Work and Capitalist Development: Origins and Context of Manfredo Tafuri's Critique of Architectural Ideology," in *The City as a Project* (blog) March 11, 2011. http://thecityasaproject.org/2011/03/pier-vittorio-aureli-manfredo-tafuri/.

36 Aureli, *The Project of Autonomy*, 19.

37 Ibid., 20.

groups as social aristocracy seriously as he concludes that this was the affirmation of the "open-ended forms of cultural debate typical of a liberal society."[38] This, he believes does not contradict with Fortini's identification of "intellectuals" vocation in the society transforming into a "profession" in the 1960s as:

> against pluralism, the group affirms the superiority and irreducibility of the position it represents, not by asserting the presumed scientific truth of its own analysis, but by offering the possibility of transforming its position into a critical weapon in the service of the part of society it wishes to support.[39]

Aureli iterates in "Intellectual Work and Capitalist Development": "For a philosopher, an artist, a filmmaker, a writer, or a scientist, adopting the form of the critical essay challenges intellectual work by transgressing the way culture was managed as a system of production in terms of its specializations."[40] Aureli refers to "critical essay" via Adorno as a "self-interrogative (performative) literary art form in which the work is critical, not through its message, but through its medium and its construction."[41]

However in contrast to the perception of intellectuals as a group who has the transforming power which Aureli mentions, I believe Fortini's articulation on intellectuals is more likely to be approached in relation to Toscano's approach to Fortini and the question of intellectuals: "A communist cannot be an intellectual. A communist can only be an intellectual."[42] Toscano reports Fortini strove towards a "solitary pursuit of poetry and of personal polemic" in his struggle within the tension of "the universality of a traditional, ideological vision of the intellectual and the particularity of his [*sic*] instrumental role in class society."[43] This was accompanied by his "practical attention to the political valence of intellectual collectives" including

38 Ibid.

39 Ibid.

40 Aureli, "Intellectual Work and Capitalist Development."

41 Ibid. Aureli suggests Tafuri had embraced this tool more than any other architectural historian had.

42 Alberto Toscano, "The Non-State Intellectual: Franco Fortini and Communist Criticism," in *Occasion: Interdisciplinary Studies in the Humanities* 3 (March 1, 2012) http://occasion.stanford.edu/node/73: 1-18, 2. What Aureli speaks of in terms of intelelctuals' role is not alien to Italy. Futurists of early nineteenth-century Italy, surely assigned themselves a similar role. Acknowledging, and promoting their position as the transformative force in the service part of the society, and supporting the "nation of Italy," Marinetti, the key figure of Italian futuristic movement argued for the transformation to a society of "the proletariat of geniuses, in co-operation with the growth of mechanised industry," which will "arrive at the maximum salary and minimum manual labour," the "intellectual art-alcohol must be distributed to everyone." Then again, this role would eventually cease with the rise of the fascist state of Mussolini, Marinetti's ex-political partner. Günther Berghaus, *Futurism and Politics: Between Anarchist Rebellion and Fascist Reaction, 1909-1944* (Oxford: Berghahn Books, 1996): 134.

43 Toscano, "The Non-State Intellectual," 11.

Quaderni rossi, and *Quaderni piacentini* (1962-1984): "one of the most important political and cultural journals of the 1960s" as Aureli posits.[44] Fortini was not necessarily a pre-eminent operaisti himself; but he indeed was an important figure for the operaisti, as he seems to had influenced the leading operaisti figures in their formative years, including Tronti, Bologna, Negri apart from Tafuri. As Aureli suggests, it is reasonable to place Tafuri's criticism in his 1969 essay "within the context of the critique of reformism as this critique was elaborated by Panzieri and Fortini."[45] This is hardly disputable. But against this, Aureli writes that the limitations of Tafuri's project are unavoidable. [46]

---

44 Aureli posts *Quaderni piacentini* as "one of the most important political and cultural journals of the 1960s." Aureli, *The Project of Autonomy*, 20. It is Fortini's interpretation of intellectuals' naivety regarding their role as intellectuals that seem to most trouble the *operaisti*. As in their reflections to the period, they seem to understand their defeat or limits through Fortini's "Cunning as Doves." Tronti, for example, in 2012 with his reflection on his own interpretation of *operaismo*, says: "Blessed naivety which made us—Fortini said it well—'as wise as doves'. *Operaismo* was our university; we graduated in class struggle—entitling us not to teach, but to live." Tronti, "Our Operaismo," 127. Where Negri refers to this "naivety" Tronti mentions, again with reference to Fortini and argues in his distancing from Quaderni rossi and eventually taking a path where "interpretation" required a consequent action to the ambiguity of *Quaderni rossi*'s stance towards existing institutions of labour movement was to avoid himself "cunning as doves:"

> this ambiguity seems a fully conscious one, reflecting acutely the precariousness of *Quaderni Rossi*'s relations with the CGIL. According to Negri, many in the group had already come to accept the characterisation of unions – advanced by *Socialisme ou Barbarie*, Correspondence and much of the traditional ultra-left – as 'completely bureaucratised' institutions functional only to capital. That the advocates of such a view had been swiftly dealt with in the past was a fact of which Alquati and others like him were only too aware. To avoid a similar fate, therefore, they found themselves forced to be, in the words of a Fortini essay, 'As Cunning as Doves'" Wright, *Storming Heaven*, 83.

45 Aureli, "Intellectual Work and Capitalist Development."

46 Intellectuals, who were part of *Contropiano* and *Angelus novus* were familiar and influenced by Walter Benjamin, Theodor Adorno, Aureli reports. Still, Franco Fortini is paid a special tribute by Aureli regarding his influence on Tafuri as Tafuri also acknowledges Fortini's role in his formative years. In the interview Tafuri gave to Françoise Very, he mentions Verifica dei Poteri and its significance in his intellectual formation. Tafuri, "Entretien avec Manfredo Tafuri," 64. In 1992 Tafuri refers to the conference organized by Fortini in Venice "Candidi come serpenti" (White as snakes); articles "Fine dell'antifascismo" ("End of Anti-fascism"), "Verifica dei potere" ("Verification of the Powers") and Panzieri's insistance that "starting all over again called for an enormous work of destruction" as fundamental for his intellectual formation between 1966-1967. Ibid., 37. This period is when Tafuri is assigned his position on the faculty at Palermo in 1966-1967: when Tafuri was preoccupied by his own work as well. Tafuri elaborates on this as he recalls the context that led to his Teorie e storia dell'architettura:

> What bothered me was the nature of the work -secondary courses. The time passed very slowly, but in fact one could do three times the amount of work we can do today. I turned my attention to a number of issues that had preoccupied me, and began a sweeping revisionist

Aureli attempts to excuse the limitations of Tafuri's project by understanding it within the role of the intellectuals ascribed by Fortini. This includes the constant interrogation of this role of intellectuals without necessarily proposing an alternative. Just as Panzieri had been criticized by the *operaisti* in the early 1960s in regard to his hesitation to confront the consequences of his theories not only in the factory but also in the struggles in front of the factory, Fortini is also prone to a similar critique. Even what Aureli himself portrays of Fortini suggest a necessity of constant self-interrogation by the intellectual, however Aureli does not dwell on this though:

> Fortini directed his critique at this ideological use of cultural experimentation [avant-garde techniques such as collage, estrangement and so on by leftist "progressive" intellectuals and artists such as Umberto Eco's Gruppo 63] in order to mediate (and mystify) the effects of production both on society and especially intellectual work … Political economy, was used by Fortini as a tool to describe the way capitalist affirmation within society manifested itself through its systematic cultural self-deception. … The main objective of Fortini's critique was to demonstrate how capitalist development was the source of a number of ideological manifestations that not so much represented bourgeoise power, but rather the good conscience of progressive intellectuals. … Fortini's conception of being critical involved becoming 'cunning as doves and innocent as foxes:' meaning to constantly adjust the terms of criticism to the standard cunning of capitalist ideology and not to surrender to the easy narcissism of good intentions typical of reformist approaches.[47]

Within the limits of Aureli's perspective, Fortini's exposure of the intellectuals' situation was to be embraced as it is, without necessarily contesting or challenging it, as the situation was a given, a priori, for those who were "intellectuals."

To posit the deadlock, as if Fortini identifies as the ultimate end, is to benumb the possibilities of such a critique. Fortini's conception of being critical involved becoming "cunning as doves and innocent as foxes," but constant self-interrogation needs to be directed against this deadlock of contradiction. Aureli misconstrues the intellectuals' intention by assigning the situation they find themselves in to their

---

study inspired by Tronti, Asor Rosa, and the group connected with Romero [sic] Panzieri. … Why? Well, those of us in my circle -and this didn't include architects, because I had abandoned them completely – felt a strong bond with Gruppo '63, with Umberto Eco and Franco Fortini." Ibid., 36.

47 Aureli, "Intellectual Work and Capitalist Development."

failure to resist capitalist development and to reduce this deadlock to their intentions. The reason that Aureli finds both Tafuri's and Fortini's works less problematic than the work of the autonomists in the 1970s seems to be that both Tafuri and Fortini are gradually submersed into the endorsement of their roles as intellectuals with a growing impasse to intervene in struggles against the capitalist development. They identify the barriers to acting as antagonistic political subjects other than as an elite avant-guard on behalf of the rest of the radical workers and revolutionaries.[48]

Toscano explains this phenomenon which Aureli seems to suffer from, in his account of the "communism" of Franco Fortini:

> Our present distance from the problem of intellectuals is easily ascribed to epochal shifts in our political culture. Signal texts of the fifties and sixties are marked by a seemingly unalterable anachronism. Yet the supposed desuetude of this problem -notwithstanding its periodic and almost invariably superficial exhumations and re-interments- blinds us to some of the crucial analyses and unfulfilled projects thrown up by that period's intense debates.[49]

When Aureli argues that Fortini's "cunning as doves and innocent as foxes" meant to "constantly adjust the terms of criticism to the standard of the cunning of capitalist ideology and not to surrender to the easy narcissism of good intentions typical of reformist approaches,"[50] one would expect a criticism of Fortini, Tronti, Cacciari, Negri, as well as Tafuri. However, for Aureli, Fortini's criticism was limited with exposing "the seemingly most genuine attempts of social reform advanced by leftist movements and institutions that often revealed the true features of capitalist domination."[51] When this is exposed via the works intellectuals delivered, for Aureli, this was always bound to an impasse, which the real intellectual would not even bother to overcome. Similar to what Toscano notes:

> On one column ... we note the specifically bourgeois character of the intellectual's role ... on the other column, we register the programmatic conviction that intellectual life is both a generic condition of human beings in society and something that will flourish only after capitalism's demise, through revolutions in pedagogy and the pedagogy of revolution.[52]

48 Tafuri secures a position in the university as of 1968; so does Fortini in 1976.

49 Toscano, "The Non-State Intellectual," 2.

50 Aureli, "Intellectual Work and Capitalist Development."

51 Aureli, "Intellectual Work and Capitalist Development."

52 Toscano, "The Non-State Intellectual," 2. Rita Di Leo, says they were atypical intellectuals who were not satisfied with being intellectuals. Their *atypicality*, according to Di Leo,

Where it is relevant to argue Tafuri's critique of ideology took its form from those premises, the consequences of the role to which he appointed himself do not have to and in reality, do not follow this form.[53] As mentioned earlier, what Tafuri taught was not necessarily what he was doing as a historian.[54] Hence this lead to the institutionalization of Tafuri as a historian that did not produce any antagonists in contrast to what Tronti had argued with penetrating the institutions and taking power would allow one to subvert those institutions. This tactic not only failed for PCI in the case of Tronti or Cacciari, but also failed for the university and academia in general.

Quite righteously, however, Aureli argues that one can approach Tafuri's critique as an understanding of capitalism, which acknowledged there was no outside position to capitalist development, as this development consisted of "waged labour" that also "incorporated the role of intellectual."[55] This is how Aureli approaches Tafuri's critique. However this does not lead to arguing for the extreme implication of overturning the waged labour by refusing to participate, but instead Aureli uses it to explain the apathy to do so. Therefore "any critical and political discourse needed first of all to be addressed toward intellectuals as workers, rather than addressed to

---

came from "trying to be anti-bougeoise." See Rita Di Leo, *Gli operaisti*, interview with Rita Di Leo, 159.

53 Remember the opening paragraph of "Toward a Critique of Architectural Ideology:" "Culture in its intermediary role, has so defined its distinguishing features in ideological terms that in its shrewdness it has reached the point -beyond all intellectual good faith- of imposing forms of contestation and protest upon its own products." Tafuri, "Toward a Critique of Architectural Ideology," 6.

54 It is relevant to quote Tafuri at length:

> In 1968 and 1970, in an elite faculty like the one at Venice, where a hundred people attend your lectures but only seventy of them take the examination, where students from other faculties come to audit, it seemed that everything could be taken for granted. It's the ingenuity of the young student that leads him to take classes that are too advanced, but in taking everything for granted, he comes to think of them as common merchandise. Therefore, what must be taught is a transmission not only of the information or the methodology but also the art of constructing interconnected histories. When I started to direct my first dissertations, I understood that I couldn't actually teach this. What was more important was the method of investigation, a very different thing. I gradually realized how much the technical side of the field had been neglected and how idealistic I had been. I understood that I should not lecture about what I do: many of the students study history because they will become conservators of buildings, not historians. These grand intellectual constructions should be addressed to my colleagues who are historians in other disciplines, rather than my students, who in any case will need to know very well how a building was made in order not to make errors in the practice of conservation. Tafuri, "History as Project," 65.

55 Aureli, "Intellectual Work and Capitalist Development."

'others' (workers), contradicting the notion that the social and political mandate given to the intellectual could be taken for granted."[56] This is a problematic approach to intellectuals.

Reminding ourselves of what Aureli reiterates as what *Contropiano* proposed as "a valid counter-plan," he says it "would consist in the working-class appropriation of the most advanced bourgeois culture within modernity, especially the bourgeoise intellectual tradition that Cacciari defined as 'negative thought'."[57] This plan only works as a "valid plan" if the intellectuals are acknowledged and treated as "workers", like Aureli does. The role of intellectuals assumed in 1960s and 1970s Italy, and to some extent today, does not substantiate Aureli's conviction of an intellectual being a worker.[58]

Behind Aureli's reading of "intellectual work," lies what could misconstrue the understanding of immaterial labour:

> If Fordism integrated consumption into the cycle of the reproduction of capital, post-Fordism integrates communication into it. From a strictly economic point of view, the cycle of reproduction of immaterial labor dislocates the production-consumption relationship as it is defined as much by the "virtuous Keynesian circle" as by the Marxist reproduction schemes of the second volume of *Capital*.[59]

In other words, to understand intellectual labour as the bourgeoise intellectual being treated as a worker and hence gaining subversive antagonistic power through the tools they already possess, is a reduction on the edge of a fetish. The role of the intellectual, in the post-1968 context can be defined within "continual innovation in the forms and conditions of communication … [which] gives form to and materializes needs, the imaginary, consumer tastes … enlarges, transforms, and creates the 'ideological'

---

56 Ibid.

57 Ibid.

58 Tronti's 1963 analysis may come handy to understand how Aureli grants the intellectual the role of a worker:

> If this corrupted word [alienation] still has a meaning, it is only that of expressing a specifically determined form of direct exploitation of labor on the part of capital: total estrangement of labor with respect to the worker; useful, concrete labor which becomes objectively estranged, external and indifferent to the worker; the end of the trade, of the profession, of this last appearance of individual independence of the worker, the extreme survival of a bourgeois person in the body of a worker. Tronti, "Social Capital," 116-117.

59 Maurizio Lazzarato, "Immaterial Labor," trans. Paul Colilli and Ed Emory in "Radical Thought in Italy: A Potential Politics," ed. Paolo Virno and Michael Hardt, *Theory Out of Bounds* 7 (1996): 132-147, 139.

and cultural environment of the consumer … transforms the person who uses it."[60] Tronti or other *operaisti* perceiving their failure as intellectuals to contest the production of a "social relationship" do not necessarily imply the hegemony of this labour; but instead infiltration of capitalist structures to life itself that transforms the "lives" of the working class.[61] This, however, is not to propose that "mass intellectuality" ascends the working class to the level of bourgeoise intellectual, nor bourgeoise intellectuals descend to the working class.[62] Neither Tafuri, Cacciari, nor Tronti can be or had been considered as workers. They always were very much aware of their elitist position in regards to the theoretical endeavors they were undertaking.[63]

Assigning "the intellectual worker" as a category from which Tafuri was speaking from as an 'exploited' and 'whose struggles had been appropriated by the capitalist development' class in the late 1960s and 1970s Italy, can not be sustained. This would be overlooking the analysis and the discourse the *operaisti* constructed, and collapsing the consequences of the failed attempts of the opearisti -to adopt the discourse they constructed to contest capitalist development- on top of their project.

One of the consequences of the problem of the attempts of architectural circles to return to the context of Tafuri's 1969 essay can be read in this light: their unwillingness to except Tafuri's project is an unfulfilled project, apart from his historiography. And even when we consider Tafuri as a historian, we still need to go to the trouble of excavating the debates or events which lead to his choice of history over something else. Instead, however, there is a tendency to reach the conclusion that by re-contextualizing Tafuri's critique within the precise project "where the possible relationships between cultural disciplines and class struggle were at stake, not architectural discipline itself;" that the argument and the common conclusion architectural critics reached from Tafuri's analysis' implication of the "death of architecture" is wrong.[64]

---

60 Ibid., 137.

61 Ibid.,

62 Hardt and Virno suggest mass intellectuality (intelletualità di massa) "refers to the collective intelligence and accumulated intellectual powers that extend horizontally across society." See the glossary of concepts in "Radical Thought in Italy: A Potential Politics," for further inquiries. Also to have a rather quick idea of the transition from the late 1960s concept Negri worked through "mass worker" to the 1970s "social worker" and further contemporary elaboration on the advanced capitalist modes of production, see Antonio Negri, "Archeology and Project: The Mass Worker and the Social Worker," in *Revolution Retrieved*: 203-228; Paolo Virno, *A Grammar of the Multitude: For an Analysis of Contemporary Forms of Life*, trans. Isabella Bertoletti, James Cascaito and Andrea Casson (Los Angeles: Semiotext(e), 2004) and Dyer-Witheford "Cyber-Negri: General Intellect and Immaterial Labor."

63 At least Tafuri was, as I have been reposting from Tafuri's 1992 interview in Chapter Three.

64 Aureli, "Intellectual Work and Capitalist Development."

To what extent Tafuri's historical project delivers what the political project, which he adopted in his formation as a historian, attempted is questionable, if not irrelevant. However, through assigning Tafuri's project with "a will to understand" rather than "a will to power," Aureli depicts a Tafuri, who stands in deadlock with himself.[65] Avoiding interrogating more deeply the deadlock of Tafuri's, Fortini's or other critiques' failure to overcome the role assigned by capitalist structures to them, as well as their failure to address the role they assigned themselves as intellectuals; seems to be considered a deliberate strategy according to Aureli. Aureli argues:

> this will to understand, which Tafuri never expected to be satisfied, was only used as a trigger for his research, and it was implicitly aimed at what Fortini would have called the recuperation of the totality of intellect, or, in other words, the possibility of transgressing the disciplinary specializations and expertise imposed by the political economy of neo-capitalist work and production.[66]

However, as Toscana reminds the reader in his paper on Fortini, we are far removed from the conflicts regarding the context in which Fortini shaped his critique and stance, which overlaps and/or coincides with/extends Tafuri's. He argues, with reference to Fortini and approaching his articulation on the intellectuals:

> Without both the drive toward totality and the horizon of collective pedagogy as well as the incessant work on the forms and contents, the relations and institutions, of cultural production under capitalism to speak of the intellectual will be, to borrow the situationist adage, to have a corpse in one's mouth.[67]

Aureli, who assigns Fortini's intellectual as transcendental to reality and not bringing it back to the ground, not even to self-interrogation, seems to find it more than useful to have a corpse in his mouth.

5.3 Gail Day and her take on Tafuri

Where Aureli focusses on the Tronti's *operaismo* and understands the context of *Contropiano* only in relation to Tronti and Cacciari's political formation; Day tries to provide a more comprehensive study of the context. At least, Day does mention the shared opposition the magazine had with Negri and other autonomist figures against Left-Hegellianism. In relation to the common thread, dialectical synthesis where the

65 Ibid.

66 Ibid.

67 Toscano, "The Non-State Intellectual," 18.

negative's power is "compromised by capital's appropriation of negation's dynamic," and "nihilism" that "requires the strength to face capitalist negativity," are elaborated by Day to locate Tafuri and Cacciari within this opposition to orthodox-Marxism.[68] However her study is instrumental in presenting Cacciari's "negative thought" and its relevance to Tafuri's project, without necessarily mentioning the rest of the spectrum of the opposition to Left-Hegellianism of the 1960s and 1970s.[69]

Against those who assume Tafuri's pessimism deplores any attempt avant-gardes or architects can deliver, she presents her analysis of Tafuri in her 2012 essay "Manfredo Tafuri, Fredric Jameson and the Contestations of Political Memory:"

> There are certainly limitations to Tafuri's account, but it is remarkable the extent to which they are discussed as if they floated in political ether, severed from the discourses and histories that animated them. As an intervention into the reassessment of key political moments of the twentieth century, his work was always likely to be provocative, but it remains curious how the historical specifics are themselves translated into the *lingua franca* of cultural theory. The problems with Tafuri are addressed neither by the routine casting of him as despondent declarer of 'futility', nor by countering his arguments with calls for 'hope' and 'enclaves'.[70]

I do not intend to argue against Day's version of Tafuri, I have already dealt with it briefly above in Chapter Two. And to some extent, Day does acknowledge the provocative nature of Tafuri's work, which I appreciate as I argue for this nature in my postulation of Tafuri's 1969 essay as a piece of agitation. Then again, Day is committed to provide a Tafuri whose nihilism is not useless due to the pessimistic outlook it presents for architecture. Day inquiries into the formation of the political framework of Tafuri's project to make the point that Tafuri's pessimism was not a total rejection of the possibility of progressive architecture. However while doing so, Day fails to give the specific characteristic of the Italian radical Left, beyond Cacciari; hence omits the consideration to approach to Tafuri's 1969 essay in its particularity.

Day argues, the moment of overcoming the Hegelian dialectics within *operaisti* discourse is identified with "the critique of the avant-garde, the Left-Nietzscheanism

68 Day, *Dialectical Passions*, 101-09.

69 Though Day refers to Cacciari's and Tafuri's acceptance of "many of the dialectic's tropic turns and transitory characteristics, its movements of internalization, integration, introjection, and immersion." Ibid., 107. Even though Day does not mention, or criticize Cacciari and Tafuri's position, she seems to touch on what Mandarini refers as Negri criticizing Cacciari and his *Krisis* for Cacciari paying "a heavy price for having saved the negative from its positivation in the development of Capital-Geist- he effectively domesticates it." Mandarini, "Beyond Nihilism," 48.

70 Day, "Manfredo Tafuri, Fredric Jameson and the Contestations of Political Memory," 73.

and embrace of the completed nihilism, the opposition to the Universal History, and the rejection of dialectical synthesis."[71] This approach to *operaismo* was announced in Cacciari: "our progression should be from the negative, to the Metropolis as an instrument of class, to its negativity as a contradiction of class: from the perspective of the negative to the perspective of class."[72] Similarly to Aureli's purpose in arguing for an "intellectual worker," Day's depiction of "different groups and tendencies of *operaismo*," which "acquired a large base of support among intellectuals and industrial workers," assumes a role for intellectuals alongside the workers in their struggle against capitalist society. Where this role failed to go beyond participating in the workers' struggle as agitators, organizers of reading groups of *Capital* in factories, and interventionists to Party and Union on behalf of the workers to subvert those institutions.

For Day, "the decision by a number of prominent *operaisti* to enter the PCI, and the split in *Contropiano*, is central, not only to the political history of workerism/autonomism, but also to the history of the Venice-school."[73] Day herself questions whether the use of "tactical entryism" is a correct one or not as she notes "intellectuals who made this move into the PCI appear not to have organized to do so."[74] Although, it is quite clear what Day means by it: it is the trajectory, which had been chosen by those intellectuals who were convinced they needed to embrace the reality of the plan of the capital, as well as their role in this plan as intellectuals. Rather than overcoming the contradictions of being an intellectual, which they collectively exposed, they assigned themselves roles within the Party, unions, and also universities where they represented the "rights" of the workers. Whereas *operaisti* were critical of institutions of capitalist structures conforming the subversive antagonistic potential of the political working class back into the plan of capital. Day, clearly chooses not to expose this contradiction or dwell on it and it does make sense on a practical level as it would hi-jack her own project: contesting the view of Tafuri's project as blunt pessimism, and instead takes up Carrera's invitation to read Tafuri: "within the frame of mind of a theory of the Metropolis."[75]

This theory of Metropolis grants Cacciari a more central role in approaching Tafuri's project: combining the theory of Metropolis "with the militant practice in the factory as Italy experienced its own industrial revolution through workers' struggles."[76]

---

71 Day, *Dialectical Passions*, 123.

72 Massimo Cacciari, "Metropolis," in *Architecture and Nihilism: On the Philosophy of Modern Arhcitecture*, trans. Stephen Sartarelli (New Heaven and London: Yale University Press, 1993): 3-22, 16.

73 Day, review of *The Project of Autonomy*, 229.

74 Day, *Dialectical Passions*, 271.

75 Carrera, "On Massimo Cacciari's Disenchanted Activism,", xxxiii-xxxiv.

76 Ibid., xxv.

Day takes off from here, bringing Tafuri, Metropolis and the negative thought into the same pot, to allow a reading of more appropriate Tafuri, most likely in its more appropriate context.

Day initiates her analysis citing Tafuri's notes to the second edition of 1968 *Teorie e storia dell'architettura* which was published in 1970. In this note, Tafuri reiterates the criticism of "the use of negation" to argue that "architecture was in the forefront in the battles of the dialectical conversion from Negative to Positive," for the transformation of crisis into models of capitalist development.[77] Day portrays what Tafuri presents as "the use of avant-gardist" negation as: "once-radical thing that had unfortunately been appropriated by capitalism's commercial and political machinery."[78] "Despite his trenchant criticism of avant-gardist negation, negation was nevertheless at the core of Tafuri's method," Day argues, and tries to find explanations for Tafuri's stance via Cacciari.[79] In reality, the link between Tafuri and Cacciari is not hard to establish and to some extent, it is already out there and does not take too much excavation.

In the chapter on intellectual work and ideology of *Architecture and Utopia*, Tafuri argues "in order to survive, ideology had to negate itself as such, break its own crystallized forms, and throw itself entirely into the 'construction of the future'."[80] Day explains this was to argue for the avant-garde to "acclimatize the public to the disruptions of the urban world," quoting Tafuri from 1976 *Modern Architecture*, to report Tafuri stating avant-garde's "objective role in the process (however marginal) was to function as a force for modernization, thereby contributing to capitalism's changing requirements."[81] We can go back to the 1969 essay as there Tafuri refers to the "experience of shock, suffered in the city" and the role of the artists to allow absorption and internalization of this shock, as an inevitable condition of existence.[82] Tafuri argues: "The public had to be provoked. That was the only way people could be inserted actively into the universe of precision dominated by the laws of production."[83] Metropolis, as Tafuri postulated in 1969, was the "foundation of the avant-garde and 'the real proving ground for all its proposals'."[84]

Having said that, to understand the implications of Tafuri's account of the European avant-gardes, as Day argues, "we need to keep in mind the profile of the Metropolis"

77 Day, *Dialectical Passions*, 79.

78 Ibid., 79.

79 Ibid., 80.

80 Tafuri, *Architecture and Utopia*, 50.

81 Day, *Dialectical Passions*, 82.

82 Tafuri, "Toward a Critique of Architectural Ideology," 18.

83 Ibid., 19.

84 Ibid.

Cacciari provided.[85] In this work of Cacciari, he posits that "the entire avant-garde and its crisis" fell in between Georg Simmel's 1903 "The Metropolis and Mental Life" and "Walter Benjamin's fragments on Badelaire and Paris."[86] This profile consisted of "a category employed to describe a process of social abstraction," through Simmel's view where "individuality and emotion take on the characteristics of exchange value and are defined by the equivalence and quantification," in the Metropolis.[87] What is more, Metropolis was postulated as an abstract category where it "names capitalism at a certain stage of its development, along with capital's most widened social effects and impacts on individual consciousness."[88]

Day arrays Tafuri's works from 1969 to 1980 *Sphere and the Labyrinth* to portray the brutal criticism of the avant-gardes, with which he anticipated that avant-gardes' complete efforts were subsumed back into capitalist development with their attitude to overcome their anxiety for being forced to remain "forever dumb in the face of" capitalism.[89] Day argues, with reference to the Metropolis and negative thought that "the concept of revolution is not," for Tafuri, some general panacea. Rather it is simply the condition for beginning to work on reality in a non-illusory fashion. Commencing this task, Tafuri believes, must entail confronting the new Metropolitan situation in all its negative force: grasping its conditions, entering into, and working with and through, them."[90] Day reiterates from Tafuri's 1980 book *Sphere and the Labyrinth*:

> The new language emerging from the Metropolis -the possibilities presented by the breaking up of syntactical connections and the disenchanted sign- could only be unleashed once the avant-garde had 'neutralized the paralyzing anguish that can only contemplate itself.' The fear of the present conditions and nostalgia for an imagined older social order could only end in a disconnected solipsism and was hopelessly unrealistic. For Tafuri, the way ahead involved actively embracing the given situation.[91]

However, this embrace was not in order to solve 'the crisis of the intellectuals' in the identification of their contradictory roles as the avant-gardes of the bourgeoise ideology, or their role in the capitalist development. As we inquire into the formation

85 Day, *Dialectical Passions*, 86.
86 Cacciari, "Metropolis," 3-4.
87 Ibid., 84-85.
88 Ibid., 85.
89 Ibid., 94.
90 Ibid.
91 Ibid., 95.

of the discourse Tafuri adopts in his identification, we can conclude that embracing the given situation as it is, was aimed at identifying the problems with the assumption that the intellectuals, the bourgeoise or the middle class was in crisis, in attempts to struggle against capitalist society.

As we return to understand this political framework, I tried to demonstrate in Chapter Four, it needs to be acknowledged that the essay and *Contropiano* stand at a critical moment: 'the Italian 1968'. The Creeping May; between May 1968 and December 1969 was when the trajectories for the Italian new Left were opening and closing at the same time. In the case of intellectuals, they questioned their own role within the social conflict as the *operaisti* they identified themselves to be. They tried to become the social scientists of the workers, as in the case of Panzieri; though they needed further affirmation to believe they were actively participant in the struggle and hence became agitators in front of the factory gates like Tronti, Asor Rosa, Negri and Cacciari until 1968. Somehow one of the logical conclusion to become active participants of the struggle caused another split amongst *operaisti* right after the May 1968 of Italy. This date is symbolic in terms of the dominance of the revolutionary rhetoric amongst students as well as workers as is December 1969 when the counter-revolutionary attacks in Italy were initiated officially that would start an atmosphere of terror.

Day's interest in the period can be understood with reference to what she observes as the renewed contemporary interest in *operaismo*. "This renewed interest," she says, "in the Italian-Left debates of the 60s and 70s is not understood as specific to Italy, but has itself become deployed by many sections of the current anti-capitalist movement as a mode of resistance and struggle, a strategy of 'counter-empire'."[92] The resurgence of *operaismo* amongst anti-capitalist movements today, she further explains "as activists have sought to develop understandings that exceed both the fascination with autonomism (where the belief in the inversion was more exaggerated and yet less determinate) and the debilitating stream of constant reminders of capital's total domination."[93] She acknowledges "the approaches taken, and terms developed, by Italian workerism were and are, deserving radical criticism."[94]

For example, she suggests Trontian inversion was a tendency to "political blindness," and further reminds the reader about Tronti himself distancing from his own theses and insists "*operaismo* should be seen as specifically tied to the practices of Fordist and Taylorist workplace."[95] "Nevertheless," Day continues, "for a while, the culture of this Italian Left had grounds for its sense of growing strength and wrought tangible

92 Day, "Manfredo Tafuri, Fredric Jameson and the Contestations of Political Memory," 72

93 Day, *Dialectical Passions*, 126.

94 Ibid.

95 Ibid.

gains."[96] However she fails to provide what those "strengths" and "tangible gains" are, apart from a handful of prominent Italian intellectuals, art and architecture historians and philosophers.

What is more, Day also argues that readers need to be reminded of *operaismo*'s assertion about "the primacy of living labour over capital, that is, its emphasis on the role of the workers as the active and the determinate force in the struggle with capital."[97] She presents Cacciari and Tafuri's interventions in the culture of struggle through the concept of "negation." But she does not question whether it can be really referred as a class concept that is an autonomous instrument for the class, which does not feed the capital, a moment of a struggle that resists being subsumed back into capitalist development.[98] Instead, for the sake of convincing the reader that Tafuri's project and its nihilistic aspects have functional value for the contemporary architectural discourse, she overlooks "the critique of wage labour, its refusal on a mass scale," which gave substance to the "mass challenge directed against professional roles and hierarchies … to the attack on the organization of social knowledge; to qualitative demands for changes in the structure of everyday life," as for the contemporary reader, these must have no pragmatic attribute.[99] Hence questioning the link between "Toward a Critique of Architectural Ideology," and *Architecture and Utopia*: as the particular context of the 1969 essay would not help Day with her Tafuri.

5.4 Conclusion to Chapter Five

One does not necessarily expect Aureli to acknowledge that *operaismo* was a failed project in order to be able to go beyond what *operaisti* attempted with their antagonism towards capitalist structures. Day refers to Aureli as a "rising star on the circuit of critical-architectural and urban theory," who combines "art-radicalism with hard-line political critique of all that is (merely) 'radical'," with his commitment to form.[100] In light of Aureli's own contradictions with his "left avant-gardist" position, which Day picks up on, it is beside the point to expect Aureli to approach *operaismo* or *autonomia* with an intention to interrogate the role of the intellectuals in the failure of contesting the capitalist society. Aureli is a good demonstration of a "bourgeoise intellectual," except now the intellectual is immersed in the post-1968 rhetoric that perceives surrendering to capitalist development as the same as acknowledging the reality and actuality of capitalist society. Hence the justification

96 Ibid., 127.

97 Ibid., 123.

98 Ibid., 125.

99 See Antonio Negri and et.al., "Do You Remember Revolution?" in *Revolution Retrieved*, 229-243.

100 Day, review of *The Project of Autonomy*, 221.

of the apathy of Tafuri as an intellectual who is romanticized and further fetishized through the concept of 'will to understand' that is portrayed as conflicting with 'will to power'. In this picture, it is easy to miss the irony in Tafuri's 'will to understand.' This 'will to understand' is what allowed Tafuri to secure his position within the academia in an institution which graduated architects who needed "to know very well how a building was made in order not to make errors in the practice of conservation."[101]

Aureli approaches the political context of Italy in the 1960s and the 1970s with a particular point of view. He finds it "fascinating and at the same time exhilarating that those from abroad consider [the legacy of autonomy] interesting and appealing, while in Italy it is not only neglected but even despised, and not always for the wrong reasons."[102] Aureli's perspective becomes problematic when he, almost intentionally, misconstrues the context by "not saying" things after granting himself the right to hold on to his point of view as an "Italian architect working mostly outside of Italy today."[103] Apart from what Aureli does not say, what he does say is not necessarily always substantiated, as in the case of "intellectual workers" or Fortini's understanding of the role of intellectuals as discussed above. Hence his works need scrutiny, even though they are some of the seminal resources in architectural discourse that revisits the political context of 1960s Italy.

When it comes to Day, however, it is crucial to remind her that the moment, which she returns to in order to seek a strategy that is "counter-empire" or counter-capitalist society, is a context that might not have exhausted itself, but exhausted the tactics it granted to intellectuals. What Day wants to do by returning to this context, is not necessarily establishing the relationship between Cacciari's negative thought, and Tafuri's project as a historian. This link is easy to make. The negative thought is where the contradictions and internal conflicts of the society are exposed for Cacciari and it is demonstrated in Tafuri's project as a historian: where "negativity" is "made to

101 Tafuri, "History as Project," 65.

102 Aureli, The Project of Autonomy, 82. Aureli's firm stance against *autonomia* and the thread of it which Hardt and Negri extend to today via their trilogy *Empire*, *Multitude* and *Commonwealth*; may lead him to present a biased account of the 1960s and 1970s Italy, without necessarily acknowledging the limitations of his position. Aureli deliberately does not attempt to portray a picture that aims for a complete apprehension of the period, but he does not say so. As an Italian-speaking architectural theoretician, who inquires into *operaismo* and *autonomia*, his work could have been a valuable resource for us who find a relevance of returning to this context within contemporary debates on globalization of capitalist structures and architectural practice and design, for example with his account for the interviews *operaisti* gave in 2000s. However, he only refers to Tronti's interview amongst more than fifty operaisti-affiliated figures, and I must say the parts he cites are very selective and to some extent open to interpretation, where, for example, Tronti says "it is better to have a greater number of reactionaries then petite revolutionaries," in relation to *Contropiano*. See Borio and et.al. eds., *Gli operaisti,* interview with Mario Tronti, 301-302.

103 Ibid.

speak: speak of its making, its becoming, its function, and its conflicts."[104] Tafuri as a historian is the torturer and the one who is tortured at the same time. "Distance is fundamental to history;"[105] which is not always an option however, and indeed that is why the historian "must create artificial distance."[106] Hence, as Tafuri remarked the relationship between architectural theory and practice, this contradiction of the historian is legitimized as: "it is the conflict of things that are important, and that are productive."[107] However what this form of a conflict produced within the transformation of industrial society to the post-industrial society, other than the contemporary and advanced modes of production, which capitalism thrives on, is unclear.

In any case, what is challenging for Day is to argue for the more optimistic aspects of Tafuri's project. Or in other words, to argue for the utility of the pessimism of Tafuri's work through negative thought without confronting the role of the architect as well as the intellectual and/or professionals within the capitalist development. If we assume Cacciari's mayor-ship of Venice demonstrated a success for the potential of "negative thought," or Tafuri being able to hold on to an academic position which he was assigned in 1968 until his death as part of what *operaisti* project aimed for, it is easier to concede that Tafuri's project and negative thought had some further potential in them. Without necessarily saying so, Day implies they may have, at least in the case of Tafuri:

> Tafuri's [body of intellectual work] represents one of the most explicit and extended articulations on negation and art to emerge from the New Left, not to mention a specific and distinctive political expression of the philosophical problem of Left Hegelianism and nihilism. Its full implications are still to be reckoned with, and, perhaps, still to be played out. Between the methodological positivism and (sometimes blind) political optimism of *operaismo*, on the one hand, and, on the other, the historical pessimism generated out of the Left-Hegelian and Western Marxism traditions - between militant autonomy and the melancholy of alienation, or between the emphasis on politics and on economic theory- there is still much to be negotiated.[108]

At the end of the day, Day is against the argument Tafuri's account being a pessimist

104 Day, *Dialectical Passions*, 108.

105 Ibid., 109.

106 Ibid.

107 Ibid.

108 Ibid., 130.

prophecy of the death of architecture. She puts emphasis on the context of his explicit and trenchant distance taken for being a pessimist as the prelude to *Architecture and Utopia* was written "in the midst of the world oil crisis and the social turmoil in Italy -not to mention the traumas undoubtedly being wrought by the PCI's historic compromise."[109] Regardless, she does take Tafuri's reputation as a pessimist seriously, even though she refers to Tafuri distancing himself "from the accusation of being doom-laden,"[110] so that she can tackle it. For Day, the transformation of Tafuri's position from 1969 to 1973 does not possess too many problems, except that it demonstrates the potential of Tafuri's project for architectural theory and practice. Where her emphasis on this context is exactly what I have been tried to demonstrate, I instead argue for looking at the context of the essay, rather than the book, to be able to approach Tafuri's work as an agitation that does not and should not present any blueprint nor path to follow for those who contest capitalist society apart from what not to do in our contestations.

Day argues, on the other hand, it is the collaborative efforts of Tafuri and Cacciari that would allow us to see the potential of Tafuri's work, though she acknowledges, "as we encounter the arguments about negative thought, Tafuri's alleged pessimism seems only to deepen."[111] She quotes Tafuri from the late 1970s: "To save oneself one must lose one's self, one must resign oneself to being submerged in the chaos, one must make oneself among signs. But by action."[112] The affirmation of nihilism forms the prelude to a salvaging of an emancipating mode of negativity, one that goes beyond negation's appropriation by capital; by acknowledging this world as the only world and calling it "good" as Nietzsche put it.[113]

---

109 Ibid., 100.

110 Ibid.

111 Ibid., 101.

112 Ibid., 108.

113 Gail Day's approach is, however, practical in responding to Esra Akcan, for example. Akcan provides a coherent study of Tafuri's approach to avant-gardes in her essay "Manfredo Tafuri's Theory of the Architectural Avant-garde" to ask the question in her conclusion: is it fair for Manfredo Tafuri to deny any possibility for the avant-garde to change society? Esra Akcan, "Manfredo Tafuri's Theory of the Architectural Avant-Garde," in *Journal of Architecture* 7, no.2 (Summer 2002): 135-170, 162. Day's re-visit of the political framework of Tafuri's works should lead Akcan to revisit her question. What is quite problematic with Akcan's perspective is her conclusion. For Akcan, "as long as class remains as Tafuri's privileged category of historical analysis, oppression based on other categories such as gender, race and geography seem to be considered less relevant." Ibid., 165. Akcan says, "perhaps with a level of far-fetched optimism," critical analysis of the oppressions and exclusions of Architecture have nevertheless shaken some status quo." Ibid. Apart from ignoring completely the political formation of the critique of the avant-garde in the case of Tafuri, I believe this is a blunt approach to contemporary structures, networks of power and production of identities, spaces, bodies and relations on a biopolitical level. For an argumentation of how the progression of race, gender and geography had actually cultivated further modes of oppression which are equally, if not more violent, see Jeffrey R. Di Leo and Sophia A. McClennen, "Postscript on Violence," in *Symploke* 20 nos. 1-2 (2012): 241-250.

What is problematic in Day's approach is that for the sake of finding an (actually)-not-so-pessimistic Tafuri within the context of *Contropiano*, she expands "Toward a Critique of Architectural Ideology," to the whole of *Architecture and Utopia* for the sake of dismissing the agitating tone of the essay. It is ironic, because Day accuses Aureli of "collapsing the Tafuri of, say, 1969 and the 70s with the [Tafuri] of 1962," when Aureli quotes from Tafuri's 1962 essay, in his attempt to find a Trontian-intervention to the architectural culture of the 1960s and 1970s Italy.[114] Clearly, collapsing 1970 to 1969; or 1973 to 1969 does not look like as much of a problem to Day.

In her given importance, one expects more of an emphasis to the debates around entryism which she posits as a determinant factor to shape the post-*operaisti* thinking. Yet she fails to do so in order to make her point against the assumption that Tafuri was a *nay-sayer*. Instead she establishes the link between Tafuri's and Cacciari's explicit engagement with the anti-positivistic arguments deriving from German philosophy and Western Marxism that their approach was shaped by a culture of militant praxis.[115]

Day is not in a different space than Aureli is, in terms of her approach to the project of the *operaisti* and what they expected via the working class struggle: an end to capitalist society. Without questioning the role of the intellectuals and the roles they assigned themselves, Day conforms with the assumption of hegemony of immaterial labour transcended the class relations which were once so obvious but now becoming diminished. Hence the negative thought finds its contemporary "praxis" in de-marketing the city of Venice via commissioning high profile advertiser Olivero Toscani to discourage a certain kind of tourism; rather than becoming the tool for the working class struggle as Tronti and Cacciari first assumed it to be in the late 1960s and 1970s Italy.[116] There might yet be more to come in a playful and challenging manner from this line of politics and thinking. However, one thing is for sure that capitalist development has advanced. And what is more, both Tafuri's and Cacciari's initial plans to "revolutionize" the party and the institution in a radical way failed as well.

If we are able to acknowledge the particularity of the context of the 1969 essay, in between post Hot Autumn of Italy and pre-Piazza Fontana attacks, we can be able to be content with the agitating character of the essay, unlike Day is. We would also be content with the absence of provision of a blueprint, and the lack of compromise that urges architects to embrace their new roles in transforming capitalist structures. This would be our reading instead of devoting our efforts to revisiting the wider political

114 Day, review of *The Project of Autonomy*, 233

115 Day, *Dialectical Passions*, 131

116 See Day, *Dialectical Passions*, 70-71.

framework of Tafuri's 1969 essay to explain his and his fellow *operaisti* colleagues' failure. It is most likely the case that if we approach it as such a text, we could even get agitated to some level and re-approach Tafuri, Cacciari and the *operaisti* project which would allow us a much more critical approach to their projects, than Aureli or Day's approaches.

SECTION III

Recapitulation

CHAPTER SIX
CONCLUSIONS

1. Self interrogation of the intellectual with relation to their place in class struggle and capitalist development is crucial for an apprehension of the *operaisti* project and their antagonistic potential that was realized only to some extent in 1960s and 1970s Italy.

The first conclusion I draw by re-visiting the political framework of Tafuri's 1969 essay considers the way English-speaking architectural theoreticians approach *operaismo* and *autonomia*. I argue *operaismo* and *autonomia* movements should not be understood as mere intellectual interventions to the culture of struggle. Those movements should be considered as parts of social struggles Italian Left experimented with in the 1960s and 1970s. *Operaisti* did not only antagonized the working class against the capitalist society with their analyses of capitalist structures and development, but they also antagonized themselves. This should not be confused as if *operaisti* were preoccupied with the crisis of the middle class. If anything, they were paralyzed in such a crisis.

There is already an established understanding that points out how *autonomia* was developed within the framework of earlier *operaismo*. This is an important effort to overthrow the equation of the radical Italian left with one strand of *autonomia* which had gained a relatively significant amount of attention in comparison to other threads of radical politics in 1960s and 1970s Italy. However this effort needs tuning.

The narration of this period I provided in Chapter Four can be read as coming from a similar precursory critique that establishes *autonomia* is not equal to *operaismo* or vice versa. Within the limits of this thesis and the research question I have formulated around Manfredo Tafuri's 1969 essay, I only had the chance to mention other contemporary authors who recently refer to this political framework other than Day and Aureli. I was not able to inquire deeply into the works of writers who find the relevance of this framework to architectural practice and design such as Felicce Memetti; Alexandra Brown; or Jacoppo Galimberti. Those authors' works also deliver a similar critique against approaching *operaismo* and *autonomia* from the selective readings of the period which have only become accessible after the attention Negri gained. This critical trend comes with a confirmation of an almost established understanding of the fact that the political context of 1960s and 1970s Italy can not be studied without acknowledging the seminal movement *operaismo* and a more comprehensive spectrum of radical movements that are affiliated with *operaismo* and *autonomia*.

While being critical of the asymmetrical attention *autonomia* gained, the emphasis on the seminal ground of both *operaismo* and *autonomia* seems to be overlooked. Instead

there is an inclination to treat any *operaisti* intellectual intervention that is counter-Negri as a benchmark of more appropriate and more justifiable actions without necessarily inquiring more deeply. Once a thread of *operaismo* is demonstrated to be condemning or standing against the extra-parliamentary militancy, it is often considered to be more appropriate and legitimate in its apprehension of the seminal *operaisti* critique. This may be because extra-parliamentary militancy is often identified with the controversial connection established between Negri and Red Brigades by the Italian prosecutors.

With my return to the Italian 1960s and 1970s radical politics, my first conclusion is a general one regarding how to approach to that context that requires us to move beyond the architectural discourse. With my study of this context, I conclude that we need to halt to consider the *operaismo* and *autonomia* movements as mere theoretical endeavours intellectuals intervened with into the culture of struggle in 1960s and 1970s Italy. Those theoretical endeavours which constituted the discourse and the language of the *operaisti* critique were not found in a vacuum. On the contrary, those endeavours were the consequences of the existing social conflicts into which intellectuals inquired; not as outsiders, but through a constant self-interrogation to expose where they stand with reference to the capitalist development with their inquiries to provide the necessary antagonistic tools to resist capitalist development and obliterate the dominance of its structures and institutions. Within the contemporary academic discourse, to some extent, we fail to go beyond the post-*operaisti* or post-autonomist rhetoric these intellectuals adopted. This comes with an assumption that suggests if we understand their limits and failures, we would go beyond their project; where simultaneously we fail to approach their research in the light of their self-interrogation as intellectuals who assume a role within class struggle.

The contribution of intellectuals to *operaismo* (as well as to *autonomia*) and their cultural intervention to the culture of struggle do not cover the political framework of 1960s nor 1970s Italy. The language they constructed with their critique can be understood as an attempt to explain the social, political and economic transformation Italy was going through in the 1960s and 1970s. It is nearly unquestionable that this language is important to understand their project. However in order to apprehend the *operaisti* critique I believe it is equally, if not more, important to identify their project's antagonistic aspect in their constant critique and interrogation of the role they held as scientists, intellectuals or agitators.

The existing inquiries not only fail to be critical of the role of intellectuals with reference to *operaismo* and *autonomia*, but they are also inclined to ignore the self-criticism of those intellectuals at the time or even today. These works do not place enough emphasis on the critique of the role of intellectuals with reference to the critique that *operaisti* initiated.

These debates have become accessible almost in the form of a well prepared package

to contemporary generation of Italian-literate audience via especially the interviews the *operaisti* gave in early twenty-first century. Recently in English there is a growing number of possible means to approach those debates and intellectuals via the works of Mandarini, Toscano as well as Santini who inquire into the roles of intellectuals such as Negri, Cacciari, Fortini and others. Through their works I believe a debate on the role of intellectuals in capitalist development can be revived.

If we want to go beyond either *operaismo* or *autonomia*, it is clear that we need to be able to look beyond what is usually presented by most of the academics and intellectuals. If we acknowledge the self-interrogation of the intellectuals as a crucial and primary aspect of the *operaisti* to understand why *operaisti* figures such as Tronti, Cacciari, Asor Rosa ascribed themselves to a project that ended up being completely different than, say of Negri's after 1968; we may start seeking the alternative positions that intellectuals took in order to go beyond the predominant self-assigned roles of *operaisti* figures. I cannot claim I present those alternative positions within my own research. However by the suite of references that I have made to a defined literature on this context, I suggest we need to go beyond what the existing dominant literature provides us. Overcoming the trend of assigning Negri as representing the autonomist of *autonomia* or counter-Trontian *operaisti* is a start.

2. *Contropiano*'s precise context needs to be understood in relation to the context in which Italy was found after 1968, rather than through the role assigned to the magazine by its editors.

With the second conclusion, in light of my first conclusion, I argue *Contropiano* deserves a more critical assessment with reference to the political framework of 1960s Italy. It is well known that Cacciari and Asor Rosa ascribe the role to the magazine in its second issue published after Negri departing from the editorial board: putting emphasis on class issues. Before this the magazine had no definitive role ascribed to it, apart from being another medium where intellectuals attempted theoretical interventions to the culture of struggle in 1960s Italy. Through the role the magazine was ascribed to, contributors to the magazine articulated their intellectual intervention to the labour movement through with elaboration on their theories via the magazine. However, how we approach the magazine today became demarcated by the project Cacciari initiated with his articulation on "negative thought."

Contopiano is a symbolic moment of departure and/or arrival for the *operaisti* who had been assessing their roles as intellectuals since Panzieri and his critique of the Socialist Party in the early 1960s and after in their break up with Panzieri which eventually lead to the dissolution of *Classe operaia* and the formation of *Contropiano*. *Contropiano* needs to be understood as another medium where, especially in the light of the events that were triggered after the attack of December 12, 1969; the hot autumn of 1969-1970, some intellectuals, whose role was to agitate the masses until 1968 re-calibrated their position as agitators. They re-subscribed themselves as

intellectuals to their standing exterior to the working-class in opposition to assigning themselves as militants.

We need to approach Tronti, Cacciari, Asor Rosa, Dal Co, Tafuri and other figures we find relevant to architectural discourse, without overlooking to those authors' changing tone in terms of class struggle, capitalist development and their roles as intellectuals after 1969 and from the 1970s onwards with reference to the rhetoric they appropriated in the 1960s.

Hence we need to approach Tafuri's assumption about *Contropiano* in 1975, the time when he was writing the "Preface" for the English translation of *Progetto e utopia*, with scrutiny. What Tafuri takes for granted in 1975, the understanding of the working class struggle to which he and his close circle around *Contropiano* assigned themselves, was not fully articulated until the complete experiment at *Contropiano* was tested and the magazine stopped publishing in 1971. This was two years before *Progetto e utopia* was published. Tafuri's expectations that "many equivocal interpretations" would be avoided through the general understanding of the completion of the *Contropiano* project is unrealistic for the context of 1969. But the fact that he held this expectation in 1975, immediately before the English translation makes it clear that the rhetoric of 1969 is somehow very different from that in 1975, as for Tafuri it seems incomprehensible to embrace the 1969 essay in its very own context.

3. We need to acknowledge that the political framework of 1969 "Per una critica dell'ideologia architettonica" shifts significantly by 1973 with *Progetto e utopia*.

In Chapter Three, before postulating the problems with collapsing Tafuri and his personal politics, his complete oeuvre, and phenomena of reception of Tafuri in relation to Tafuri's 1969 essay; I suggested it is worth questioning the assumption that *Architecture and Utopia* is a further articulation and/or more mature version of the essay "Toward a Critique of Architectural Ideology."

In the light of the first two conclusions above, we see that after 1968, *operaisti* find themselves in a crisis which had been preceded by similar such crises since the late 1950s. Within this narration, we see intellectuals' self-interrogation dominated a significant aspect of 1960s' *operaisti* thinking. This self-interrogation had been shaped by the consequences of their agitation of the marginal and radical Left groups including workers and students, but not limited to them. By 1968, and especially after 1969, the social conflicts accompanying the crisis are more intense and more tangible as a result of the antagonistic culture that the *operaisti* had reinforced since the early 1960s against orthodox Marxism and capitalist society. This was heightened by the interventions of the Right wing and the State. In the light of this observation, it is possible to argue that by the time the volume was published: 1973, the *optimistic* outlook for the architect to become an antagonistic political subject is replaced with

an apathy that is legitimized through intellectual debates on negative thought and Cacciari's nihilism. This apathy may be understood as an outcome of the debates amongst the *operaisti* which were hi-jacked by the violent State apparatuses initiated in 1969. This violence was assumed to be part of the greater civil unrest that the new Italian Left was aggravating. Where "Toward a Critique of Architectural Ideology" was speaking from a more agitated and potentially subversive point of view in 1969 when the stakes were getting higher, by 1973 Tafuri was already aligned with those intellectuals whose antagonistic potential was already subsumed back into capitalist development by their unwillingness to participate in the ascending civil disorder. This group rationalized their impasse in place of action.

What is more, by re-assessing the relationship between the 1969 essay and the 1973 volume, it becomes clearer that essay's implications need to be acknowledged in the context of the time without passing them through the filters of Manfredo Tafuri, his career, his audience, his audience's critics or *Contropiano*'s role in this context.

This means, in contrast to Day and Aureli's views that we should approach the work through the lens of the 1970s "negative thought" or Tafuri's subsequent intellectual endeavours, it needs to be acknowledged that the tools and methods that *Contropiano* offered to intellectuals such as "negative thought" were not sufficiently articulated at least until Cacciari published his article in the same issue that Tafuri published his 1969 essay in *Contropiano*. It is not only too hasty but also non-substantial to filter the implications of the essay through *Contropiano*'s take on the role of the intellectual, which we can only ascribe today from the distance we have towards the magazine and the movement. Even if we cannot return to the actual context of the essay, we need to acknowledge its particularity.

The implications of Tafuri's 1969 work can not be treated in a vacuum but only in a context that the magazine provides which is self-evident and noted by Tafuri himself. However, as I mentioned above, we need to acknowledge the fact that the context the magazine provided to Tafuri's essay, was not found in a vacuum either. And once we position that context within its bigger context, it should come to our attention that the essay on its own as an agitation that targets architects, artists, and to some extent intellectuals, finds its proper relevance within the context the magazine is founded upon. This is in contrast to *Contrapiano* understood in the light of the transformation of the politics of its editors. Within the context of *Contropiano* in the light of Cacciari's articulation of "negative thought," the essay is no longer an agitating piece but turns out to be a constituent of Tafuri's project as an attempt to revolutionize pedagogy, success of which can be evaluated today.

4. It is crucial to address Tafuri's 1969 essay as an agitating piece to understand the stakes of the "radical" critique Tafuri delivers.

In the light of all the conclusions above, in response to my research question:

"What is the relevance of re-visiting the political framework of Tafuri's 1969 essay to contemporary architectural discourse" I conclude that it is still relevant, and even crucial to revisit the specific political context of Tafuri's "Toward a Critique of Architectural Ideology" as it is found to be obfuscated and needs to be revealed more before we 'move on' from that context. What is more, with my conclusion that suggests the precise context for Tafuri's essay assigns it an agitating role; I think it is worth questioning to what extent architects were actually agitated? The answer to that question seems to be answered in the light of Tafuri's postulation in his essay's opening paragraph with reference to the bourgeoise intellectual:

> We recognize, in any case, the "necessity" of the bourgeois intellectual in the imperative significance his "social" mission assumes: in other words, there exists, between the avant-gardes of capital and the intellectual avant-gardes, a kind of tacit understanding, so tacit indeed that any attempt to bring it into the light elicits a chorus of indignant protest.[1]

In 1982 Ockman identifies the militancy in Tafuri's 1976 work, along with Jameson. She calls it Tafuri's "military rhetoric": "which aggressively views all institutions, architecture among them, as 'strategies of domination' linked to the advancement of capitalism, and which sees the enemy as ideology."[2] It is through the chorus of "indignant protest" we can understand the limits of architects, architectural practice and theory to actually challenge the status quo, and the limits of their agitation. Within the complexity of the "negative trajectory" Tafuri's critique had been assigned to, Jameson's "Gramscian alternative," for example, comes to the aid of the architect. Without having to confront the *operaisti*, architects assume Tafuri's critique could be assimilated within the architectural discourse. This discourse is attributed an autonomy by architects, architectural historian and theoreticians who are devoted to the professional ground they operate on, regardless Tafuri's exposure of this ground's inherit problems. Where Tafuri's contemporaries are clearly the "indignant protestors;" the subsequent generation of architectural historians and theoreticians are not necessarily going beyond their precursors by failing to interrogate Tafuri's essay's extreme implications which resonate with the 1960s *operaisti* ideal of political commitment which was only given up, even by Cacciari in 1976.

As they do not bother to confront the *opearisti* critique itself, and the proper political framework of Tafuri's 1969 essay, we can assume, for example Ockman and Jameson's identification of the militant qualities in the work of Tafuri was in order to overcome

---

1 Tafuri, "Toward a Critique of Architectural Ideology," 6.

2 Joan Ockman, postcript to *Architecture Criticism Ideology*: "Critical History and the Labors of Sisyphus," in *Architecture Criticism Ideology*, ed. Joan Ockman (New York: Princeton Architectural

Press, 1984): 182-189, 183.

them.

As a consequence the agitating tones in Tafuri's work are getting lost but what is more, they are being replaced by a problematic approach to Tafuri that assumes being true to his complete oeuvre and historiography. Where as for approaching his 1969 essay, this approach is biased and wrong. This approach intentionally overlooks to the agitating arguments present in the essay, by replacing them with their counter-parts in the 1973 book. Or they are ignored completely with an argument that Tafuri was never an *agitator* at the first place. Tafuri's North-American audience have not done so, but paved the ways to such an obfuscation of arguments in Tafuri's 1969 essay that should be confronted by going beyond the architectural discourse. And this is what is being done by the contemporary architectural circles. The contemporary efforts to locate Tafuri within a more appropriate understanding of his project is only possible by manipulating the framework of 1969 with collapsing the 1970s on 1968 and 1969. This is problematic as it needs a systematic subtraction of radical Left militants from the discourse and replace their militancy with a form of post 1968 nihilism that rationalizes one's surrender to the sovereign structures.

Returning to the political context of "Toward a Critique of Architectural Ideology," allows us to conclude there are problems with the way contemporary architectural circles approach the context of *operaismo* and *autonomia* via Tafuri. In this light, we can identify problems with approaching Tafuri's essay and his *Architecture and Utopia* through an assumption that the two are identical; which is not questioned, yet not true. Also this return allows not only to identify intellectuals who have not given enough attention to study of Tafuri or the context, and it allows us to identify a need to study *Contropiano* within architectural theory and history more thoroughly. Even if it is only the implications of returning to the political framework of Tafuri's 1969 essay demonstrate that we need to re-visit Tafuri's 1969 essay in light of the conclusions I draw above: I can confidently conclude it is more than relevant to re-visit the political framework of Tafuri's essay. And it is also relevant as it is necessary to go beyond the already existing discourse around Tafuri and the implications of his work.

EPILOGUE

I mentioned in Chapter Two that in 1994 Ghirardo attacked Peter Eisenman and those who followed his footsteps. Her frustration was with architects' inability to see the consequences of their designs and practice, whether theoretical or not. Within their "blindness," Ghirardo posited the problem, which the new generation of architects in the 1990s would be facing, due to "the network of power relations that sustain the entire institution of building" which architects, architectural historians, theoreticians and academics contribute via their lack of a meaningful dissent.[1] This, Ghirardo argues, avoids an examination or inquiry for "a panacea for the upheavals of deindustrialization and unemployment," which architects are facing.[2]

Peter Eisenman, Zaha Hadid and other such 'starchitects' surely have been able to thrive on in their apprehension of the globalization and working within the contemporary globalized capitalist market as architects.[3] Ghirardo's skepticism toward those architects seem to find its substance in 2001 Tombesi with his paper "A true south for design? The new international division of labour in architecture," where he elaborated two different kinds of "globalization" in relation to architecture. The first one is "the geographic expansion of professional markets" for the architects, which already had been the case with Le Corbusier and Louis Kahn, anyway.[4] Within the contemporary structures, Tombesi draws built environment professionals' attention to the "mobile nature of capital, the use of building imagery as a primary tool of corporate communication, and the reorganization of production geographies," that demands for international design services.[5] He reminds us that "the globalization of architectural markets" and "globalization of design production are two different things."[6] Eisenman and his company's indifference as well as success to find their ways within the second form of globalization's relation to architecture, may grant Ghirardo a more legitimate ground to base her critique on. As Tombesi warns: "within a generation, the bourgeoning third world population will contain not only billions of unskilled workers, but hundreds of millions of scientists, engineers, architects and other professionals willing and able to do world-class work for a fraction of the

1 Ghirardo, "Eisenman's Bogus Avant-Garde," 73.

2 Ibid.

3 For a more contemporary polemic on this issue, see Graham Owen, ed., *Architecture, Ethics and Globalization* (New York: Routledge, 2009).

4 Tombesi, "A True South for design? The New International Division of Labour in Architecture," in *arq* 5, no.2 (2001): 171-180, 171.

5 Ibid.

6 Ibid., 172.

payment their [Western] counterparts expect."[7] This demands, for Tombesi, design services be internationalized and simultaneously developed into another kind of globalization relating to the division of labour internal to the design process: "the geographic subdivision of the design process is an important element to consider for the future architectural practice because it contains the seeds of a fundamental restructuring of professional work."[8] From this point of view, globalization is put as a seed of a fundamental restructuring of professional work.

In 1975, Tafuri wrote

> Paradoxically, the new tasks given to architecture are something besides or beyond architecture. In recognizing this situation, which I mean to corroborate historically, I am expressing no regret, but neither am making an apocalyptical prophecy. No regret, because when the role of a discipline ceases to exist, to try to stop the course of things is only regressive utopia, and of the worst kind. No prophecy, because the process is actually taking place daily before our eyes. And for those wishing striking proof, it is enough to observe the percentage of architectural graduates really exercising that profession.[9]

This and the picture I tried to depict in Chapter Two in the light of one of the threads of the contemporary debate architects, architectural theoreticians, historians as well as other built environment professionals participate, points to one thing in common whether critical of or not the status-quo. There is an apprehension of what Tafuri refers to be a crucial step for architects to confront: understanding the role of the architect in relation to political, social and most importantly, economic structures. Yet architects, architecture theoreticians and historians do so without possessing the assumed criticality Tafuri possessed as an intellectual.

If we approach Tafuri, the political context of his works, their precursors, and his fellow intellectuals' attempts to contest capitalist society; we can start re-considering what today stands as the orthodox-position within academia and architectural so-called radical or critical circles: a hybridization two consequences of post-1968 rhetoric: a devoted skepticism towards possibility of a different world and an impasse that is rationalized as a confrontation of the state of things from within without giving enough emphasis to the fact that this confrontation stays on the level of surrendering unless the conditions for being against are constantly interrogated and reminded. Left without an option to participate in any form of struggle against contemporary social political and economic structures we are simultaneously

7 Ibid., 177.

8 Ibid., 178.

9 Tafuri, *Architecture and Utopia*, ix-x.

encouraged to train ourselves as intellectuals and/or professionals overlooking the consequences of our own participation in this development. Regardless, we still puzzle ourselves with the consequences of capitalist development.

Tafuri and his project failed to antagonize capitalist society. He had his own limitations as an intellectual and an academic. His critics viewed his self-criticality as the source of his "greatest impasse" and greatest limitation as a historian and political theorist. However, there is ground for an argument that his acute self criticality could have carried him beyond some of his intellectual and academic limitations. It is a powerful reminder to question our own limits and ambitions, reassess how much we are willing to push our limits and how much we actually choose to avoid being not only critical but more importantly self-critical in our own engagement with the state of things as architects.

In one sense, Tafuri's only failure with his project was to challenge or transform his own institution, to constitute a moment within the class struggle. And after all, this might have seized to be his project after acquiring a professional status one that is other than as an architect, or never existed at the first place, regardless his collaboration to the project of *operaisti*. Though one thing is for sure that Tafuri's legacy does not necessarily produce academics and intellectuals who possess an unbearable desire to contest and challenge the institutions they are part of. Instead, his legacy grants them and those institutions relatively solid grounds for their roles and positions within the capitalist society with which they are firmer and more resilient to possible attacks.

We can be highly critical of Tafuri, and yet follow in his footsteps. As a dissident, he granted himself the right to refuse to accept the role he had been granted within capitalist development as an architect before 1968. It is curious that his audience have not considered granting themselves the same right instead of mourning over Tafuri's so called declaration of the death of architecture by rigorously attempting to prove architectural practice can not afford to cease to exist. Bernard Tschumi, addresses my curiosity :

> In certain parts of the world, the effect of 1968 was so brutal that intelligent and capable thinkers argued that socially committed architects had to leave architecture all together, because architecture was compromised by power and money, since it takes a lot of money to build a building or lots of power to build new towns. ... The result was that many talented architects left architecture altogether, which inevitably created an uncomfortable situation. ... In the case of Italy, some joined the political underground, got arrested, and then disappeared from the face of architecture. So one asks oneself, how could one find one's way back into

architecture?[10]

I believe we should either be grateful to those who insisted on finding their way back to architecture as architecture, for the art and profession of architecture did not cease to exist. Or we can question how much their resistance to participation in an actual confrontation 'with and against' capitalist structures is to be held accountable for bastardizing and benumbing the *operaisti* and other antagonistic projects of the 1960s.

10 Tschumi, "London-Milan-Paris-Florence," 50.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Akcan, Esra. "Manfredo Tafuri's Theory of the Architectural Avant-Garde." In *Journal of Architecture* 7, no.2 (Summer 2002): 135-170.

Aggregate. *Governing by Design: Architecture, Economy, and Politics in the Twentieth Century*. Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 2012.

Australian Institute of Architects. "What Architects Do." Accessed October 2, 2012. http://www.architecture.com.au/i-cms?page=13274.

Asor Rosa, Alberto, ed. *Socialismo, città, architettura, URSS 1917-1937: Il contributo degli architetti europei*. Rome: Officina, 1971.

___. "Les premières hypotheses de planification urbaine dans la Russie soviétique, 1918-1925." In "Sozialistische Architektur? UdSSR / Architecture socialiste? URSS 1917-1932." Special issue. *Archithese* 7 (1973): 34-41.

___."Critica dell'ideologica ed esercizio storico" / "Critique of Ideology and Historical Practice." Translated by Sebastiano Brandolini. In "Il progetto strocio di Manfredo Tafuri" / The Historical Project of Manfredo Tafuri," ed. Vittorio Gregotti, special issue, *Casabella* nos. 619-620 (1995): 28-33.

___. "Manfredo Tafuri, or, Humanism Revisited." Translated by Ruth Taylor with Daniele Pisani and Manuel Orazi. In *Log*, 9 (Winter/Spring 2007): 29-38.

Aureli, Pier Vittorio. *The Project of Autonomy: Politics and Architecture within and against Capitalism*. New York: Princeton Architectural Press, 2008

___."Intellectual Work and Capitalist Development: Origins and Context of Manfredo Tafuri's Critique of Architectural Ideology." In *The City as a Project* (blog). March 11, 2011. http://thecityasaproject.org/2011/03/pier-vittorio-aureli-manfredo-tafuri/. Originally published as an earlier version with the same title in *SITE* 26-27 (2009): 18-23.

___. *The Possibility of an Absolute Architecture*. Cambridge and London: The MIT Press, 2011.

Amyot, Grant. *The Italian Communist Party: The Crisis of the Popular Front Strategy*. London: Biddles Guildford and King's Lynn, 1981.

Aufhaben. Review of *Storming Heaven: Class Composition and Struggle in Italian Autonomist Marxism* by Steve Wright and *Reading Capital Politically* (2nd edn.) by Harry Cleaver: "From Operaismo to Autonomist Marxism." In *Aufhaben* 11 (2003) http://www.prole.info/texts/automarx.html.

___. "Must try harder!: Towards a Critique of Autonomist Marxism." In *Aufhaben* 13 (2005). http://libcom.org/library/aufheben/aufheben-13-2005/must-try-harder-towards-a-critique-of-autonomist-marxism.

Begg, Zanny. "Autonomous Marxism – DIY Revolution." In *GLW* 384 (November 10, 1999). http://www.greenleft.org.au/node/18943

Berghaus, Günther. *Futurism and Politics: Between Anarchist Rebellion and Fascist Reaction, 1909-1944*. Oxford: Berghahn Books, 1996.

Barber, Danial A. "Militant Architecture: Destabilising Architecture's Disciplinarity." In *Critical Architecture*. Edited by Mark Dorrian, Murray Fraser, Jonathan Hill, and Jane Rendell, 57-66. London and New York: Routledge, 2007.

Brown, Alexandra. "Operaismo, Architecture & Design in Ambasz's New Domestic Landscape: Issues of Redefinition and Refusal in 1960s Italy," in *Imagining: Proceedings of the 27th International SAHANZ Conference*. Edited by Michael Chapman and Michael Ostwald. 52-57. New Castle: SAHANZ, 2010.

Biraghi, Marco. *Progetto di crisi: Manfredo Tafuri e l'architettura contemporanea*. Milan: Marinotti, 2005.

___., Gabriella Lo Ricco, Silvia Micheli and Mario Vigano, eds. *Italia 60/70 : una stagione dell'architettura*. Padova: Il Poligrafo, 2010.

Bologna, Sergio. Review of *Storming Heaven: Class Composition and Struggle in Italian Autonomist Marxism* by Steve Wright. Translated by Arianna Bove in *Strategies: Journal of Theory, Culture & Politics* 16, no.2 (2003): 97-105.

___. "Workerist Publications and Bios." Translated by Lawrence Venuti. In *Autonomia: Post-Political Politics*. Edited by Sylvère Lotringer and Christian Marazzi. 178-181. 2nd ed. Los Angeles: Semiotext(e), 2007.

Borio, Guido, Francesca Pozzi, Gigi Roggero, eds. *Futuro anteriore: Dai "Quaderni rossi" ai movimento globali – Richezze e limiti dell'operaismo italiano*. Rome: DerriveApprodi, 2002.

___. *Gli operaisti: Autobiografie di cattivi maestri*. Rome: DeriveApprodi, 2005.

Cacciari, Massimo. *Architecture and Nihilism: On the Philosophy of Modern Architecture*. Translated by Stephen Sartarelli. New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1993.

___. "Metropolis." In *Architecture and Nihilism: On the Philosophy of Modern Architecture*. Translated by Stephen Sartarelli, 3-22. New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1993.

Calvi, Evelina. "Oublier Tafuri?" In "Being Manfredo Tafuri." Special issue. Edited

by Ignasi de Solà-Morales. *Architecture New York*, nos. 25-26 (2000): 21-28.

CARI, " April 7: Repression in Italy." In *Autonomia: Post-Political Politics*. Edited by Sylvère Lotringer and Christian Marazzi. v-xvi. 2nd ed. Los Angeles: Semiotext(e), 2007.

Carrera, Alessandro. Introduction to *The Unpolitical: On the Radical Critique of Political Reason*: "On Massimo Cacciari's Disenchanted Activism." 1-44. New York: Fordham University Press.

Castellano, Lucio. "Living with Guerilla Welfare." Translated by Felicia Czin. In *Autonomia: Post-Political Politics*. Edited by Sylvère Lotringer and Christian Marazzi. 228-233. 2nd ed. Los Angeles: Semiotext(e), 2007.

Chiesa, Lorenzo and Alberto Toscano, eds. *The Italian Difference: Between Nihilism and Biopolitics*. Melbourne: Re.press, 2009.

Christie, Stuart. *Stefano Delle Chiale: Portrait of a Black Terrorist*. London: Anarchy Magazine/Refract Publications, 1984.

Ciucci, Giorgio, Francesco Dal Co and Mario Manieri-Elia, eds. *La città americana dalla Guerra civile al New Deal*. Bari: Laterza, 1973. Translated into English by Barbara Luigia La Penta as *The American Ctiy from the Civil War to the New Deal*. Cambridge and London: The MIT Press, 1979.

Cleaver, Harry. *Reading 'Capital' Politically*. 2nd ed. Leeds, Edinburgh and San Francisco: AK Press, 2000.

___. "Response to Sergio Fiedler's Attack on Autonomous Marxism." In *libcom.org*. August 10, 2005. http://libcom.org/library/response-sergio-fiedler-attack-autonomous-marxism-cleaver.

Cole, Raymond J. and Richard Lorch, eds. Buildings, Culture and Environment: Informing Local and Global Practices. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing, 2003.

___. Introduction to Buildings, Culture and Environment. "Knowledge, Values and Building Design." In *Buildings, Culture and Environment: Informing Local and Global Practices*. Edited by Raymond J. Cole and Richard Lorch. 1-8. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing, 2003.

Colomina, Beatriz and Craig Buckley, eds. *Clip Stamp Fold: The Radical Architecture of Little Magazines 196x to 197x*. Barcelona: Actar, 2010.

Cooper, Ian. "What is the Problem?" In *Buildings, Culture and Environment: Informing Local and Global Practices*. Edited by Raymond J. Cole and Richard Lorch. 109-124. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing, 2003.

___. "Understanding Context." In *Buildings, Culture and Environment: Informing*

Local and Global Practices. Edited by Raymond J. Cole and Richard Lorch, 11-17. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing, 2003.

Crinson, Mark and Jules Lubbock. *Architecture: Art or Profession? Three Hundred Years of Architectural Education in Britain*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1994.

Cuninghame, Patrick. "'Hot Autumn': Italy's Factory Councils and Autonomous Workers' Assemblies." In *Ours to Master and to Own: Workers' Control from the Commune to the Present*. Edited by Immanuel Ness and Dario Azzellini. 322- 337. Chicago: Haymarket Books: 2011.

Day, Gail. "Strategies in the Metropolitan Merz: Manfredo Tafuri and Italian Workerism." In *Radical History* 133 (September/October 2005): 26-38.

___. Review of *The Project of Autonomy: Politics and Architecture Within and Against Capitalism* by Pier Vittorio Aureli. In "Review Articles," *Historical Materialism* 18 (2010): 219-236.

___. *Dialectical Passions: Negation in Postwar Art Theory*. New York: Columbia University Press, 2011

___."Manfredo Tafuri, Fredric Jameson and the Contestations of Political Memory," in *Historical Materialism* 20, no.1 (2012): 31-77.

Davies, William and John Knell. "Context." In *The Professionals' choice: The Future of the Environment Professions*, edited by Simon Foxell, 17-34. London: Building Futures, 2003.

Davis, Mike. *Planet of Slums*. London and New York: Verso, 2006.

Deamer, Peggy and Phillip G. Bernstein, eds. *Building (in) the Future: Recasting Labor in Architecture*. New York: Princeton Architectural Press, 2010.

Del Re, Alisa. "Feminism and Autonomy: Itinerary of Struggle." Interview with Alisa Del Re. Translated by Arianna Bove. In *The Philosophy of Antonio Negri: Resistance in Practice*. Edited by Timothy S. Murphy and Abdul-Karim Mustapha. 48-72. London: Pluto Press, 2005.

Deleuze, Gilles. "Open Letter to Negri's Judges." Translated by Committee April 7. In *Autonomia: Post-Political Politics*. Edited by Sylvère Lotringer and Christian Marazzi, 182-184. 2nd ed. Los Angeles: Semiotext(e), 2007.

Davies, William and John Knell, "Context." In *The Professionals' choice: The Future of the Environment Professions*. Edited by Simon Foxell. 17-34. London: Building Futures, 2003.

Di Leo, Jeffrey R. and Sophia A. McClennen. "Postscript on Violence." In

Symploke 20 nos. 1-2 (2012): 241-250.

Dorrian, Mark, Murray Fraser, Jonathan Hill and Jane Rendell, eds. *Critical Architecture*. London and New York: Routledge, 2007.

Dyer-Witheford, Nick. *Autonomist-Marxism and the Information Society*. Canberra: Treason Press, 2004.

___. "Cyber-Negri: General Intellect and Immaterial Labor." In *The Philosophy of Antonio Negri: Resistance in Practice*. Edited by Timothy S. Murphy and Abdul-Karim Mustapha. 136-162. London: Pluto Press, 2005

FantoSamotnaf, Sam. "cop-out-the significance of Aufhebengate." *dialectical delinquents* (blog), January, 2013. http://dialectical-delinquents.com/?page_id=9.

Fleming, Jim. Editor's Preface to *Marx Beyond Marx: Lessons on the Grundrisse*. Antonio Negri. Edited by Jim Fleming. vii-xiii. New York and London: Autonomedia and Pluto Press, 1991.

Foxell, Simon, ed. *The Professionals' choice: The Future of the Environment Professions*. London: Building Futures, 2003.

Galimberti, Jacopo. "The Intelelctual and the Fool: Piero Manzoni between the Milanese Art Scene and the Land of Cockaigne," in *Oxford Art Journal* 35:1 (2012): 75-94

___. "The N Group and the Operaisti: Art and Class Struggle in the Italian Economic Boom," in *Grey Room* 45 (Fall 2012): 80-101

Gannon, Todd, ed. *Zaha Hadid: BMW Central Building*. New York: Princeton Architectural Press, 2006.

___. "Conversations with Zaha Hadid." Interview with Zaha Hadid, Patrik Schumacher, Lars Teichmann. In *Zaha Hadid: BMW Central Building*. Edited by Todd Gannon. 13-22. New York: Princeton Architectural Press, 2006.

Gregotti, Vittorio, ed. "Il progetto storico di Manfredo Tafuri" / "The Historical Project of Manfredo Tafuri." Special issue, *Casabella*, nos. 619-620, 1995.

Ginsborg, Paul. *A History of Contemporary Italy: Society and Politics 1943–1988*. Harmondsworth: Penguin Books, 1990.

Ghirardo, Diane, Y. "Manfredo Tafuri and Architecture Theory in the U.S., 1970-2000." In "Mining Autonomy," *Perspecta* 33 (2002): 38-47.

Goodbun, Jon. "The Assasin: The Critical Legacies of Manfredo Tafuri, Columbia University, New York, 20-21 April 2006." In *Radical Philosophy* 138 (July/August 2006).

Hardt, Michael. "Into the Factory: Negri's Lenin and the Subjective Caesura (1968-73)." In *The Philosophy of Antonio Negri: Resistance in Practice*. Edited by Timothy S. Murphy and Abdul-Karim Mustapha. 7-37. London: Pluto Press, 2005.

Hays, Michael K. *Architecture Theory since 1968*. Cambridge: MIT Press, 2000.

___. Introduction to "Toward a Critique of Architectural Ideology." In *Architecture Theory since 1968*. Cambridge: MIT Press. Edited by Michael K. Hays. 2-5. Cambridge: MIT Press, 2000.

___. "Tafuri's Ghosts." In "Being Manfredo Tafuri." Special issue. Edited by Ignasi de Solà-Morales, *Architecture New York*, nos. 25-26 (2000): 36-42.

Hill, Timothy. "Newsworthy: People Clear About Architect's Role." In "Bring me the Horizon." Edited by Anthony Parker. *Architect Victoria: Official Journal of the Australian Institute of Architects Victorian Chapter* (Winter 2011): 4.

Hoekstra, Rixt. "Lost in Translation? Tafuri in Germant, Tafuri on Germany: A History of Reception." *International Journal of Architectural Theory* 12, no.2 (December 2008). http://www.tu-cottbus.de/theoriederarchitektur/Wolke/wolke_neu/inhalt/en/issue/2007-2.php#2-5.

Jameson, Fredric. "The Politics of Theory: Ideological Positions in the Postmodernism Debate." In "Modernity and Postmodernity," *New German Critique* 33 (Autumn 1984): 53-65. http://www.jstor.org/stable/488353

___. "Architecture and the Critique of Ideology." In *Architecture Criticism Ideology*. Edited by Joan Ockman. 51-87. New York: Princeton Architectural Press, 1984.

___. *Archaeologies of the Future* (London and New York: Verso, 2005)

Kaminer, Tahl. *Architecture, Crisis and Resuscitation: The Reproduction of Post-Fordism in late-twentieth-century Architecture*. London and New York: Routledge, 2011.

Koetter, Fred and Colin Rowe. *Collage City*. Cambridge: MIT Press, 1983.

Lazzarato, Maurizio. "Immaterial Labor." Translated by Paul Colilli and Ed Emory. In "Radical Thought in Italy: A Potential Politics." Edited by Paolo Virno and Michael Hardt. *Theory Out of Bounds* 7 (1996): 132-147.

Leach, Andrew. "'Everything we do is but the larva of our intentions': Manfredo Tafuri and Storia dell'architettura italiana 1944-1985." In *Additions to Architectural History: XIXth Annual Conference of the Society of Architectural Historians, Australia and New Zealand*. Edited by John Macarthur and Antony Moulis. 1-12. Brisbane: SAHANZ, 2002.

___. "Death in Venice: Tafuri's Life in the Project." *Architectural Theory Review* 8,

no.1 (2003): 235-244.

___. "Inoperative Criticism: Tafuri and the Discipline of History." *Architectural Theory Review* 8, no.2 (2003): 85-93.

___. "Choosing History: A Study of Manfredo Tafuri's Theorisation of Architectural History and Architectural History Research." PhD dissertation, University of Ghent, 2006.

___. "Tafuri's Eyes: The Biographical Subject and Subjectives of Reception." In *Contested Terrains: Proceedings of the 23rd Annual conference of the Society of Architectural Historians, Australia and New Zealand*. Edited by Steve Basson, Terrance McMinn and John Stephens. 285-290. Perth: SAHANZ, 2006.

___. *Manfredo Tafuri: Choosing History*. Ghent: A&S Books, 2007.

___. "Criticality and Operativity." In *Critical Architecture*. Edited by Mark Dorrian, Murray Fraser, Jonathan Hill and Jane Rendell. 14-21. London and New York: Routledge, 2007.

van der Linden, Marcel. "Socialisme ou Barbarie: A French Revolutionary Group (1949-65)." In *Left History* 5, no.1 (1997): 7-37. http://www.left-dis.nl/uk/lindsob.htm.

Lombardo, Patrizia. *Introduction to Architecture and Nihilism: On the Philosophy of Modern Architecture* by Massimo Cacciari: "The Philosophy of the City": ix-lviii. New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1993.

Lotringer, Sylvère and Christian Marazzi, eds. *Autonomia: Post-Political Politics*. 2nd ed. Los Angeles: Semiotext(e), 2007.

___. "In the Shadow of the Red Brigades." In *Autonomia: Post-Political Politics*. Edited by Sylvère Lotringer and Christian Marazzi. v-xvi. 2nd ed. Los Angeles: Semiotext(e), 2007.

___., and Christian Marazzi, "The Return of Politics." In *Autonomia: Post-Political Politics*. Edited by Sylvère Lotringer and Christian Marazzi. 8-21. 2nd ed. Los Angeles: Semiotext(e), 2007.

Lumley, Robert. *States of Emergency: Cultures of Revolt in Italy from 1968 to 1978*. New York: Verso, 1990.

Mandarini, Matteo and Alberto Toscani. Translator's introduction to *Political Descartes: Reason, Ideology and the Bourgeois Project*: "Antonio Negri and the Antinomies of Bourgeois Thought." In Antonio Negri, *Political Descartes: Reason, Ideology and the Bourgeois Project*. Translated by Matteo Mandarini and Alberto Toscani. 1-25. London and New York: Verso, 2007.

___. "Beyond Nihilism: Notes Towards a Critique of Left-Heidegerrianism in Italian Philosophy of the 1970s." *Cosmos and History: The Journal of Natural and Social Philosophy* 5, no.1 (2009): 37-56.

Matheron, François. "Operaismo." Translated by Nate Holdren. In *multitudes*. http://multitudes.samizdat.net/Operaismo.

Milner, Andrew. Review of Archeologies of the Future by Fredric Jameson: "Jameson's Utopia or Orwell's Dystopia?" In *Historical Materialism* 17 (2009): 101-119.

Mometti, Felice. "La Crisi come progetto: Architettura e storia in Manfredo Tafuri." In *Marx au XXI siècle : l'esprit & la lettre*. (n.d.) http://www.marxau21.fr/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=175:manfredo-tafuri-la-crisi-come-progetto&catid=54:culture-arts-a-esthetique&Itemid=77.

Moulier, Yann. Introduction to *The Politics of Subversion: A Manifesto for the Twenty-First Century*. Antonio Negri. Translated by Philippa Hurd. 1-44. Cambridge: Polity Press, 2005.

Murphy, Timothy S. Editor's Introduction to *Books for Burning: Between Civil War and Democracy in 1970s Italy*. Antonio Negri. Edited by Timothy S. Murphy. ix-xxviii. London and New York: Verso, 2005.

___., and Abdul-Karim Mustapha, eds. *The Philosophy of Antonio Negri: Resistance in Practice*. London: Pluto Press, 2005.

Negri, Antonio. *Revolution Retrieved: Selected Writings on Marx, Keynes, Capitalist Crisis and New Social Subjects 1967-83*. Edited by Red Notes. London: Red Notes: 1988.

___. "Keynes and the Capitalist Theories of the State Post-1929." In *Revolution Retrieved: Selected Writings on Marx, Keynes, Capitalist Crisis and New Social Subjects 1967-83*. Translated by Ed Emery and John Merrington. 9-42. London: Red Notes: 1988. Originally published as "La teoria capitalista dello stato nel '29: John M. Keynes." *Contropiano* 1 (1968): 3-40.

___. "Archeology and Project: The Mass Worker and the Social Worker." In *Revolution Retrieved: Selected Writings on Marx, Keynes, Capitalist Crisis and New Social Subjects 1967-83*. 203-228. Translated by Red Notes. London: Red Notes: 1988.

___. *Marx Beyond Marx: Lessons on the Grundrisse*. Edited by Jim Fleming. Translated by Harry Cleaver, Michael Ryan and Maurizio Viano. New York and London: Autonomedia and Pluto Press, 1991.

___. "Reviewing the Experience of Italy in the 1970s." Translated by Ed Emery. *Le*

Monde diplomatique (September 1998) http://mondediplo.com/1998/09/11negri.

___. *Negri on Negri: Antonio Negri with Anne Dufourmantelle*. Translated by M.B. DeBevoise, New York and London: Routledge, 2004.

___. *Books for Burning: Between Civil War and Democracy in 1970s Italy*. Edited by Timothy S. Murphy. London and New York: Verso, 2005.

___. *The Politics of Subversion: A Manifesto for the Twenty-First Century*. Translated by James Newell. Cambridge: Polity Press, 2005.

___. "The Italian Difference." Translated by Lorenzo Chiesa. In *The Italian Difference: Between Nihilism and Biopolitics*. Edited by Lorenzo Chiesa and Alberto Toscano. 13-23. Melbourne: Re.press, 2009.

___. *Political Descartes: Reason, Ideology and the Bourgeois Project*. Translated by Matteo Mandarini and Alberto Toscano. London and New York: Verso, 2006.

___. "Negri's Interrogation." Translated by III WW and Phil Mattera. In *Autonomia: Post-Political Politics*. Edited by Sylvère Lotringer and Christian Marazzi. 188-194. 2nd ed. Los Angeles: Semiotext(e), 2007.

___. "On Rem Koolhaas." Translated by Arianna Bove. In *Radical Philosophy* 154 (March-April 2009): 48-50.

Nesbitt, Kate, ed. *Theorizing a New Agenda for Architecture: An Anthology of Architectural Theory 1965 – 1995*. Princeton Architectural Press, 1996.

O'Brien, James P. "Possibilities for Architectural Production under Capitalism." PhD dissertation, MIT, 2007. http://dspace.mit.edu/handle/1721.1/41718.

Obrist, Hans Ulrich. "In Conversation with Antonio Negri." In *e-flux* journal, 18 (September 2010). http://www.e-flux.com/journal/in-conversation-with-antonio-negri/.

Ockman, Joan, ed. *Architecture Criticism Ideology*. New York: Princeton Architectural Press, 1984.

___. Postscript to *Architecture Criticism Ideology*: "Critical History and the Labors of Sisyphus." In *Architecture Criticism Ideology*. Edited by Joan Ockman. 182-189. New York: Princeton Architectural Press, 1984.

Oliver, Giles. "Responsive Practice." In *Architecture and its Ethical Dilemmas*. Edited by Nicholas Ray. 55-68. New York: Taylor and Francis, 2005.

Owen, Graham, ed. *Architecture, Ethics and Globalization*. New York: Routledge, 2009.

Parker, Simon. *Cities, Politics and Power*. New York: Routledge, 2010.

Pescarolo, Sandra. "From Gramsci to Workerism." In *People's History and Socialist Theory*. Edited by Raphael Samuel. 273-78. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1981.

Panzieri, Raniero. "Surplus-value and Planning: Note on the reading of *Capital*." Translated by Julian Bees. In *The Labour Process and Class Strategies*. Conference of Socialist Economists 1. 4-25. London: CSE, 1976. Originally published as "Plusvalore e pianificazione: Appunti di lettura del capitale." *Quaderni rossi* 4 (1964): 257-288.

___. "The Capitalist Use of Machinery: Marx versus the Objectivists." Translated by Quintin Hoare. In *Outlines of a Critique of Technology*. Edited by Phil Slater. 44-69. London: Atlantic Highlands, 1980. Originally published as "Sull'uso capitalistico delle macchine nel neocapitalismo." *Quaderni rossi* 1 (1961): 53-72.

Parker, Anthony, ed. "Bring me the Horizon." *Architect Victoria: Official Journal of the Australian Institute of Architects Victorian Chapter* (Winter 2011).

Parker, Simon. *Cities, Politics and Power*. New York: Taylor and Francis, 2010.

Piperno, Franco. "The Naked Truth about Moro's Detention." In *Autonomia: Post-Political Politics*. Edited by Sylvère Lotringer and Christian Marazzi. 202-205. 2nd ed. Los Angeles: Semiotext(e), 2007.

Pollard, John. *The Fascist Experience in Italy*. London and New York: Routledge, 2005.

Ray, Nicholas, ed. *Architecture and its Ethical Dilemmas*. New York: Taylor and Francis, 2005.

Red Notes, ed. *Working Class Autonomy and the Crisis: Italian Marxist Texts of the Theory and Practice of a Class Movement 1964-79*. (London: Red Notes and CSE Books, 1979).

Rendell, Jane. Introduction to *Critical Architecture*: "Critical Architecture: Between Criticism and Design." In *Critical Architecture*. Edited by Mark Dorrian, Murray Fraser, Jonathan Hill and Jane Rendell. 1-9. London and New York: Routledge, 2007.

RIBA. *Explaining an Architect's Services: General Information on the Usual Tasks Undertaken by an Architect*. London: RIBA, June 2008.

Roche, François. "A Dialogue: Negri and Roche." In "Reclaim Resi[lience]stance," edited by François Roche. *Log*, 25 (2012): 104-117.

Santini, Francesco. Review of *Critica dell'utopia capitale* by Giorgio Cesarano:

"Apocalypse and Survival." Translated by Alias Recluse. In *libcom.org* (January 16, 2013) http://libcom.org/library/apocalypse-survival-reflections-giorgio-cesaranos-book-critica-dell'utopia-capitale-expe. Originally published as "Apocalisse e sopravvivenza: Considerazioni sul libro *Critica dell'utopia capitale* di Giorgio Cesarano e sull'esperienza della corrente comunista radicale in Italia." In *autprol.org* (1994) http://www.autprol.org/public/news/apoeriv.htm (accessed on January 24, 2013)

Saint, Andrew. "Practical Wisdom for Architects: The Uses of Ethics." In *Architecture and its Ethical Dilemmas*. Edited by Nicholas Ray. 7-21. New York: Taylor and Francis, 2005.

Slater, Phil. "Introduction to Panzieri," in *Outlines of a Critique of Technology*. Edited by Phil Slater. 39-43. London and Atlantic Highlands: Ink Links and Humanities Press, 1980.

de Solà-Morales, Ignasi, ed. "Being Manfredo Tafuri." Special issue. *Architecture New York*, nos. 25-26, 1999.

___. "Beyond the Radical Critique: Manfredo Tafuri and Contemporary Architecture." In "Being Manfredo Tafuri." Special issue. Edited by Ignasi de Solà-Morales, *Architecture New York*, nos. 25-26 (2000): 56-60.

Spencer, Douglas. "Replicant Urbanism: The Architecture of Hadid's Central Building at BMW, Leipzig." *The Journal of Architecture* 15, no.2 (2010): 181-207.

Stille, Alexander. "'Apocalypse Soon': An Exchange." *The New York Review of Books*. February, 23, 2003. http://www.nybooks.com/articles/archives/2003/feb/27/apocalypse-soon-an-exchange

Stoppani, Teresa. "The Building of Tension - Manfredo Tafuri's Legacy: from Operative Criticism to Historical Project, Between Critical Practices and Material Practices in Architecture." In *Reflections on Creativity: Exploring the Role of Theory in Creative Practices, 21 and 22 April 2006*, edited by Hamid van Koten. Dundee: Duncan of Jordanstone College, 2007. http://artanddesign.dundee.ac.uk/reflections/pdfs/TeresaStoppani.pdf

Tafuri, Manfredo. *Teorie e storia dell'architettura*. Bari: Laterza, 1968. Translated into English by Giorgio Verrecchia as *Theories and History of Architecture* (London: Granada, 1980).

___. "Toward a Critique of Architectural Ideology." Translated by Stephen Sartorelli. In *Architecture Theory since 1968*, edited by Michael Hays: 6-35. Cambridge & London: MIT Press, 1998. Originally published as "Per una critica dell'ideologia architettonica," in *Contropiano: Materiali marxisti* 1 (1969): 31-79.

___. "Lavoro intellectuale e sviluppo capitalistico." In *Contropiano: Materiali marxisti* 2 (1970): 241-281.

___. "Socialdemocrazia e città nella Repubblica di Weimar," in *Contropiano: Materiali marxisti* 1 (1971): 207-223

___. "Design and Technological Utopia." In *Italy: The New Domestic Landscape, Achievements and Problems of Italian Design*. Edited by Emilio Ambasz. 388-404. New York: Museum of Modern Art, 1972.

___."URSS-Berlin: Du populisme à l''internationale constuctiviste'." In "L'architecture et l'avant-garde artistique en URSS de 1917 à 1934." Special issue. VH101: Revue trimestrielle nos. 7-8 (1972): 53-87. English edition published as "USSR-Berlin, 1922: From Populism to 'Constructivist International'," in *Architecture Criticism Ideology*. Edited by Joan Ockman. 121-181. New York: Princeton Architectural Press, 1984.

___., Massimo Cacciari and Francesco Dal Co. *De la vanguardia a la metropolis: Crítica radical a la arquitectura*. Barcelona: Gili, 1972.

___. *Architecture and Utopia: Design and Capitalist Development*. Translated by Barbara Luigia La Penta. Cambridge & London: MIT Press, 1976. Originally published as *Progetto e utopia: Architettura e sviluppo capitalistico* (Bari: Laterza, 1973).

___. "'L'architecture dans le boudoir:' The Language of Criticism and the Criticism of Language." Translated by Victor Caliandro. In *Oppositions*, no. 3 (1974): 37-67.

___. La sfera e il labirinto: Avanguardie e architettura da Piranesi agli anni'70. Turin: Einaudi, 1980. Translated into English by Barbara Luigi La Penta as *The Sphere and the Labyrinth: Avant-Gardes and Architecture from Piranesi to the 1970s.* Cambridge: MIT Press, 1987.

___. "Manfredo Tafuri." Interview with Manfredo Tafuri. By Fulvio Irace. In *Domus* 653 (September 1984): 26-28.

___. *Storia dell'architettura italiana*. 1944-1985. Turin: Einaudi, 1986. Translated into English by Jessica Levine as *History of Italian Architecture*, 1944-1985. Cambridge and London: MIT Press, 1989.

___. "There is No Criticism, Only History." Interview with Manfredo Tafuri. By Richard Ingersoll. In *Design Book Review* 9 (Spring 1986): 8-11.

___. *History of Italian Architecture 1944-1985*. Translated by Jessica Levine. Cambridge and London: The MIT Press, 1989. Originally published as *Storia dell'architettura italiana, 1944-1985* (Torino: Giulio Einaudi editore, 1986).

___. "I mercati della cultura: Françoise Very intervista Manfredo Tafuri" / "The Culture Markets: Françoise Very interviews Manfredo Tafuri." Translated by Kenneth Hylton. Interview with Manfredo Tafuri. By Françoise Very. In "Il progetto storico di Manfredo Tafuri" / "The Historical Project of Manfredo Tafuri," special issue, ed. Gregotti, Vittorio, *Casabella* nos. 619-620 (1995): 36-45. Originally published as "Entretien avec Manfredo Tafuri," in *Architecture mouvement continuité*, 39 (June 1976): 64-68.

___. "History as Project." Translated by Denise Lynne Bratton. Interview with Manfredo Tafuri. By Luisa Passerini. In "Being Manfredo Tafuri." Special issue. Edited by Ignasi de Solà-Morales. *Architecture New York*, nos. 25-26 (2000): 10-70.

Tarrow, Sidney. *Democracy and Disorder: Protest and Politics in Italy 1965-1975*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1989.

Teichmann, Lars. "Architect's Statement." In *Zaha Hadid: BMW Central Building*. Edited by Todd Gannon. 9-11. New York: Princeton Architectural Press, 2006.

Teyssot, Georges. "One Portrait of Tafuri." Interview with George Teyssot. By Paul Henneger. In "Being Manfredo Tafuri." Special issue. Edited by Ignasi de Solà-Morales. *Architecture New York*, nos. 25-26 (2000): 10-16.

Till, Jeremy. *Architecture Depends*. New York and London: MIT Press, 2009.

Tombesi, Paolo. "A True South for Design? The New International Division of Labour in Architecture." In *arq* 5, no.2 (2001): 171-180.

___. "Capital Gains and Architectural Losses: The Expansion Journey of Caudill Rowlett Scott: 1948-1994." *LIMITS: from the 21st Annual Conference of the Society of Architectural Historians Australia and New Zealand*. Edited by Harriet Edquist and Hélène Frichot. Volume 2. Melbourne: SAHANZ, 2004: 485-491.

___. "On the Cultural Seperation of Design Labor." In *Building (in) the Future: Recasting Labor in Architecture*. Edited by Peggy Deamer and Phillip G. Bernstein. 118-136. New York: Princeton Architectural Press, 2010.

Toscano, Alberto. "The Non-State Intellectual: Franco Fortini and Communist Criticism." *Occasion: Interdisciplinary Studies in the Humanities* 3 (March 1, 2012). http://occasion.stanford.edu/node/73

Tschumi, Bernard, "London-Milan-Paris-Florence." Conversation with Stefano Boeri and Bernard Tschumi. In *Clip Stamp Fold: The Radical Architecture of Little Magazines 196x to 197x*. Edited by Beatriz Colomina and Craig Buckley. 47-57. Barcelona: Actar, 2010.

Tronti, Mario. *Operai e capitale*. 1966. Reprint, Turin: Giulio Einaudi editore, 1977.

___. "Social Capital." *Telos*, no. 17 (Fall 1973): 98-121. doi:10.3817/0973017098. Originally published as "Il piano del capitale." *Quaderni Rossi* 3 (1963): 44-73.

___. "Struggle Against Labor." In *Radical America* 6, no. 1 (May-June 1972): 22-25. Originally published as "14.Lotta contro il lavoro!" In *Operai e capitale*. Mario Tronti. 259-263. Torino: Giulio Einaudi editore, 1966. http://dl.lib.brown.edu/pdfs/112540371468249.pdf

___. "The Strategy of Refusal." Translated by Red Notes. In *Autonomia: Post-Political Politics*. Edited by Sylvère Lotringer and Christian Marazzi, 28-35. 2nd ed. Los Angeles: Semiotext(e), 2007. Originally published as "12. La strategia del rigiuto." In *Operai e capitale*. Mario Tronti. 234-252. Torino: Giulio Einaudi editore, 1966.

___. "Lenin in England." Translated by Red Notes. *Working Class Autonomy and the Crisis: Italian Marxist Texts of the Theory and Practice of a Class Movement: 1964-79*. Edited by Red Notes. 1-6. London: Red Notes and CSE Books, 1979. Originally published as "Lenin in Inghilterra," in *Classe Operaia* 1 (January 1964). Republished in *Opreai e Capitale*. Mario Tronti. 89-95. Torino: Guilio Einaudi editore, 1966.

___. "Classe e partito." In *Operai e capitale*. 110-120. Torino: Giulio Einaudi editore, 1966. Translated into English by Alex Diceanu as "Class and Party." In *libcom.org* (2006) http://libcom.org/book/export/html/30013.

___. "Towards a Critique of Political Democracy." Translated by Alberto Toscano. In *The Italian Difference: Between Nihilism and Biopolitics*. Edited by Lorenzo Chiesa and Alberto Toscano. 97-106. Melbourne: Re.press, 2009.

___. "Our Operaismo." Translated by Eleanor Chiari. In *New Left Review* 73 (January-February 2012): 119-139.

Ward, Colin. Talking to Architects: Ten Lectures by Colin Ward. London: Freedom Press, 1996.

Weeks, Kathi. "The Refusal of Work as Demand and Perspective." In *The Philosophy of Antonio Negri: Resistance in Practice*. Edited by Timothy S. Murphy and Abdul-Karim Mustapha. 109-135. London: Pluto Press, 2005.

___. *The Problem with Work: Feminism, Marxism, Antiwork Politics and Postwork Imaginaries*. Durham and London: Duke University Press, 2011.

Weinberg, Leonard. *The Transformation of Italian Communism*. New Jersey: Transaction Publishers, 1995.

Wigley, Mark. "Post-Operative History." In "Being Manfredo Tafuri." Edited by Ignasi de Solà-Morales. Special issue. *Architecture New York*, nos. 25-26 (2000): 47-

53.

Wright, Steve. *Storming Heaven: Class Composition and Struggle in Italian Autonomist Marxism*. London: Pluto Press, 2002.

___. "Operaismo, Autonomia, Settantasette in Translation: Then, Now, the Future," in *Strategies* 16 (2003): 107-120. doi: 10.1080/1040213032000151548

___. Review of *Futuro anteriore, Dai 'Quaderni Rossi' ai movimenti globali: ricchezze e limiti dell'operaismo italiano*, edited by Guido Borio, Fracesca Pozzi and Gigi Roggero, and *La nefasta utopia di Potere operaio. Lavoro tecnica movimento nel laboratorio politico del Sessantotto italiano* by Franco Berardi: "Children of a Lesser Marxism?" In *Historical Materialism*, vol. 12, no.1 (2004): 261-274.

___. "A Party of Autonomy?" In *The Philosophy of Antonio Negri: Resistance in Practice*. Edited by Timothy S. Murphy and Abdul-Karim Mustapha. 73-106. London: Pluto Press, 2005.

___. "Back to the Future: Italian Workerists Reflect Upon the Operaista Project." In *ephemera* 7, no.1 (2007): 270-281. www.ephemeraweb.org/journal/7-1/7-1wright.pdf.

Virno, Paolo. *A Grammar of the Multitude: For an Analysis of Contemporary Forms of Life*. Translated by Isabella Bertoletti, James Cascaito and Andrea Casson. Los Angeles: Semiotext(e), 2007.

Volpe, Della. *Critique of Taste*. Translated by Michael Caesar. London: NLB, 1978.

Zerowork. Introduction to *Zerowork: Political Materials* 1 (December 1975). http://zerowork.org/3.1Introduction.html.