RE-BUS

CULTURAL PRODUCTION IN THE 20TH AND 21ST CENTURIES: ART COLLECTIVES, INSTITUTIONS, CULTURE INDUSTRY

SPECIAL ISSUE

VOLUME 2

Table of Contents

EDITORIAL STATEMENT FOR VOLUME 2

For the second volume of the *re-bus* Special Issue "Cultural Production in the 20th and 21st Centuries: Art Collectives, Institutions, Culture Industry" the editorial team has put together three articles that highlight the contested spaces in which the relationship between institutions and their history develop. Thus, the historiographical revision of the term 'avant-garde' as applied to architectural currents since the 1960s provides great insight into how exactly definitions are wielded by intellectuals and members of the public sphere in order to characterize and shape the discipline's common sense, extending into wider use (L. Stergiou). This essentially discursive practice faces deep conflicts when it comes down to historicity, inasmuch as the definitions that have become hegemonic are opened up by the particularities of contexts. This is the case of avant-garde cinema in the New York of the 1960s, in the sense that the concept of the 'amateur' used by certain artists associated with the Charles Theatre generated an 'in-between' space that resisted both the 'common sense' of avant-gardism and commercial productions (B. Hummel). These spaces in which the traditionally 'hard' definitions of institutions become fluid are well exemplified in curatorial approaches that give primacy not to rational (or historical) presuppositions but affective ones, such as Brazil's Instituto Cultural Inhotim, where affect becomes the means to structure an experience of an otherwise inarticulate space (A. Heeren).

Ana Varas Ibarra & David Murrieta Flores

re-bus Issue 8 Co-editors

With special thanks to Christopher Collier

1960s Institution Architecture: Avant-Garde Roots and Function

Dr. Lina Stergiou

Abstract

From the early twentieth century, the avant-garde forms an important cultural and interdisciplinary sub-system with a strong impact on architecture. However, it is only in the sixties that the term 'avant-garde' starts describing architects, groups, and material and immaterial productions of the latter – simultaneously associated with and distant from wide cultural avant-garde circles of their time. The sixties mark the period when the term enters into architectural history books and writings of theory and criticism. A disciplinary consciousness of the phenomenon is now manifest along with the term's appropriation as endogenous architectural quality. A terminological approach to the avant-garde of the sixties provides tools for detecting its patterns of formation and ideological constructions, and for uncovering how these may even shape avant-garde's understanding up to the present.

Introduction

The origin of the French term 'avant-garde' is military. Since the twelfth century it has referred to the 'foremost part of an army; the vanguard or van.'[1] There are few military theoreticians of classical warfare who have not devoted some words to it in their treatises. Its first use in a non-military context is during the 1820s in France, by Saint-Simon and his disciples.[2] Social theorist

Henri de Saint-Simon (1760-1825) elaborated a model of a state-technocratic socialism in which society would be led by the artist, the scientist, and the industrialist. Of these, the artist, the man of imagination, would be the avant-garde.[3] In this first Saint-Simonian phase art was by definition conceived as the avant-garde of society. An artistic avant-garde, which would detach itself from other artistic tendencies of its time, did not hitherto exist. By the 1850s, within twenty years of this coinage in arts and politics, the usage of the term proliferated in other directions as well and spread to the cultural arena, describing writers in particular. In this second phase, the 'avant-garde' appeared attached to a subgroup within the arts and literature. Not all writers, not all artists, were 'avant-garde,' but only some. This signifies the emergence of our modern understanding and usage of the term.[4] A third phase of the avant-garde is its radical transition from the singular to the plural. In other words, there is a co-existence in time and competition between 'avant-gardes.' There are few artists today who do not claim to be or who are not described by art critics as such. The term has become synonymous with artistic movement.[5]

It is widely acknowledged that the avant-garde has been amply explored in the field of art and literature and it is from these two fields that much of its history[6] and many concepts emerge (Poggioli, 1962; Bürger, 1974). The avant-garde is a broader cultural tendency though, shaped by politics, architecture, design, theatre, dance, music, intellectuals, and more. From a historical formation's perspective, it defines a network of identifiably distinct social groupings based on common cultural attitudes and practices. Yet they differ from modernism, which is a larger category with which the avant-garde only partially coincides, even if both peaked during the interwar period.[7] The distinction between avant-garde and modernism is a fairly recent one, even if authors such as Theodor Adorno and Renato Poggioli used these terms as though they were interchangeable.[8]

While not underestimating the ambivalence that the question 'what is the avant-garde' still has in the arts and the literary field today, if it is a historic category or an ongoing project, and if so, what defines this project,[9] a respective straightforward enquiry has not yet amply preoccupied the architectural field. Even so, the 1960s mark a shift. It is in this decade when the term 'avant-garde' also begins to describe buildings, architects and their productions, correlating with the study of the reciprocal relation between architecture and the avant-garde. This assertion develops through the mapping of the usage of the term in a corpus of influential pieces of architectural history published during a period that begins with the approximate end of the interwar modern movement in 1932 until today. These books are chosen for offering the widest possible space- and timeframe including the period mentioned above.

The corpus is comprised by Hitchcock, Henry-Russell and Philip Johnson, *The International Style. Architecture since 1922*;[10] Pevsner, Nikolaus, *Pioneers of Modern Design*;[11] Giedion, Sigfried, *Space, Time and Architecture: The Growth of a New Tradition*;[12] Hitchcock, Henry-Russell, *Architecture: Nineteenth and Twentieth Centuries*;[13] Banham, Reyner, *Theory and Design in the First Machine Age*;[14] Benevolo, Leonardo, *History of Modern Architecture*;[15] Fleming, John, Hugh Honour and Nikolaus Pevsner, *The Penguin Dictionary of Architecture*;[16] Tafuri, Manfredo and Francesco Dal Co, *Modern Architecture*;[17] Frampton, Kenneth, *Modern Architecture: A Critical History*;[18] Curtis, William, Modern *architecture since 1900*;[19] Colquhoun, Alan, *Modern Architecture*;[20] and Cohen, Jean-Louis, *The Future of Architecture. Since 1889*.[21]

The term 'avant-garde' first appears in this corpus in 1960. From this year onwards it gradually gains momentum, most frequently describing the so-called Soviet avant-garde and fractions of

the modern movement. The essay elaborates this occurrence, and suggests that it results from the historical inquiry into the modern movement and its interrelation with the avant-garde, as well as from revisiting the so-called Soviet avant-garde. I refer to both as 'historical avant-garde,' [a term] frequently used by Manfredo Tafuri who claimed that the modern movement is the avant-garde architecture par excellence.[22]

Even if the avant-garde enters architectural discourse in the 1960s, most of the existing methods and approaches to the architectural avant-garde from the 1960s until today, take the term as *given;* the avant-garde is commonly understood as those architectures that are 'avant-garde.' Rarely is it conceptualized and examined with other research objectives: Patrick Schumacher, for example, elaborates it as a sub-topic in his discourse analysis of the discipline and the evolutionary mechanism of architecture, which he names *autopoiesis* (Schumacher, 2011 and 2012); Michael Hays constructs a theory of 'Late Avant-Garde' architecture (Hays, 2010); Hilde Heynen examines which variations of the modern movement are 'avant-garde' within other related research objectives (Heynen, 1999); Manfredo Tafuri writes a history of the architectural avant-garde formation and elaborates a concept, but an indirect and fragmentary one (Tafuri, 1980); and Leonardo Benevolo discerns three conceptual categories of the avant-garde, not explicitly elaborated yet clear enough, and relates them to a large span of architectural and urban history (Benevolo, 1960). The relatively limited preoccupation with the architectural avant-garde as a concept, theory or history of formation, makes the term remain a slippery one, and is often used as buzz word.[23]

This essay develops an argument about the reasons why the above takes place. It is informed by a second corpus of seminal pieces of architectural theory and criticism, books and articles, in which the term 'avant-garde' appears in their title,[24] and are published from the year the term

'avant-garde' starts describing architecture, 1960, until today. Through these writings this paper detects the reasons that various authors 'avantgardify' specific architects, groups, material and immaterial architectural productions.[25]

My corpus is comprised by: Tafuri, Manfredo, *Theories and History of Architecture*;[26] *The Sphere and the Labyrinth: Avant-Gardes and Architecture from Piranesi to the 1970s*;[27] 'Toward a Critique of Architectural Ideology';[28] *Architecture and Utopia: Design and Capitalist Development*;[29] Scolari, Massimo, 'The New Architecture and the Avant-Garde';[30] Grassi, Giorgio, 'Avant-Garde and Continuity';[31] Eisenman, Peter, 'Autonomy and the Avant-Garde. The necessity of an Architectural Avant-Garde in America';[32] Hays, Michael K., 'Reproduction and Negation: The Cognitive Project of the Avant-Garde';[33] Frampton, Kenneth, 'Towards a Critical Regionalism. Six Points for an Architecture of Resistance';[34] Speaks, Michael, 'Which Way Avant-Garde?';[35] and Hays, Michael K., *Architecture's Desire: Reading the Late Avant-Garde*.[36]

My essay argues about the disciplinary role of the 'avant-garde.' This is elaborated through analysing the aspects of formation and ideological templates of the avant-gardism of the 1960s as compared to those of the 'historical avant-garde.' It is also examined through the case of the 'Soviet avant-garde' architecture, continuously revisited and re-avantgardified from the 1960s until today; more specifically, through its re-avantgardification within the framework of Deconstructivist architecture in 1988. By drawing attention to the fact that the term becomes used all the more frequently from the 1960s onwards, describing a large number of architectural productions, the article suggests the term's operational role within the discipline and points at the instrumental nature of the 'avant-garde.'

It is the methodology of my essay to regard as 'avant-garde' the architects, groups, material and immaterial architectural productions that were avantgardified by the authors of my historiographic corpus.[37] I refer to the 'avant-garde,' within quotes, to indicate a building, work, person, group, movement or tendency that is denominated as such in this corpus. The avant-garde, without quotes, refers to theories and concepts within architecture but also within other fields. While the above supposition sometimes stands separate to what is taken as given in the wide avant-garde discourse, it derives from the standpoint of this essay: the architectural avant-garde is here discussed as a product of architectural discourse, for what it came to stand for architects from the 1960s onwards. This essay does not address what the architectural avant-garde really is, or what it was in the 1960s. It rather shows how it was and still is understood by architects. Which values does it carry, and how does it function ideologically and culturally within the field?

1960s: 'Avant-garde' Entrée

In the 1960s a radical transformation of the perception of time takes place within the field of architectural history. For historians of the period, such as Reyner Banham (1960), Peter Collins (1965) and Manfredo Tafuri (1968), the modern movement already belongs to the past, and continuity with interwar modernism is replaced by the acquisition of a certain historical distance. The years from 1960 to 1965 sum up the historical research into what was, for the new generation of architects, the forgotten heroic modernism,[38] and the early seventies marks the moment when it is also pronounced 'officially' dead. Charles Jencks, the main spokesman for postmodern architecture, dates modern architecture's symbolic demise on July 15, 1972.[39] During the 1960s, the modern movement is thus relegated to history as a theme for reflection

and becomes a subject of intense discourse.[40] This is followed by excitement, by the imitation of its formal vocabulary,[41] by continuing its idea of technological advancement and social and urban practices, already taking place in the post-war period - but also receives severe criticism such as that by Jane Jacobs.[42] This historical inquiry extends to modern masters' manifold collaboration with the avant-garde of the twenties and thirties, a subject that receives particular interest and contributes to the set-off for the architectural avant-garde discourse. Architectural historian Anthony Vidler attests that the publication of Reyner Banham's *Theory and Design in the First Machine Age* (1960) concurrently creates an excitement for research into the forgotten history of the avant-garde.[43]

The Soviet architecture of 1917 to 1932 follows a different trajectory within western architectural history. In the years between 1932 and the 1960s it faces active repression and passive misinformation in the West.[44] The 1960s mark the moment when it starts being gradually revisited and even evokes an enthusiastic reception by architects.[45] Soviet Constructivism and Rationalism, the architecture of OSA and ASNOVA respectively,[46] by attracting historical attention, affect architectural magazines and projects. 'The influence of the Russian Constructivists on architects in the 1960s and 1970s is discernible both in the magazines and projects of the period,' architectural historian Beatriz Colomina attests.[47] The historical inquiry into them is due both to the myth of rediscovering a forgotten treasure when the temporary freedom in the 1960s in Russia permits a return to the sources, as well as to a leftist ideological inclination of historians, theoreticians, critics and magazines. While the Russian revolution is a prime motivator of historical research for both leftwing and liberal historians, the hegemonic response is however to dissociate the Soviet avant-garde from involvement in revolutionary politics, until 1962, at least. The Cold War mostly depoliticizes this avant-garde *tout court*.[48]

Little magazines of the 1960s and early seventies are also devoted to the history of the modern movement and the Soviet architecture of 1917 to 1932. As 'little magazines' are considered various phenomena including posters, manifestos, flyers, postcards, letters, building cookbooks, manuals, or advertisements.[49] Intertwined with history and theory, they initiate a discourse on what it is frequently called the 'historical avant-garde.' They compile previously unavailable sources, rivalling and often exceeding those available in books at that time.[50] *AD* in 1970[51] and *VH 101* in 1972[52] for example, are dedicated to the history of the so-called Soviet avant-garde.

While entirely absent from the publishing year 1932 to 1960, Reyner Banham first employs the term in 1960. Its usage in *Theory and Design in the First Machine Age* (1960) is, however, only indicative of the heretofore general perception within the field: to only describe cultural dynamics excluding architecture. 'Avant-garde' is here mentioned twice; first, to describe 'Herwarth Walden, proprietor of a gallery and magazine, both called *Der Sturm*;'[53] and second, the Parisian movements of the early 1920s that felt gratified through the phrase and magazine *L'esprit nouveau.*[54]

It is in the same year, however, that Leonardo Benevolo, an architectural historian, becomes the first in my corpus to attach it to architectures. In his *History of Modem Architecture* (1960), he avantgardifies the so-called Soviet avant-garde, the modern movement, and architectures from 1880 to 1914, such as the Chicago school, Art Nouveau, Adolf Loos, Tony Garnier and August Perret. His denominations are far from arbitrary since he methodically explores the avant-garde, notably placed in italics, and formulates three conceptual categories which combine architectural and cultural tendencies. The first one denotes the architect as genius

artist, who criticizes the world, aims at originality, evolves a personal style and disagrees with the dominant trends.[55] The second conception relates to the re-establishment of the link between art and life. The third category denotes the architect as collective and social force who, in opposition to the aristocratic and individualist character of the first category, claims the new 'art' of the proletariat in contrast to the bourgeois.[56]

Moreover, Sigfried Giedion's 1967 history book provides more context, particularly because he adds new chapters for the fifth edition of *Space, Time and Architecture,* first published in 1941. It is in this edition, and not in the previous ones, that he includes the term. Employed twice in the new chapters, the 'avant-garde' describes in both cases CIAM (1928-1959), the principal organization of the modern movement which he directed.[57] For him, 'CIAM was an avant-garde movement.'[58] A fundamental change is taking place in the 1960s: the avant-garde spirit starts permeating architecture. It is not an exogenous cultural dynamic with which architecture interrelates or not; it gradually starts describing architects, architectural productions, movements and institutions. It becomes an endogenous quality.

Thus, in the 1960s the term 'avant-garde' appears in architectural history books along with the avantgardification of diverse architectural productions, architects and groups; a historical interest in the avant-garde phenomenon in its relation to architecture, along with the beginning of an architectural appropriation of the avant-garde occur. For architectural historians of my corpus, both for those who use the term, such as Banham, and for those who don't, such as Philip Johnson, Nicolaus Pevsner, and Henry-Russell Hitchcock, architecture and the avant-garde were rather incompatible activities. These activities belonged to different domains, a disposition also shared and finely articulated by the architectural historian Peter Collins (1965), an excerpt of which I include in the next section. Benevolo is the first historian in my corpus

to suggest that they fuel each other occasionally. By unfolding the reciprocal relation between the two, he avantgardifies those architectures which form part of this connection. For example, he elaborates the manifold collaboration of the modern movement with the avant-garde such as in the Bauhaus, in which Feininger, Kandinsky and Klee worked to re-establish this link between art and life;[59] or scrutinizes the complex relation of Walter Gropius to it, and of Mies van de Rohe to *Novembergruppe* and review *G*.[60] He avantgardifies all of them. Giedion, in his additions for the fifth 1967 edition, presents a remarkably mature, yet unrefined architectural avant-garde awareness. Even more, it exemplifies a common post-1960s slipshod way of using the term, implying a positive value or elite paradigm, which Giedion ex post facto grants to CIAM, under his direction.

Parameters that allow the shift of the 1960s include, first, the intense interest in the interrelation of the modern masters with the avant-garde, from a historical perspective distant to the present, as supported by Vidler. Second, it includes the growing focus on the cultural dimension of architecture, on architecture as a cultural artefact, apparent through journals such as *Oppositions*. First appearing in September 1973, *Oppositions'* content concentrates on the cultural parameters of the modern movement, situating the heroic figures of the 1920s and the functionalist ethos embodied in histories of modernist architecture in a wider cultural modernity. It introduces new methodologies, like Marxism and structural linguistics. *Oppositions* extends the history of the modern movement 'from ideas and forms to institutions and societal conflicts,' which are however hard to reconcile with professional practice.[61] Third, the 1960s also mark the beginning of contemporary architecture theory.[62]

Fourth, the historical study and fascination with the so-called Soviet avant-garde as a derivative of linguistics is important. The term 'Russian avant-garde' is codified from the 1960s within

the Western context.[63] The denomination of the Soviet phenomenon as 'avant-garde' takes place by agents of the artistic, literary and cultural avant-garde discourse, before architects revisit it. Thus architecture's enthusiasm for Soviet architecture transforms into a keen passion for an 'avant-garde' architecture per se. An engagement with the concept and its formal language also becomes fervour for the term 'avant-garde,' as all next to each other in various writings on the Soviet cultural phenomenon. For the architects of the 1960s the 'Soviet avant-garde' starts representing what an 'avant-garde' architecture *is*, related to formal language and ideology. In their convergences with the modern movement - both are part of new historical knowledge – they play a vital role in shaping the architectural avant-gardism of the 1960s.

Architectural avant-gardism of the 1960s

'Avant-gardism' summarizes the qualities of the 'avant-garde,' and bundles up the commitment to them into an attitude and even an ideology.[64] This definition by David Cottington, delineating the diverse 'avant-garde' architectures of the 1960s, guides the way in which avant-gardism is here to be read. While this section refers to tendencies deriving from parameters of formation, the next one concentrates in the ideological ingredients and to the diverse avantgardified architectures of this decade.

The study of the 'historical avant-garde' from a fresh, new historical perspective, the familiarization with its aspects of formation and ideology, and the assimilation of some of the latter coalesce in the 1960s;[65] they go hand-in-hand with the beginning of an avant-gardism that permeates most architecture. It adopts some of the 'historical avant-garde' patterns of formation and ideological templates, summarized as: innovation in formal language or building

types; progress and technological advancement, at least as a claim; the internalization of an ideological battle (in a disciplinary or broader sense, even if the latter does not always include a relation to revolutionary politics); bold theoretical positions and/or manifestos, publishing of magazines, exhibitions, a wide and extensive collaboration with the avant-garde, and working within an international network of circulation of ideas.

Measured against the above aspects of formation and ideologies of the 'historical avant-garde' in a comparative fashion, Colomina notes that just as experimental little magazines of the 1920s and 1930s drive the historical avant-garde, little magazines of the 1960s and 1970s not only study the avant-garde but move towards their own rebirth and transformation.[66] Joan Ockman, associate editor and editorial consultant of the journal *Oppositions,* describes the journal's title and editorial agenda, which, by assimilating the ideological elements of the historical avant-garde aims at continuing its legacy. Ockman writes,

> The title could also be understood as...an intention to be new, to start from scratch, from 'degree zero,' *a polemical project* nodding to Roland Barthes and *typical of avant-garde magazines in the heyday of modernism*: namely, to return a stagnant architectural culture to its ABC's, *to a pioneer and reformist role in cultural politics*. The contradictions inherent in being an avant-gardist little magazine in America in the 1970s are undoubtedly among the most interesting aspects of *Opposition*'s publishing life.[67]

Arguably, a door for architectural avant-gardism opens in 1955. It is the year when Reyner Banham publishes the article 'The New Brutalism,'[68] in which he employs the notion of the 'image.' 'Image' is for him something visually valuable, not necessarily by the standards of classical aesthetics, and when seen affects emotions. It suggests 'that the building should be an immediately apprehensible visual entity,' even if he admits that 'the form grasped by the eye should be confirmed by experience of the building in use.'[15] Banham notes in 1986 that as the image and photographs of U.S. industrial buildings became the creative source of the modern

movement,[69] their work became almost exclusively known through the rise of the immaterial sites of architectural production - exhibitions, publications, journals.[70] This presupposes the escalation of an appreciation of the 'image,' which he defended in 1955.

As part of this phenomenon, the 1960s witness an appropriation of the formal language of the modern movement and the 'Soviet avant-garde.' The scholar of Soviet architecture Anatole Kopp attests that so-called 'Constructivist' and 'Rationalist' projects are innumerably produced in European schools of architecture in the mid-1960s, and their formal vocabulary suddenly becomes fashionable in building production. In some cases, the magazine of OSA[71] replaces the works of Le Corbusier and of the Bauhaus as the chosen formal source.[72] Similarly, as Kopp implies, the style of the modern movement is also widely adopted. This is finely summarized, and criticized, in 1961 by the architectural historian Nikolaus Pevsner. He writes that,

Of course, this time architects were not returning to the Gothic or the classical so much as to modern styles themselves – creating 'neo' versions of modernisms in Italy's neoliberty style, in the work of Philip Johnson, in the neo-expressionism of Le Corbusier's Ronchamp...'neo Art Nouveau,' 'neo de Stijl,' 'neo School of Amsterdam,' and 'neo Perret'...[73]

Bruno Zevi is another architectural historian to testify the above. He uses in 1965 the term 'anti avant-garde' for describing neoliberty, neorealism, environmental perceptionism, historicism, mannerism, which, he claims, has produced no substantial shifts, but only works of regressive retreat. For Zevi, this regressive retreat is done by all architectures of his time – the faithful remaining to the modern tradition, the new historicist approach, pop architecture.[74] Nonetheless, besides pop architecture - commonly understood as the work of Archigram,

Archizoom, Constant or Superstudio - none of the architectures Zevi refers to are denominated as 'avant-garde' in my historiographic corpus. In fact, no architectural production is avantgardified in this corpus if merely for the reason of displaying 'historical avant-garde's' formal language, even if innovatively deployed, without having developed other aspects which drive avant-gardism. It is part of my intent in this essay to separate the term 'avant-garde' from other evaluative attributes such as 'successful,' which Zevi probably besets in the 'anti avant-garde.'[75] The 'avant-garde,' this essay supports, indicates a unique quality, enmeshed in an operational disciplinary role. This is elaborated in the next section.

Avantgardified architectures of the 1960s do not merely include building production as their activity, and the opposite is likely. The introduction of 'image' in architectural discourse prepares the ground for the unfolding of such 'avant-garde' architectures of the 1960s which express themselves through powerful images, and which, moreover, adopt the visual codes of their contemporary avant-garde. They immediately convey avant-gardism, not by architecture's formal language but by association with the visual codes of the artistic and graphic design avant-garde of their time. Archigram, for instance, employs pop and op art aesthetics, collage and montage, arresting advertising techniques, and striking graphics. Constant communicates his vision of a utopian architecture in a non-commodity socialism (the *New Babylon* project) through models and illustrations 'looking like a cross between Constructivism and Abstract Expressionism.'[76]

Even if met with strong opposition by theorists and critics, they strongly display an involvement in a range of other activities such as exhibitions, and in the publication of little magazines in which graphic novelties and polemical articles are introduced. 'Avant-garde' group Archigram, for example, circulates a magazine, with the group's name, from May 1961

to 1970. Publishing nine issues altogether, its founding members include provocative statements. While remaining apolitical, innocent, hobbyists, teenagers, and consumerists, [77] and sensing that mass leisure and mechanization is part of a social and political process, they aim to provoke change. They proclaim that 'we are predisposed to agree a series of logical propositions that WILL ACTUALLY LEAD TO CHANGE.' [78] Archigram group initiates change in a consumer democracy, in which the consumer is less a target and more of a participant.

Avantgardified architects of the 1960s are also preoccupied with the writing of manifestos. A fine example is Constant. Being educated as a painter and having established with Guy Debord and Asger Jorn in 1957 the Situationist International (SI), he collaborated with Aldo Van Eyck and believed 'that architecture could change the world,'[79] Constant works towards the concept of 'Unitary Town Planning' as part of the SI. Its principles are stated in 1958 in a writing style echoing the manifestos of the early twentieth century:

> The following eleven points, which convey a brief definition of the Situationist action, are to be construed as a preparatory theme for the third conference of the International Situationists (I.S.) […].
> 5. Unitary town planning is determined by the uninterrupted complex activity through which man's environment is consciously recreated according to progressive plans in all domains.[80]

In a similar writing style, Constant describes in 1960 *The New Babylon*, a project he furthers on his own on the basis of 'Unitary Town Planning':

> Individualist culture is at its end, its institutions are exhausted.
> New Babylon is not primarily a town plan project. Equally, it is not intended as a work of art in the traditional sense nor as an example of architectonic structure.
> The modern city is dead; it has fallen victim to utility. New Babylon is a project for a city in which it is possible to live. And to live means to be creative. [81]

Summarizing, the architectural 'avant-gardes' of the 1960s assimilate some structures of formation, from a materialist perspective, that derive from the 'historical avant-garde.' The avant-garde starts in the 1960s signifying a positive value. It would not be perilous to claim that it gradually becomes an evaluation filter and a type of distinction, as this hypothesis is also supported from a historical and theoretical perspective within avant-garde discourse.[82] In any case, avant-gardism is rich and diverse in the 1960s, penetrating the whole spectrum of architecture. It is manifested in magazines and architects' diverse work and activities.

Ideological aspects. Operational mode

Avant-gardism of the 1960s resembles in complex combinations some formative aspects of the 'historical avant-garde,' one of which is the internalization of an ideological battle. Two commonplace ideas of the historical avant-garde are opposition and the idea of the break with the past. The initiatives of the 'avant-gardes' of the 1960s are filtered through these ideological templates.

The avant-garde marks out defiance, a finally violent rejection of tradition, and insists on a clean break with the past.[83] Its artists are conventionally considered as having a prophetic function, helping their contemporaries invent the future. They incarnate change, which occurs as a historical necessity, with the 'troops' following close behind. The idea that the avant-garde creates a rupture with the past presupposes an adherence to the idea of linear progress, evolutionism, revolutionism, and a perception of history as a succession of events.[84] This idea is in avant-garde theory and criticism both opposed and supported – for example, by Habermas, who claims that, in fact, it is directed against what might be called a false normativity in history;

for him, the avant-garde spirit seeks to use the past in a different way.[85] However this may be, this idea was transmitted to architecture, shaping the avant-gardism of the 1960s. While this is evident in the editorial agenda of the journal *Oppositions*, Benevolo claims in 1960 that the (architectural and cultural) avant-garde enterprises always begin by asserting their own freedom and originality in relation to all preceding ones, retaining their independence from the rest of society while putting forward theories valid for all.[86]

Avant-garde art is also, in its classical theorizing, an oppositional formation or a negation culture. Peter Bürger conceptualizes in 1974[87] the historical avant-garde on the critique it exercised on the institution 'art,' representing at that period of time 'art for art's sake.' For Poggioli in 1962 the historical avant-garde wants to react against the dominant nuclei of society and mass culture, while keeping its free exchange with it. For him, 'the avant-garde looks and works like a culture of negation.'[88] Fredric Jameson, though, claims that the avant-garde of the 1960s is no longer oppositional and marginal. It constitutes the very dominant aesthetics of consumer society itself. It significantly serves this society's commodity production as a virtual laboratory of new forms and fashions with a precise socioeconomic functionality.[89] Issues like the one Jameson raises derive from the gap between the concept and ideology of the avant-garde and its formation,[90] as well as from the variations that the subject of opposition take within the theory of the avant-garde.

Likewise, the 'avant-garde' architects of the 1960s adopt an oppositional stance, aiming at a rupture with the status quo, as they claim. Here I add that their opposition does not target everything and all. Their opposition is directed to specific conditions of external reality and/or specific internal conditions of architecture. It targets either the reality outside architecture or ideological templates prevailing within architecture of their times - or both, but not to all of

their aspects and respective segments. There are segments with which it coalesces and from which it attracts support. Demystifying the oppositional nature of the avant-garde is an approach supported in avant-garde discourse, including Thomas Crow. Referring to the 1960s and writing in 1985, Crow describes the avant-garde formation as a 'negotiated resistance.' The society of consumption, in which the avant-garde groups are formed, displaces resistant impulses but also gives a refuge in a relatively unregulated social space, where contrary social definitions can survive and occasionally flourish. Much of this is, for Crow, a 'permitted disorder.' Once the zone of permitted freedom exists, it can be seized by the avant-garde groups which articulate for themselves a counter-consensual identity, an implicit message of rupture and discontinuity. The expansion of cultural economy continually creates new fringe areas, which the avant-garde, as incorporated subculture, occupies with marginal positions and new recruits. Its unique position between higher and lower zones of commodity culture makes the avant-garde perform a special and powerful function: it searches out areas of social practice, not yet completely available to efficient utilization, and makes them discrete and visible.[91]

The external conditions of architecture during the 1960s, which comprise the social, political and economic reality forces, are characterized by protest and liberation - the opposition to the U.S. involvement in the Vietnam War, the May 1968 events in France, the civil rights movement or the rise of the women's liberation movement. A return to class struggle also appears as the economic boom that follows the war shows signs of wear and tear and labour's mood strikingly changes from its calm post-war wage negotiations. Also, in contrast to the 1950s, the centre of gravity in politics shifts towards the moderate left, which formed the government of many European countries. By the end of the decade the first welfare states appear in all advanced capitalist countries in Europe and the U.S.[92] Production is being gradually transformed by technological revolution - this is after all when the information age

starts - and is gradually globalized. The system of development moves through the use of cybernetics towards immateriality, which gives new impulse to the study of highly formalized languages such as simulation and programming.

The internal conditions of architecture are by the 1960s largely defined by the expansion and enrichment of the modern movement paradigm. A number of ideas are included in its wide and abstract nature, yet during the post-war period they are specified and formulated as distinct tendencies. The orthogonal modernist formal language continues as a style; yet it is complemented with Scharoun-like curvatures in the organic architecture, but also with Constructivist-like multiple angled formal language in dispersed examples. The scale is enlarged with the 'new monumentality,' and connected to civic and political ideas around the monument. 'Corporatism' achieves the modernist anonymity in a U.S. context of advanced capitalism and corporate bureaucracy. The period is also marked by the closure of CIAM in 1959, and the formation of Team X in 1956,[93] bringing into the discourse a social theory based on their concept of *Gemeinschaft*, and a systems theory which sees society as information systems.

This is the time when the avant-garde enters the architectural discourse and the newly formed 'avant-gardes' of the 1960s appear. As my historiographic corpus shows, and by summarizing them in categories, they are four: *first*, the defenders of the everyday vernacular, social relevance, city movements and participationists, environmental activism or purely activism;[94] *second*, the technological utopia of Archigram, Archizoom, Superstudio, Metabolism, Yona Friedman, Michael Webb and Constant; and *third*, the rise of information technologies and computerization, supported by the Yale School of Architecture and the Architectural Association School of Architecture in London. *Finally*, in the early seventies, a dominant

'avant-garde' is Autonomy. Its counterpart is the equally dominant architectural Post-modernism.

But which are the targets of opposition, as well as alliances, of the above 'avant-garde' categories? The *first* 'avant-garde' expresses the social and political upheaval of the late 1960s related to activism, the right to the city, and to the struggle regarding planning laws and urban renewal. This 'avant-garde' turns to strategies of stimulus, critique and struggle.[95] It allies with those segments of the political domain which support such claims, with the activist segments of society, and with the leftist intellectuals of the Frankfurt school and the neo-Marxian studies. It opposes the status quo of the discipline of the times described before. The *second* 'avant-garde' is comprised by divergent groups which however share the generic passion for techno-utopia. Among them, Archigram is the most popular. Using lowbrow visual art imagery, Archigram assaults the status quo of architecture as a conventional, high-brow, 'upper class' discipline. Its alliances derive from mass culture and society, thus from the majority of the domain of arts and design, as well as from the society at large. The *third* 'avant-garde' introduces new science and technology in the field, which already affect and radically change society and the modes of production. It neither leads nor aligns with the technological sector of production. It rather lines up with those segments of art, design and culture, which share an enthusiasm for the new capacities in communications and information techniques, as well as with its concurrent 'technetronic' segments of society. *Finally,* and within the early seventies, the 'avant-garde' of Autonomy indicates a stance of radical opposition and withdrawal from its current and undesirable external conditions of consumerism and the rise of popular culture.[96] To these external conditions it asserts its own determinism: it is an almost heroic withdrawal from the market forces. At the same time, it opposes the disciplinary status quo, at least as defined by the other dominant 'avant-garde,' dominant from the 1970s onwards, architectural

Post-modernism. Autonomy finds its voice in the journal *Oppositions*, which, as mentioned before, states its desire to initiate a polemical project, one which will return the now stagnant architectural culture to a pioneer and reformist role in cultural politics.[97]

The subject of oppositions of the new 'avant-garde' architectures of the 1960s is rich and diverse; its alliances too. It can be thought as a complex system of oppositions and negotiations maneuvering between architecture and its diverse external forces, be it social, economic and political ones, including rest of social players or professional groups. It rearranges the existing value system and the given order. This uncovers an aspect of the nature of the architectural avant-garde from a theoretical perspective.

In this essay the approach to the architectural avant-garde of the 1960s derives from those avantgardified architectures which appear in important history books written by seminal authors. The hypothesis is thus not irrelevant to the methodology this essay follows. The claim however is that the 'avant-garde' architectures derive from an avantgardification activity, by specific historians, who act within their own objectivity, subjectivity and time frame. Set in motion by those who avantgardify, the 'avant-garde' is the result of a mechanism of selection. Some, only few, architectures pass through the avant-garde filter of the architectural historian. Moreover, as the system of oppositions and negotiations shows, the 'avant-garde' architectures rearrange architecture's internal rules and values in relation to all that surrounds it. This rearrangement of system values is not only initiated by the 'avant-garde' architects of the 1960s, but also by the authors of my theory and criticism corpus, such as Tafuri (1968). In the case of the latter, the 'avant-garde' becomes their tool, a paradigm, able to let them orchestrate architecture's internal rules in relation to external societal function systems, which constantly evolve. This is equivalent to what the 'avant-garde' does. In this sense the 'avant-garde' and

the theoreticians and critics who avantgardify point towards the same direction. Placing both under the umbrella of the architectural avant-garde, as a phenomenon, concept or idea, the architectural avant-garde displays an operational nature, towards synchronizing architecture's internal rules and external conditions. This (undeclared by all) goal, or direction, is accommodated by the lack of systematic study of the architectural avant-garde – of 'what it really is.' As mentioned in the introduction of this essay, the architectural avant-garde has not been sufficiently examined until today, and the reason is obvious.

What the 1960s introduce is a new code in architecture indicating distinction, and a new type of paradigm as the norm. The multifaceted nature of this new evaluation filter presents a new-fangled complication for architecture, which is not always the case for the arts and other cultural fields. It derives from the fact that any distinction through the avant-garde is granted via operational modes, dispositions, and heretofore tools of architecture (exhibitions, magazines, writings) instead of heretofore ends (buildings and cities). It is granted by putting aside the traditional codes of utility and function which make sense only when attached to the building and urban space production. Another intricacy is its formation in collaboration with the broader avant-garde, which blurs the disciplinary boundaries and complicates the internal system-rules of architecture (which is at its base, and like any other discipline, a self-enclosed, self-referential system). These complications are finely illuminated in the words of Peter Collins. Referring to the relation of architecture to painting and sculpture (he does not explicitly mention avant-garde art but his examples, like Bruno Taut, are), he writes in 1965:

> Hence today (when, thanks to the efforts of the Bauhaus, the new tectonic forms appropriate for reinforced concrete and steel and have been fully adopted) painting and sculpture may prove more of a hindrance to architectural creativity than an aid…For the danger of architectural design of laying too much emphasis on abstract painting and sculpture as formative disciplines is that they lead to the idea of a building as simply an object in space, instead of as part of a space. They thus accentuate the evil…[98]

As the subsequent decades show, architecture resolves the aforementioned complications by placing the 'avant-garde' in its ideological core, its productive irritator. It operates on an ideological level, indirectly influencing the building and urban space production, and directly fuelling its cultural one. Yet the equation between architecture's cultural and tectonic dimension, which are just two of its facets, is now balanced in relation to the 1960s. With their powerful dynamics, the ideologically inclined initiatives of the 'avant-garde' of the 1960s start off what will gradually become fate: its turn into a disciplinary tool. This is assisted by the growing historical knowledge and awareness of the interwar avant-garde's value starting in the 1960s. The 'avant-garde' gradually develops into a code of evaluation and distinction, an elite paradigm for directing architecture's internal system rules measured against its surroundings. Its instrumental nature is exemplified next, through one out of the many post-1960s re-avantgardifications of the 'Soviet avant-garde', which takes place in 1988.

Re-avantgardifications of the 'Soviet avant-garde'

Initiated in the 1960s, the re-avantgardification of the 'Soviet avant-garde' is still taking place, slowly and steadily. One example, seminal in architecture, happened in the 190s, within the 'apolitical' context of the architecture of Western Europe and the U.S. In 1988, the Tate Gallery, London, launches the 'Deconstruction' symposium,[99] and the Museum of Modern Art, New York, mounts the exhibition 'Deconstructivist Architecture.'[100] Both state that the origin of Deconstruction is Constructivism, the 'Soviet avant-garde.' Moreover, the MoMA exhibition stresses the formal similarities between Deconstructivist projects and

Constructivism, yet excludes the latter's built work, and concentrates on its architectural

experiments. Curator Philip Johnson states in the preface of the exhibition catalogue that,

> It is perhaps not strange that the new forms of deconstructivist architecture hark back
> to Russian Constructivism... I am fascinated by these formal similarities, of our
> architects to each other, on the one hand, and to the Russian movement on the other.
> Some of these similarities are not known to the younger architects themselves, let alone
> the predominated. Take the most obvious formal theme repeated by every one of the
> artists: the diagonal overlapping of rectangular or trapezoid bars. These are also clear
> in the work of all the Russian avant garde from Malevich to Lissitzky.[101]

Similarly, the Tate symposium examines the theoretical connections between Deconstruction

and Constructivism. This aim is stated in the symposium's main publication,

> At the beginning of the century a conscious theoretical development within architecture
> took place in Russia, and Deconstructivist theories owe a debt to the Constructivists of
> that time. Indeed, much of the present work stems from earlier, often intuitive, moves
> in this direction.[102]
> My function here, as I see it, is to lay a ghost. The ghost is that of the Russian avant-
> garde.[103]
> I think we can most carefully address and illuminate the relationship between historical
> Constructivism and Deconstruction. [...] Deconstruction ... tends to be identified with
> buildings that look massively 'constructed' or 'deconstructed' in a physical respect.
> Here we touch the very essence of Constructivism and, consciously or unconsciously,
> the reason for the present attention to this Russian work.[104]

Two interrelated premises are here present. First, the 'Soviet avant-garde' is re-avantgardified

in both the symposium and the exhibition for its innovative formal properties and ideological

positions (revolutionary politics excluded). Both aspects are affiliated with Deconstruction.

Deconstructivist architects adopt and develop the formal properties of the 'Soviet avant-garde'

while authors and curators of the events affiliate Soviet ideological positions with

Deconstruction. Second, these authors and curators re-avantgardify the 'Soviet avant-garde,'

stating that it is Deconstruction's precursor, implying that Deconstruction is 'avant-garde.'

However, Mark Wigley, co-curator of the MoMA exhibition, literally refuses to denominate

Deconstruction as 'avant-garde.' In fact, this negation is so strongly articulated that it leads to the opposite direction: the impression is that Deconstruction categorically *is* 'avant-garde.' Wigley writes,

> Deconstructivist architecture does not constitute an avant garde. It is not a rhetoric of the new. Rather, it exposes the unfamiliar hidden within the traditional. It is the shock of the old. [...]. Like the modern avant garde, it attempts to be disturbing, alienating, but not from the traditional retreat of the avant garde, not from the margins. Rather it occupies and subverts the centre. This work is not fundamentally different from the tradition it subverts.[105]

Some of the recognizable patterns of the 'historical avant-garde' adopted by this new 'avant-garde' coalesce with the avant-gardism of the 1960s. As in the 'historical avant-garde,' publications, exhibitions and debates communicate Deconstruction's ideas. Its network of circulation of ideas expands within three months from London to New York. It creates a powerful collaboration with the avant-garde, such as with the intellectual one and Jacques Derrida, and employs its concepts, such as the so-called Cartesian linguistics and the deconstruction of literary studies, so as to arrive at its foundational principles. Deconstruction does not have an oppositional nature; its character is transformative, 'it exploits the weakness in the tradition in order to disturb rather than overthrow it.'[106] While it 'occupies and subverts the centre,'[107] it neither opposes the architectural status quo nor any of the external conditions of architecture, avoiding a break with the past. Its writings are in a discursive style and not in that of a manifesto.[108] Finally, Deconstruction incorporates an ideological battle within a disciplinary context, and articulates bold theoretical positions. Jacques Derrida, associate member and spokesman of architectural Deconstruction, accounts for it the re-foundation, the 'deconstruction,' of architecture. This also signifies the desired direction of renewal of the disciplinary grounds, the way that Deconstruction aims at driving and changing architecture's values and ideologies. Derrida states that,

> Deconstruction is perhaps a way of questioning the architectural model...the metaphor of foundations, of superstructures, what Kant calls 'architectonic' as well as the concept of the *archè*...So Deconstruction means also putting into question...perhaps architecture itself.[109]

To make my point clear: during the eighties the re-avantgardification of the 'Soviet avant-garde' allows another contemporary architecture, Deconstruction, to claim its denomination as 'avant-garde.' While during the seventies the 'Soviet avant-garde' offers a rich source of innovative forms that the internal domain seeks within its general stance of withdrawal from its socio-political context, now, along with 'avant-garde' Deconstruction, points at an introverted re-exploration of the very foundations of architecture, at the 'refounding' of architecture through structural linguistics. Later on, and within the more politicized external conditions of the aftermath of September 11, 2001, the 'Soviet avant-garde' would be re-avantgardified for its socio-politico-ideological nature, thus indirectly fuelling the socio-politicized segments of the architectural discipline. For example, its re-avantgardification in the exhibition 'Building the Revolution: Soviet Art and Architecture, 1915-1935,'[110] in 2011 suggests a different direction of renewal. While it is often referred to as 'revolutionary,' as the title of the exhibition implies, its re-avantgardification is no longer only due to its formal novelties but also to its political and social context, and the collective spirit it brings about.[111] This re-avantgardification indirectly encourages a politically and socially active response of the discipline toward the new politicized global external conditions of the 2000s and 2010s. The 'avant-garde' works towards re-examining and transforming architecture's internal system rules in relation to all the external conditions that surround it - a case that I elaborated in previous section regarding the 1960s.

Conclusion

The 1960s mark a shift. The historical study of the 'Soviet avant-garde' and modern architecture's relation with the avant-garde of the 1920s and 1930s finds an enthusiastic reception by architects. The avant-garde enters architectural discourse, and the term 'avant-garde' begins describing architects and diverse material and immaterial productions when related to the wider avant-garde. Yet it gradually develops into an endogenous to architecture, and positive quality, which does not necessarily qualify an interrelation with the avant-garde. Architectural avant-gardism of the 1960s is rich and diverse, adopts patterns of formation, and includes ideological templates of the 'historical avant-garde.' The term 'avant-garde' starts indicating an evaluation code and elite paradigm, gradually developing into a disciplinary tool.

To clarify my final point: The avant-garde is a strong concept for its effects. About the artistic avant-garde, Carol Duncan notes that 'to be used, its meaning must be constantly and carefully mediated'[112], yet the same connotations apply to architecture. Avant-garde architecture serves as model, in which what matters most is its usefulness to architecture's internal system to serve its own transformation. Transformations are necessary for constantly redefining its cognitive, evaluative and normative grounds,[113] thus keeping architecture's position and role within globally changing external forces - political, economic, and social - and among its own professional players. As the case of the 'Soviet avant-garde' shows, at its very base, the avant-garde's nature is instrumental; it is a driver of difference and change in architecture. 'Avant-garde' architectures contribute to prescribing architecture's self-definition measured against the different social systems it is situated in.

Dr. Lina Stergiou is Associate Professor of Architecture at Xi'an Jiaotong-Liverpool University, China, co-founder and creative director of 4Life Strategies, a non-profit organization for strategically design cross-disciplinary actions for life as agencies for change, and principal of LS/Architecture&Strategies, an award-winning design research lab. Independent Expert for the Mies van der Rohe Award-European Union Prize for Contemporary Architecture. A Princeton University Research Fellow and recipient of numerous research grants, her research explores spatial politics and the avant-garde, including her forthcoming book on *The Concept of the Avant-Garde in Twentieth and Twenty-First Century Architecture.*

Notes

[1] The Oxford English Dictionary (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1933).

[2] Cottington, David, *The Avant Garde: A Very Short Introduction* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013), p.5.

[3] 'Let us unite: in order to reach the same goal we have a different task to perform. We, the artists, will serve you as avant-garde: the power of the arts is the most immediate and the most rapid. [...] What destiny more beautiful for the arts than to exercise a positive influence on society, a true ministry, and to project themselves ahead of all intellectual faculties, in the era of their greatest development!' Response of an artist to a scientist in an imaginary dialogue in Saint-Simon, Henri de, *Opinions littéraires, philosophiques et industrielles* (Paris: Bossange père, 1825), pp.346-7. Cited in Hadjinicolaou, Nicos, 'On the Ideology of Avant-Gardism,' *Praxis: A Journal of Radical Perspectives on the Arts,* no.6 (1982), p.41. See also Egbert, Donald "The Idea of the 'Avant Garde' in Art and Politics," *The American Historical Review,* vol.73, no.2 (December 1967), pp. 342-4.

[4] Cottington, David, *The Avant Garde*, pp.5-6. See also Hadjinicolaou, Nicos, 'On the Ideology of Avant-Gardism'.

[5] Hadjinicolaou, Nicos, 'On the Ideology of Avant-Gardism,' p.43.

[6] Cottington, David, *The Avant Garde*, pp.2-5.

[7] Cottington, David, *The Avant Garde,* p.9.

[8] Heynen, Hilde, *Architecture and Modernity. A Critique* (Cambridge, Mass.; London: MIT Press, 1999), p.229.

[9] See for example the issue 'What Is an Avant-Garde?', *New Literary History*, vol. 41, no. 4 (Autumn 2010).

[10] Hitchcock, Henry-Russell and Philip Johnson, *The International Style. Architecture since 1922* (New York; London: W.W. Norton, 1932); reprint 1966. I use the new edition: Hitchcock,

Henry-Russell and Philip Johnson, *The International Style* (New York; London: W.W. Norton, 1995).

[11] Pevsner, Nikolaus, *Pioneers of Modern Design* (London: Faber and Faber, 1936); second ed. 1949; third ed. 1960. I use the third revised edition: Pevsner, Nikolaus, *Pioneers of Modern Design* (Penguin, 1991).

[12] Giedion, Sigfried, *Space, Time and Architecture: The Growth of a New Tradition*, Charles Eliot Norton Lectures for 1938-1939 (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1941); second ed. 1949; third ed. 1954; fourth ed. 1962; fifth ed. 1967. I use the fifth revised and enlarged edition: Giedion, Sigfried, *Space, Time and Architecture: The Growth of a New Tradition* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1995).

[13] Hitchcock, Henry-Russell, *Architecture: Nineteenth and Twentieth Centuries* (Baltimore: Penguin Books, 1958); second ed. 1963; third ed. 1968; fourth ed. 1977. I use the fourth revised edition: Hitchcock, Henry-Russell, *Architecture: Nineteenth and Twentieth Centuries* (New Haven, Conn.; London: Yale University Press, 1987).

[14] Banham, Reyner, *Theory and Design in the First Machine Age* (Oxford: Butterworth Architecture, 1960). I use the second edition: Banham, Reyner, *Theory and Design in the First Machine Age* (Oxford: Butterworth Architecture, 1962).

[15] Benevolo, Leonardo, *Storia Dell'Architettura Moderna* (Bari: Giuseppe Laterza&Figli, 1960). First English translation in UK from the third revised 1966 Italian edition: *History of Modern Architecture* (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1971). I use: Benevolo, Leonardo, *History of Modern Architecture* (Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press, 1977).

[16] Fleming, John, Hugh Honour and Nikolaus Pevsner, *The Penguin Dictionary of Architecture*, first edition (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1966); Fleming, John, Hugh Honour and Nikolaus Pevsner, *The Penguin Dictionary of Architecture*, fourth edition (London, New York: Penguin, 1991); Fleming, John, Hugh Honour and Nikolaus Pevsner, *The Penguin Dictionary of Architecture and Landscape Architecture* (London, New York: Penguin, 1999).

[17] Tafuri, Manfredo and Francesco Dal Co, *Architettura Contemporanea* (Milano: Electa, 1976). English translation: Tafuri, Manfredo and Francesco Dal Co, *Modern Architecture* (New York: H. N. Abrams, 1979).

[18] Frampton, Kenneth, *Modern Architecture: A Critical History* (London: Thames and Hudson, 1980); second ed. 1985. I use the third edition: Frampton, Kenneth, *Modern Architecture: A Critical History* (London: Thames and Hudson, 1992).

[19] Curtis, William, Modern *architecture since 1900* (London, New York: Phaidon, 1996).

[20] Colquhoun, Alan, *Modern Architecture*, Oxford History of Art (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002).

[21] Cohen, Jean-Louis, *The Future of Architecture. Since 1889* (London: Phaidon Press, 2012).

[22] Tafuri, Manfredo, *Theories and History of Architecture* (London: Granada, 1980), 'Note to the second (Italian) edition'. Note: since the modern movement constitutes for him the avant-garde definition doesn't always require him to name it 'historical'.

[23] This assumption derives from my book-in-progress based on my doctoral dissertation *The Concept of the Avant-Garde in Twentieth and Twenty-First Century Architecture.*

[24] Only exception is Kenneth Frampton's article in which, while the 'rearguard' appears only as subtitle, it forms a core subject.

[25] In this essay, any reference to theory and criticism indicates this specific corpus unless otherwise indicated.

[26] Tafuri, Manfredo, *Teorie E Storia Dell' Architettura* (Bari: Laterza & Figli, 1968). English translation: *Theories and History of Architecture* (London: Granada, 1980).

[27] Tafuri, Manfredo, *La sfera e il labirinto: Avanguardie e architettura da Piranesi agli anni '70* (Torino: Giulio Einaudi editore, 1980). English translation: Tafuri, Manfredo, *The Sphere*

and the Labyrinth: Avant-Gardes and Architecture from Piranesi to the 1970s (Cambridge, Mass.; London: MIT Press, 1990).

[28] Tafuri, Manfredo, 'Per una critica dell'ideologia architettonica,' *Contropiano*, no.1 (January-April 1969). English translation: 'Toward a Critique of Architectural Ideology,' in *Architecture Theory since 1968*, ed. by K. Michael Hays (Cambridge, Mass.; London: MIT, 1998), pp.2-35.

[29] Tafuri, Manfredo, *Progretto e Utopia* (Bari: Laterza&Figli, 1973). English translation: Tafuri, Manfredo, *Architecture and Utopia: Design and Capitalist Development* (Cambridge, Mass.; London: MIT Press, 1976).

[30] Scolari, Massimo, 'The New Architecture and the Avant-Garde,' in Hays, Michael K., ed., *Architecture Theory since 1968* (Cambridge, Mass.; London: MIT, 1998), pp.124-45.

[31] Grassi, Giorgio, 'Avant-Garde and Continuity,' in Hays, Michael K., ed., *Oppositions Reader: Selected Readings from a Journal for Ideas and Criticism in Architecture, 1973-1984* (New York: Princeton Architectural Press, 1998), pp.390-411. The article was originally published in *Oppositions*, no.21 (Summer 1980).

[32] Eisenman, Peter, 'Autonomy and the Avant-Garde. The necessity of an Architectural Avant-Garde in America,' in Somol, Robert, ed., *Autonomy and Ideology: Positioning an Avant-Garde in America* (New York: Monacelli Press, 1997), pp.69-79.

[33] Hays, Michael K., 'Reproduction and Negation: The Cognitive Project of the Avant-Garde', in Ockman, Joan, ed., *ArchitectureReproduction*. Revisions 2 (New York, NY: Princeton Architectural Press, 1988), pp.153-79.

[34] Frampton, Kenneth, 'Towards a Critical Regionalism. Six Points for an Architecture of Resistance', in Foster, Hal, ed., *The Anti-Aesthetic: Essays on Postmodern Culture* (Port Townsend; Washington: Bay Press, 1983), pp.16-30.

[35] Speaks, Michael, 'Which Way Avant-Garde?'. *Assemblage*, no.41 (April 2000), p.78.

[36] Hays, Michael K., *Architecture's Desire: Reading the Late Avant-Garde*, Writing Architecture Series (Cambridge, Mass.; London: MIT Press, 2010).

[37] In this essay, any reference to history books indicates this specific corpus unless otherwise indicated.

[38] Anthony Vidler shares his personal experience of this period. Being in 1960 in the first year of his studies at the School of Architecture at Cambridge, he attests that Alison and Peter Smithson's special issue of *Architectural Design* on the 'Heroic Period of Modern Architecture (1917-1937)' in December 1965 sums up modernism for his generation, in some way as a sign for closure, but also of the need for competitive emulation. Vidler, Anthony, *Histories of the Immediate Present: Inventing Architectural Modernism* (Cambridge, Mass.; London: MIT, 2008), p.xv.

[39] The famous quote of Charles Jencks is 'Modern Architecture died in St. Louis, Missouri, on July 15, 1972, at 3.32 p.m.,' Jencks, Charles, *The Language of Post-Modern Architecture* (New York: Rizzoli, 1977), p.9.

[40] 'Now [1968] the generous myths of the initial Heroic period, having lost their role as powerful ideas, are reduced to subjects of debate.' Tafuri, Manfredo, *Theories and History of Architecture*, p.2.

[41] "Once relegated to the status of 'history,' modern architecture itself was susceptible to academicization, even to revival...it was the revival of modern architecture as style..." Vidler, Anthony, *Histories of the Immediate Present*, p.5.

[42] See Jacobs, Jane, *Death and Life of Great American Cities* (London: Jonathan Cape, 1962).

[43] Vidler, Anthony, *Histories of the Immediate Present*, p.xv.

[44] Hal Foster, "What's Neo About the Neo-Avant-Garde?", *October*, vol.70 (Autumn 1994), p.7. See also Khan-Magomedov, Selim O., *Pioneers of Soviet Architecture: The Search for New Solutions in the 1920s and 1930s* (London: Thames and Hudson, 1987), p.9. And Hal

Foster, 'Some Uses and Abuses of Russian Constructivism,' in Andrews, Richard, ed., *Art into Life: Russian Constructivism 1914-1932* (New York: Rizzoli, 1990).

[45] Kopp, Anatole, *Constructivist Architecture in the USSR* (London: Academy Editions, 1985), p.6.

[46] Constructivism relates to the work of the group OSA, which is the acronym of Obedinerie Sovremennykh Arkhitektorov, Union of Contemporary Architects. Rationalism relates to the work of the group ASNOVA, which is the acronym of Assotsiatsiia Novykh Arkhitektorov, Association of New Architects.

[47] Colomina, Beatriz and Craig Buckley, eds., *Clip, Stamp, Fold: The Radical Architecture of Little Magazines, 196X to 197X* (Barcelona: Actar, 2010), p.118.

[48] See more in Wood, Paul, 'The Politics of the Avant-Garde,' in *The Great Utopia. The Russian and Soviet Avant-Garde, 1915-1932* (New York: Guggenheim Museum, 1992), pp.1-24.

[49] Colomina, Beatriz and Craig Buckley, eds., *Clip, Stamp, Fold*, p.8.

[50] Colomina, Beatriz and Craig Buckley, eds., *Clip, Stamp, Fold*, p.15.

[51] 'Building the USSR 1917-32,' *Architectural Design* (February 1970).

[52] 'Architecture and the Artistic Avant-garde in the USSR from 1917-1934,' *VH 101*, no.7/8 (Summer 1972).

[53] Banham, Reyner, *Theory and Design in the First Machine Age*, p.89.

[54] Banham, Reyner, *Theory and Design in the First Machine Age*, p.209.

[55] Benevolo, Leonardo, *History of Modern Architecture*, p.224.

[56] Benevolo, Leonardo, *History of Modern Architecture,* p.556.

[57] CIAM is the acronym of Congrès International d'Architecture Moderne, the International Congress of Modern Architecture. Founded in 1928 by 28 European architects invited by Le Corbusier, and with Sigfried Giedion as secretary general, this highly influential organization had the objective to research and formalize the principles of the modern movement through eleven congresses and events across Europe. It disbanded in 1959 with the final eleventh CIAM meeting in Otterlo, Netherlands.

[58] Giedion, Sigfried, *Space, Time and Architecture,* p.702.

[59] Benevolo, Leonardo, *History of Modern Architecture*, p.398.

[60] Benevolo, Leonardo, *History of Modern Architecture*, p.449-51.

[61] Schwarzer, Mitchell, 'History and Theory in Architectural Periodicals: Assembling Oppositions,' *Journal of the Society of Architectural Historians*, vol. 58, no. 3 (September 1999), pp.343-5.

[62] 'It does not seem particularly controversial to mark the beginning of contemporary architecture theory in the sixties.' Hays, Michael, *Architecture's Desire*, p.x.

[63] "Camila Gray first codifies the term 'Russian avant-garde' in the Western context in her pioneering monograph The Great Experiment: Russian Art, 1863-1922 in 1962." Bowlt, John E. and Olga Matich, eds., *Laboratory of Dreams: The Russian Avant-garde and Cultural Experiment* (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1996), p.5.

[64] Cottington, David, *The Avant Garde*, p.4.

[65] 'Against this [sense of closure of modernism with the historical research in it], the unruly incursions of Archigram, who set up their 'Living City' exhibit in the front lobby of Terrace in 1964, provided a healthy sense of utopianism and continuity with the early modern avant-gardes.' Vidler, Anthony, *Histories of the Immediate Present*, p.xv. A new generation of historically conscious architects appears in the sixties. Reyner Banham observes in 1960, that these architects read the writings of the Futurists for themselves, and feel once more the compulsion of technological ideology and the need to take a firm grip on it. Banham, Reyner, *Architectural Review* (May 1960), p.332.

[66] Colomina, Beatriz and Craig Buckley, eds., *Clip, Stamp, Fold*, p.8.

[67] My italics. Ockman, Joan, 'Resurrecting the Avant-Garde: The History and the Program of Oppositions', in Ockman, Joan, ed., *ArchitectureReproduction*. Revisions 2, (New York: Princeton Architectural Press, 1988), p.182.

[68] Banham, Reyner, 'The New Brutalism,' *Architectural Review* 118, no.708 (December 1955), pp.354-61. The 'image' is first posed, in the fifties again, by Ernst Gombrich.

[69] Banham, Reyner, *A Concrete Atlantis: U.S. Industrial Building and European Modern Architecture* (Cambridge and London: MIT Press, 1986).

[70] Banham, Reyner, *A Concrete Atlantis*, p.18. See also Colomina, Beatriz, *Privacy and Publicity. Modern Architecture as Mass Media* (Cambridge, Mass.; London: MIT, 1994)

[71] The magazine of OSA was *Contemporary Architecture*, in Russian Sovremennaya Arkhitektura, and was published in Moscow from 1926 to 1930.

[72] Kopp, Anatole, *Constructivist Architecture in the USSR*, p.6.

[73] Nikolaus Pevsner in his famous talk on 10 January 1961 at the Royal Institute of British Architects. It is published in: Pevsner, Reyner, 'Modern Architecture and the Return of Historicism,' *Journal of the Royal Institute of British Architects 68*, no.6 (April 1961), pp.230-60.

[74] Zevi, Bruno, 'Architettura,' in *L'Espresso* special issue (December 1965). Cited in Scolari, Massimo, 'The New Architecture and the Avant-Garde,' p.126. In this article Scolari avantgardifies the Italian *Tendenza*, comprised by Italian architects he selects to present in the 1973 exhibition he curates 'Rational Architecture,' XV Triennale of Milan, International session of architecture. Scolari constructs out of the exhibition participants an 'avant-garde' of the 1970s, the *Tendenza*, which he names 'alternative avant-garde.' He quotes Zevi so as to support his avantgardification choice.

[75] *The Dictionary of Architecture* (1991) provides the widest range of assessments of architectures and architects in my corpus. I mention them so as to point out the abundance of choices an author has for describing an architecture besides naming it 'avant-garde.' 'Leading', 86 times; 'famous' 22 times; 'the greatest' 22 times; 'influential' 18 times; 'pioneer,' 16 times; 'genius,' 14 times; 'original,' 13 times; 'important,' 11 times; 'prolific,' 6 times; 'avant-garde' 6 times; 'successful,' 4 times; 'visionary,' 3 times; 'revolutionary,' 3 times; 'brilliant,' 3 times; 'one of the best,' 3 times; 'ingenious,' 2 times; 'radical,' 2 times; 'prominent,' 2 times; 'outstanding,' 2 times; 'accomplished,' 1 time; 'interesting,' 1 time; and 'gifted,' 1 time. In this way I highlight that the use of the term has a particular meaning, which differs from other attributes.

[76] Sadler, Simon, 'New Babylon versus Plug-in City' in Máčel, Otakar and Martin van Schaik, eds., *Exit Utopia: Architectural Provocations, 1956-1976* (Munich; London; New York: Prestel, 2005), p.63.

[77] Sadler, Simon, 'New Babylon versus Plug-in City,' p.65.

[78] *Archigram*, no.9 (1970).

[79] Sadler, Simon, 'New Babylon versus Plug-in City,' p.57.

[80] Constant and Debord, 'Situationist definitions' (1958) in *Internationale Situationniste*, (Paris, 1963), no.2. Cited in Conrads, Ulrich, ed., *Programs and Manifestoes on 20th Century Architecture* (Cambridge: MIT Press, 1970), p.161.

[81] Constant, 'New Babylon' (1960) in the exhibition catalogue of the Städtische Kustgalerie Bochum, 1961. Cited in Conrads, Ulrich, ed., *Programs and Manifestos,* p.177.

[82] 'The avant-garde spirit is eminently aristocratic.' Poggioli, Renato, *The Theory of the Avant-Garde*, p.39. 'The avant-garde is by definition an elite minority, and thus in its own way aristocratic.' Egbert, Donald, *Social Radicalism and the Arts: Western Europe; a Cultural History from the French Revolution to 1968* (London: Duckworth, 1970), p.714.

[83] Williams, Raymond and Tony Pinkney, *The Politics of Modernism: Against the New Conformists* (London: Verso, 1989), p.52.

[84] Hadjinicolaou, Nicos, 'On the Ideology of Avant-Gardism,' pp.48-52.

[85] Habermas, Jürgen, 'Modernity-an Incomplete Project,' in Foster, Hal, ed., *The Anti-Aesthetic: Essays on Postmodern Culture* (New York: New Press, 2002), pp.3-4.

[86] Benevolo, Leonardo, *History of Modern Architecture*, p.259.

[87] Bürger, Peter, *Theorie der Avantgarde* (Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp Verlag, 1974) English translation: Bürger, Peter, *Theory of the Avant-Garde* (Manchester, Minneapolis: Manchester University Press and University of Minnesota Press, 1984).

[88] Poggioli, Renato, *The Theory of the Avant-Garde*, p.107.

[89] Jameson, Fredric, 'Periodizing the 60s,' in Sayres, Sohnya, ed., *The 60s without Apology* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press in cooperation with Social Text, 1984), p.196.

[90] Cottington, David, *The Avant Garde*, p.85.

[91] Crow, Thomas, 'Modernism and Mass Culture in the Visual Arts,' in Frascina, Francis, ed., *Pollock and After: The Critical Debate* (London: Harper & Row, 1985).

[92] Hobsbawm, Eric, *The Age of Extremes. A History of the World, 1914-1991* (New York: Vintage books, 1996), pp.225-400. See also Marwick, Arthur, *The Sixties* (Oxford, New York: Oxford University Press, 1998).

[93] Team X was a loosely organized band of individuals which grew out of CIAM. It was named after the committee responsible for planning the tenth congress of CIAM in 1956 in Dubrovnik: the CIAM X Committee. The composition of the group varied through the years. The seven more active members were: Jaap Bakema, Georges Candilis, Giancarlo De Carlo, Aldo van Eyck, Alison and Peter Smithson and Shadrach Woods, and, at a later stage, Giancarlo De Carlo. Team X organized its own meetings (1960-1981) after challenging the urban principles of the CIAM organization and CIAM's final dismantling in 1959.

[94] Schumacher, Patrick, *The Autopoiesis of Architecture. A New Framework for Architecture*, vol. I (West Sussex, UK: John Wiley & Sons, 2011), p.97.

[95] Tafuri, Manfredo, 'Per una critica dell'ideologia architettonica,' *Contropiano*, no.1 (January-April 1969). English translation: Tafuri, Manfredo, 'Toward a Critique of Architectural Ideology,' in Hays, Michael, ed., *Architecture Theory since 1968* (Cambridge, Mass.; London: MIT, 1998), p.33.

[96] Editorial statement, *Oppositions*, no.3 (January 1974): There is an 'awareness of the marginal role played by architecture in a society dedicated to consumption...In the last analysis there are perhaps only two factors that hold us together, apart from our mutual awareness of the marginal role played by architecture in a society dedicated to consumption: firstly, a faith in the importance of architecture as a poetic manifestation, and secondly, a belief in the importance of criticism as a necessary force set in perennial opposition to the established values of an empirically oriented society'.

[97] Ockman, Joan, 'Resurrecting the Avant-Garde: The History and the Program of Oppositions,' p.182.

[98] Collins, Peter, *Changing Ideals in Modern Architecture 1750-1950* (London: Faber and Faber, 1965), p.284.

[99] This was a one-day symposium in March 1988 organized by the Academy Forum. In conjunction with the symposium two special magazine issues have been published: 'Deconstruction,' *Architectural Design*, vol.58, no.3/4 (1988), and a year later 'Deconstruction II,' *Architectural Design*, vol.59, no.1/2 (1989). In the same year, 1988, the symposium was synopsised in: Papadakis, Andreas, Catherine Cooke and Andrew Benjamin, eds., *Deconstruction: Omnibus Volume* (London: Academy Editions, 1989).

[100] Took place from June 23 to August 30, 1988. Curators: Philip Johnson and Mark Wigley. Exhibition catalogue: Johnson, Philip and Mark Wigley, *Deconstructivist Architecture* (New York: Museum of Modern Art, 1988).

[101] Preface to the exhibition catalogue by Philip Johnson, in Johnson, Philip and Mark Wigley, *Deconstructivist Architecture*, p.7.

[102] Foreword in Papadakis, Andreas, Catherine Cooke and Andrew Benjamin, eds., *Deconstruction,* p.7.

[103] Cooke, Catherine, 'Russian Precursors,' in *Deconstruction,* p.11.

[104] Cooke, Catherine, 'Russian Precursors,' in *Deconstruction,* p.11.

[105] Wigley, Mark, 'Deconstructivist Architecture,' in *Deconstruction*, p.133.

[106] Wigley, Mark, 'Deconstructivist Architecture,' in *Deconstruction*, p.133.

[107] Wigley, Mark, 'Deconstructivist Architecture,' in *Deconstruction*, p.133.

[108] An interesting standpoint on these two forms is written by Vidler, Anthony, 'From Manifesto to Discourse,' in Buckley, Craig, ed., *After The Manifesto* (New York: GSAPP Books and T6) Ediciones, 2014), pp.24-39.

[109] 'Jacques Derrida. In Discussion with Christopher Norris,' in *Deconstruction*, p.72.

[110] The exhibition is produced by the State Museum of Contemporary Art, Thessaloniki, and the Royal Academy of Arts, London. The catalogue carries the same title with the exhibition: *Building the Revolution: Soviet Art and Architecture 1915-1935* (London: Royal Academy of Arts, 2011). The exhibition travels at the La Caixa Forum in Barcelona and in Madrid, in 2011; at the Royal Academy of Arts, London, in 2012 (29 October - 22 January, curated by MaryAnne Stevens and Maria Tsantsanoglou); and at the Martin Gropius Bau, Berlin, in 2012 (5 April - 9 July).

[111] In addition, involving original research and being historical studies, these exhibitions have been possible due to better access to archives that opened for Western scholars after Gorbachev's *Perestroika* in 1986. See Cohen, Jean-Louis, 'Uneasy Crossings. The Architecture of the Russian Avant-garde between East and West,' in *Building the Revolution*, p.13.

[112] Duncan, Carol, *The Aesthetics of Power: Essays in the Critical History of Art* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993).

[113] These are the three dimensions of the profession that Larson employs: the *cognitive*, the *normative* and the *evaluative*. All three compose what she calls the profession's ideal-type. Larson, Magali S., *The Rise of Professionalism: A Sociological Analysis* (Berkeley; London: University of California Press, 1977), p.x.

'Amateur Night at the Movies.' The Charles Theatre and 1960s New York Underground Cinema

Berit Hummel

Abstract

The Charles Theatre in New York's Lower East Side played a central role in the development of underground cinema albeit for a short time: from October 1961 until November 1962, when it had to close due to bankruptcy. Despite its short existence, the theatre was of crucial importance for the underground film scene. Drawing on the Charles' programme notes, press releases and other related material, as well as film reviews and statements by contemporary witnesses, the article investigates the correlation between filmic practices and the social space produced through experimental exhibition practice. Arguing that the Charles' importance consisted in its offering of an in-between space for filmmakers in a commercial movie theatre, this article aims to trace the correlation between the experimental cinema of the time and the spaces where these films were exhibited, investigating the notion of the amateur used as paraphrase for artistic freedom and the idea of a community based on film exhibition.

Introduction

> If there ever could be such a thing as giving [...],
> the logical place to begin is in film exhibition.
> (Jack Smith, 1972)

> [T]he evolution of alternative cinema was determined not simply by the quantity and quality of the films that were produced within any given moment and set of circumstances, but also by the extent to which whatever films did get produced were seen by audiences, and by the nature of these audiences.
>
> (Scott MacDonald, 2008)

A little note in the December 27th issue of *The New York Times*, appearing in similar form in *The Herald Tribune*, announced an open house screening at a theatre in the Lower East Side that evening. Filmmakers could bring their own films, finished or not, and have them screened at the Charles Theatre. The event would go on, the note said, until supply of films had stopped. The actual duration of the screening is not conveyed, but, to the surprise of the theatre owners, response to their call was overwhelming. Initially just trying to fill a gap in the programming[1], the news seemed to have spread:

> "We'll have a Film-Makers' Festival," Langsford announced, and after telling a few friends did no more about it. But when Wednesday afternoon came [...] Stein and Langsford went out to confront a line of people – many clutching cans of film – that reached all the way down the corner. [2]

The success of the screening not only brought to light a certain urgency for independent filmmakers in need of a way to show their work. Apparently the theatre managers Walter Langsford and Edwin Stein expected around 40 filmmakers to respond their call, with 400 coming instead, and there also seemed to be a tremendous interest by the audience. According to a *New York Times* article reporting on a later edition of the festival -- which was held on a monthly basis after its initial success -- films were screened to a full house and tickets sold at record speed[3].

New York has a rich history of independent cinema, both in terms of production and exhibition, reaching back to the early 1930s with workers' and leftist films. The city, as David James states, was 'the country's – and perhaps the century's – center of independent cinema'[4]. Monographs have shown how it related to the culture of its time, from the early days when experimental filmmaking was linked directly to industrial film production (Horak 1998), through documentary movements of the 30s (Alexander 1981) to the post-war avant-garde- and underground filmmaking (Renan 1967, Youngblood 1970, Sitney 1979 [1974], James 1989, Suárez 1996) which is the focus of this article[5]. Only if films have an audience, if they are seen and talked about, do they have an impact. Defining cinema as a 'mediated cultural site', Haidee Wasson has shown in her *Museum Movies. The Museum of Modern Art and the Birth of Art Cinema* (2005) how the art institution has influenced the status of film as an art form through its Film Library collection and educational programs starting in the mid-1930s[6]. In the field of institutional histories, Scott MacDonald has done invaluable work by bringing to light the efforts of film societies in the centres of experimental film production on the East and West Coast. His publications on the San Francisco-based societies *Canyon Cinema* (MacDonald 2008) and *Art in Cinema* (MacDonald 2006) as well as the extensive collection on New York's *Cinema 16* (MacDonald 2002) have proven the importance of institutions taking care of bringing independent and experimental films to their audiences[7].

However, relatively little is known about cinemas showing these films to broader audiences, and how exhibition could have possibly influenced filmmaking, especially in the formative years of New York underground cinema. The Charles Theatre was unique in this respect as it drew - operating as a commercial movie theatre - an eclectic audience, reaching a greater variety of people than a film society, film club or art institution like MoMA could. The Charles

Theatre, then, brought to a wide audience the plethora of independent and experimental filmmaking at this time in New York.

Drawing from the theatre's ads, program notes, press reviews as well as statements by contemporary witnesses, the purpose of this article is to show how the specific practices of film exhibition helped create a space for early underground cinema to experiment and to grow.[8] In bringing together the most different actors and audiences, the Charles Theatre seemed to represent the variety of the scene at a time when filmmaking was in a state between art and market, when the influence of the European post-war cinematic realism was still strong but personal filmmaking became increasingly popular[9]. The Charles' exhibition practices will be discussed in the light of two interrelated aspects, the amateur and community, to show how this particular theatre could become a crucial space of development for underground cinema.

Amateur vs. Professional

Out of all art forms, film depends the most on standardization; only through manufacturing standards for film stock, cameras as well as projectors could a mass market for film distribution and exhibition have developed. To a certain extent filmmaking always required a minimum of professionalization, no matter how experimental and free the approach. In *Art Worlds* (1982), Howard Becker, defining art as a set of social practices, has shown how actors in distribution and exhibition of art always seek "to make a messy process more orderly"[10] in order to create a stable supply with art works and adequate conditions for business. This need for professional standards seems to be at odds with a tendency gaining importance in the early phase of experimental filmmaking in New York.

While the notion of the amateur has often been used in a derogative way as a synonym for the unprofessionalism of experimental films, especially in press reviews, filmmakers Maya Deren and Jonas Mekas employed it in a strategic fashion to mark an independent practice of filmmaking as oppositional to the dominant mode of industrial or Hollywood cinema and the moral concepts it stood for[11]. In her short essay 'Amateur vs. Professional' (first published 1959), Maya Deren announces the amateur's material constraints as a great opportunity to reach a maximum freedom of expression[12]. Likewise Jonas Mekas opposed the 'helplessness of the professionals' with 'the creative joy of the independent film artist, roaming the streets of New York [...] not giving a damn about Hollywood, art, critics or anybody'[13]. They both used the concept of the amateur to describe a freedom in the marginalized position of independent filmmaking, taking part neither in the financial gains from the film industry nor in the growing art market, a space outside of the capitalist logic of exploitation producing a 'freedom to become'[14]. Working this way would provide the filmmaker not only with a greater freedom of expression but also make visible subjects that are otherwise restrained due to industrial cinema's dominant logic of representation as regulated by the Hollywood production code[15]. Even though Deren and Mekas used the notion of the amateur in a strategic fashion, there are crucial differences in how they employed it. While Mekas in his writing opposed any kind of formal filmic structure and foregrounded the freedom of improvisation, Deren stood for a conceptual approach which she regarded essential also for experimental filmmaking. She criticized the films which Mekas propagated to be constituting a new trend in independent American filmmaking, *Shadows* (1959) and *Pull my Daisy* (1959) as 'amateur burglar[y]' since they presented 'unorthodox subject matter in an orthodox manner'[16]. The amateur in this context appears to be less a formal than an economic concept, implying that working outside of the industry required other forms of financial success.

Reaching a broader audience with experimental films had never been easy, exhibition mostly depended on film societies and informal screenings in cafés or private apartments. For lack of possibilities to show her work, Maya Deren, for instance, repeatedly rented the 200 seat Provincetown Theater in Greenwich Village between 1946 and 1949, oftentimes presenting her films to a full crowd[17]. Since the late 1940s independent film exhibition and distribution in New York has been dominated by film society Cinema 16, founded 1947 by Amos and Marcia Vogel, which developed into an important institution for independent film exhibition in a very short time[18]. The Vogels followed a decidedly eclectic approach to programming, mixing films from the historical avant-garde, new European cinema and scientific and documentary films, as well as experimental films from the post-war avant-gardes in one show. In order to enable programming free from economic pressures, an annual membership fee was raised, which oriented potential membership mostly to Manhattan's middle class. Cinema 16 rented theatres on a regular basis for their shows, starting at the small downtown Provincetown Playhouse and eventually moving uptown to the Beekman Theatre and the 1,600 seat Needle Trades Auditorium.

Throughout the 1950s many societies and film clubs emerged throughout the U.S., establishing the first forms of wider non-industrial film circulation[19]. The beginning of the 1960s saw the inauguration of several new cinema theatres in Manhattan, two of which opened within a few weeks of each other: the New Yorker, located in the Upper West Side, on March 17, 1960 and the smaller Bleecker Street Cinema in Greenwich Village on April 4. The New Yorker was run by Dan Talbot, a film critic turned exhibitor. He convinced Henry Rosenberg, wholesale businessman and owner of a Spanish movie house chain, to buy the former Yorktown Theater (900 seats) on Broadway between 88th/89th Street and opened it just ten days after Rosenberg

had officially announced the theatre's purchase (see Talbot 2009). The 250-seat Renata Theater on Bleecker Street was bought by filmmaker and former chemical engineer Lionel Rogosin and reopened as the Bleecker. Rogosin had initially intended to show his *Come Back, Africa* (1960) there, which had won the Italian Critics' Award at the 1960 Venice Film Festival, but did not find a distributor in the US. Since he did not manage the theatre until around 1964, devoting his time to filmmaking instead, the programming was done by Marshall Lewis, who had previously helped Dan Talbot program special screening series at the New Yorker[20]. Both theatres operated as repertoire cinemas: the New Yorker with an emphasis on revivals from film history, and the Bleecker focusing more on European imports[21]. However, even though these two theatres brought a fresh approach to film programming, exhibiting films that were formerly largely invisible and undistributed, they still showed almost exclusively foreign movies and US revivals rather than new productions from the expanding sphere of New York's experimental filmmakers. In his Village Voice column *Movie Journal*, Jonas Mekas complained in September 1961 that 'the main body of our own American independents and experimentalists, cannot pass through the Blind Wall of our art theatres'[22], recommending in the same article a series dedicated to some of these new American directors in the programme of Cinema 16.

According to their own account, when Walter Langsford and Edwin Stein, two young men in their mid-twenties who had moved to the Lower East Side, decided to open their own cinema in a disused theatre, they 'originally just wanted a place where we could see good movies'[23]. The Charles Theatre had operated since the late 1920s as a neighbourhood cinema called Bijou on Avenue B and 12th Street in the Lower East Side, for its category a mid-size theatre with 600 seats. Around the time of the Charles' reopening, Mekas announced in his column, that its managers 'want it [...] to be known that the theatre is open for any adventurous 16-mm

screenings, experimental films, etc., if anybody has anything'[24]. According to press reviews, neither man had a background in film business: Langsford had studied drama and subsequently worked as theatre manager in a small Connecticut playhouse, while Stein was a recent Yale graduate[25].

With the theatre building in a seemingly derelict condition, work needed to be done before the first show. Operating on a tight budget, Langsford and Stein carried out most of the refurbishment themselves. This "Do It Yourself (DIY)" attitude remained part of the public image of the Charles after it opened in October 1961. One of the press photographs used in articles on the theatre shows Langsford and Stein equipped with mop and floor cloth in the lobby-turned-art-gallery[26] of their theatre, wiping the floor and dusting off sculptures. It is obvious in this image, however, that the scene is staged, as Langsford is wiping a shiny sculpture – a modernism style nude bronze torso conventionally installed on a pedestal – and Stein mops an already-clean looking floor [Figure 1].

Fig. 1: Langsford and Stein in the Charles' lobby, Photo: Braun Photo Service, 1961, Charles Theatre Collection, CT 11, The Museum of Modern Art Department of Film Special Collections, New York, NY.

As if to emphasise the staging, both men are wearing white shirts and suit trousers, Langsford a necktie, while the mop bucket is placed in the image's foreground. The performance of director-as-maintenance-man (two men with the attributes of white collar professions carrying out blue collar work) is important to this photographic record[27]. One of the articles using this photograph appeared in *Cue*, a high-circulation magazine whose target audience was predominantly young, middle-class New Yorkers. Here, the story of how Langsford and Stein prepared the theatre for its reopening bears a strong resemblance to that of a family moving into an old house in need of refurbishment:

> They bought paint and brushes, and gave the landmark a new surface inside and out. They bought hammers, nails, and a Do It Yourself booklet, and set about doing their own carpentering, plumbing, electrical mending and sign making, roof-leak plugging, floor-hole repairing, cement patching, marquee fixing, etcetera.[28]

A listing of the professions that the two had to perform follows this description. To run their cinema, they 'acted as their own cashiers, ticket takers, porters, delivery boys, bookkeepers and sidewalk sweepers'[29]. Staging the cinema-director-as-maintenance-man holds certain parallels to the role of the artist-filmmaker-as-producer: both positions require the professional to fill and perform multiple roles. Working outside of larger commercial structures and networks, which are thoroughly organised by market economy and its accompanying power structures and divisions of labour, provided the freedom to proceed according to personal values and ideals. Another figurative reference to this freedom is the presence of visual art in the image: while Langsford is taking care of a sculpture, Stein is cleaning the floor in front of a painting installed on an easel, as if to indicate an additional sense of freshness in this improvised art show. While operating as a commercial cinema, the Charles occupied an interstice in that field, accentuated by exhibiting across genres and media, attempting to test the potential of film exhibition.

While the programming at the Charles pursued commercial interests, its strategies emphasised working out of pure passion for cinema. Accordingly, the Charles denominated itself as the 'most informal theatre in town'[30] and demonstrated in its ads an everyday familiarity, addressing the public in a colloquial tone and sharing seemingly private stories[31]. The display of a certain amateurishness made the Charles unique among the cinemas that had opened in 1960; the label of 'informal' seemed to anticipate its becoming a centre for the exhibition of

underground cinema. This is most evident in the reception of their 'open house' policy, labelled as 'live cinema' in which the audience would supply the films to be screened[32].

The myth of the accidental success of the Filmmakers Festival, as quoted in the beginning of this article, is to be found in various forms in reviews and corresponds to the staging of the theatre managers' seemingly accidental turn from cinema goers into cinema owners. While the aim of this profiling is fairly obvious – work done out of passion in the way Maya Deren refers to the amateur – the parallel to the discourse around filmmaking is distinct: 'professionals in the making', as critic Wanda Hale described Stein and Langsford[33].

Eventually the festival continued regularly and was extended to a weeklong event in July 1962, culminating in an awards ceremony with the categories 'Best Film' and 'Most Promising Filmmaker'. Admission to one of those evenings was '95 cents or—for filmmakers—a can of film'[34]. The Charles' press release declares their goals as follows:

> (1) to bring to light valuable work being done by unknown beginners or by more practised independents who are too out-of-pocket or too uncertain of themselves to reach distribution;
> (2) to serve a teaching-function by presenting filmmakers with an opportunity to test their work under trial conditions – a theatre screen and a sizeable audience (the festivals are the best-attended weekday event at the Charles);
> (3) to give the public a chance to view the gamut of the most recent independent work.[35]

This statement has been cited regularly in articles covering the festival for bringing together the potential audience for experimental film with its producers, addressed here as 'the unsung creative amateurs of the film-making art'[36]. At the same time, it puts the filmmakers in the focus of these events by announcing a teaching function as one of the festival's aims. The notion of the amateur appears in many contemporary articles, press reception, and reviews of

the festival. When, for instance, the festival is being referred to as 'amateur night at the movies'[37], the practice of the 'open house' approach to film exhibition is related to an earlier tradition of arranging dance shows in movie theatres with the aim of discovering new talent. A cinema that becomes, at least for a certain time, a space partially freed from the normative setting of film exhibition, thus produces an interstice in a field otherwise dominated by economic forces, bringing the making and viewing of films closer together. This also seems to provide a more experimental situation for the audience, whereby it is difficult to distinguish between filmmakers and 'college students, aspiring professionals, hobbyists, television technicians, artists' from mere spectators:

> [A] crowd of predominantly young people, most of them clad in rather Bohemian comfort, waited out front for the theatre to open. A few even carried film cans to submit at the last minute, along with tapes and records that could be piped onto the screen as accompaniment.[38]

This setting seemed to provoke the audience's direct involvement, who did not only walk out of displeasing films, but also communicated its appraisement directly, which in the same article is described as '[t]he hissing auditorium sounded like a snake pit and feet pounded the floor with Rockette precision'[39]. In conversation with Stan Brakhage, filmmaker Ken Jacobs also comments on the 'booing and applauding matches' being a regular component of the Charles' evenings, much to the horror of many filmmakers[40]. Other references to this practice of communication between filmmakers and audience mentioned specific motifs in the films which were often disapproved of, such as the use of Greek mythology, being a common trope among experimental filmmakers of the time. The general atmosphere of exchange that constituted the scene at the Charles was consistently mentioned in almost all of the reviews.

The label of the Charles as a place of amateur cinema persisted in the reception of the films. Filmmaker Ron Rice, having just moved from San Francisco to New York, participated with his film *Senseless* (1962) in the first weeklong Film-Makers' Festival where he received an award for 'Most Promising Filmmaker'. Correspondingly, the ensuing screening of his *Flower Thief* (1960) at the Charles received an unexpectedly wider attention from influential film critics, with reviews appearing in *The New York Times* and other high-circulation papers. While the film itself was met by most reviewers with obvious bewilderment, taking on the perspective of the 'unsympathetic observer'[41] as acclaimed *New York Post* critic Archer Winsten did, it is striking that some critics made more or less direct remarks about the film's perceived interdisciplinarity on account of its otherness from conventional film, describing it, for example, as 'a plotless welter of textures and time, closer to the art of assemblage and the odd theatrical Happenings of the New York painters than to anything in the tradition of film'[42].

The *Flower Thief* was the first veritable underground film in the regular programme of the Charles[43]. Notably, the wide interest in the movie was sparked by a (mildly) positive review by Eugene Archer published in *The New York Times* on July 14, 1962. Other reviews added to its success and reached a broader public so that queues started to form at the Charles' entrance, leading to a postponed summer closure of the theatre 'due to such an enthusiastic clamouring for tickets'[44].

What becomes apparent in the wider critical reception is that there are certain parallels between the attitude with which Rice's film was met by the critics and that of the general experimental programming strategies of the Charles. The film, seen again as the work of an unprofessional who could only produce images that would be 'overdeveloped and underexposed'[45], was at the same time characterised as a work that transgressed the constraints of the medium towards

the new art forms of the time, happenings and performances[46]. Accordingly, the open format of film exhibition at the Filmmakers' Festivals seemed to call for involvement of the audience, suspending the conventions of 'going to the movies'. In this regard, the discourse around the 'Amateur Nights' placed both filmmakers and audience in a position to transgress their respective roles, experiment with behavioural conventions or filmic expression respectively. Also, and more importantly, another kind of transgression took place in the form of screening work in progress or sometimes even raw footage in a commercial cinema theatre in front of an audience largely un-familiarized with this kind of experimental screening format.

Going to the Movies

In an interview with Scott MacDonald, filmmaker Ken Jacobs describes the Charles as an almost utopian space and compares the theatre's impact to Jack Kerouac's seminal Beat novel *On the Road* (1957), in that it made independent filmmakers aware 'that there were other freaks and outsiders living lives similar to their own'[47].

The policy of the Charles to provide a mix of foreign and historical classics with new experimental films was nothing completely new or even unusual for independent film exhibition. After all, it was at Cinema 16 that many of the filmmakers who would later form the underground, such as Stan Brakhage, Ron Rice, Kenneth Anger or Gregory Markopoulos, showed their films for the first time. The importance of the Charles, becoming the only commercial cinema that showed underground film on a regular basis, originated in the fact that it did operate as a regular movie house on most weekdays, showing Hollywood films as well as foreign movies and revivals to a mixed audience. The Charles thus not only provided a

platform for screening experimental and unfinished work, its existence marks a crucial time in the development of the New York film scene, when personal filmmaking became increasingly popular and styles developed away from the early realist approaches, with many filmmakers seeing themselves in a state between liberal arts and film market.

The social space at the Charles, predominantly during the open house events, has been described in the press as one of familiarity and intimate community. *New York Times* critic Howard Thompson illustrated an atmosphere in which 'easy camaraderie spilled into the lobby during intermission', where members of the audience stood closely together, discussing the films and the latest news[48]. In a similar way, after the successful July 1962 Filmmakers Festival, the weekly *Village Voice* ads of the Charles between July 5 and August 30 of that year foregrounded an atmosphere of community by directly addressing their readers, offering anecdotes about the everyday business of running a movie theatre. In providing these details, the Charles' audience was addressed as a collective involved with the theatre rather than occasional cinema-goers.

The particularity of this social scene was also recalled by P. Adams Sitney, author of seminal works on post-war experimental and avant-garde cinema and close friend of many of the filmmakers[49]. He contrasts the events at the Charles to the scene gathering at Cinema 16:

> The Sunday Cinema 16 screenings were at eleven o'clock in the morning in, what was then, posh new uptown theaters, like the Beekman. It felt like going to church. All these people were dressed up in jackets and ties, coming to see the latest Japanese film or a collection of short films from the Polish Film School. The people looked very interesting but it was a little like going to the New York Philharmonic: there was no contact among people who didn't arrive together. There wasn't a lobby life. [...]
> While Cinema 16 was Lincoln Center, the Charles was a clubhouse. Down at the Charles, people who didn't have enough money to go to Stanley's for beer hung out in the lobby. [...] In those days, it was possible to live in New York with no money. New

York was a dying city. No one wanted to live there. [...] There was a whole culture in New York of people living on next to nothing, and the Charles was *their* alternative movie theater.[50]

In contrast to the social events of the Charles's screenings, film exhibition at Cinema 16 appeared as a more sophisticated event where 'one didn't have the sense of being part of a community'[51]. This perception of the Charles goes along with its claim to informality, aiming at a distinctly different and more eclectic audience than the film society did[52].

Many of the Charles' underground film nights, especially those in the Midnight Film Society programmes, were of a performative character, evoking a certain theatricality in the context of film exhibition. The Charles management invented the Midnight Film Society in January 1962, which in the beginning took place every Saturday, but afterwards also on Friday nights, to show films without appropriate distribution and therefore unknown to a wide audience[53]. This included showing films without subtitling as in the case of Antonioni's *L'Amiche*, screened in Italian original with English translation played from a tape. The exceptional character of these evenings becomes apparent in the reports of an observer, Mike Galewski, entrusted by Amos Vogel (Cinema 16)[54]. Galewski reported to Vogel in winter and spring 1962 at least on ten consecutive Saturday shows of the Midnight Film Society, taking place after the regular, usually double-feature programme. Apart from giving details such as numbers of visitors, the reports contained observations on practices of exhibition that are not visible in the printed programs or ads. Admission was included in the price of the regular ticket for the evening's regular show, and as Galewski observed, a good part of the audience consisted of people that had already attended the main show, with 'a sizeable crowd' coming especially for the midnight show, depending on the program[55]. On some occasions, such as at the midnight showing of Rudy Burckhardt's films in January 1962, there were additional screenings of

unfinished films or sometimes even raw material announced as unedited footage, for testing purposes showed to an audience that did not know what to expect. For example, after the Burckhardt evening, Galewski accounts of a filmmaker 'whose name I think was Levine' showing his footage[56]. Apparently this screening of raw material had just been announced as 'some footage unedited of a new film with "good and bad footage", an incomprehensibility of announcements that Galewski also observed at other shows. Galewski remembers not having 'the faintest idea of what it was or any intention behind it' except that he recognised some familiar faces appearing in the film as actors such as filmmaker Gregory Markopulos, whom Galewski also mentioned as member of the audience on several of the Saturday screenings he reported on, or actor Ben Caruthers[57].

According to Galewski's reports, a good share of the audience frequently stayed behind after the evening's regular bill for this additional programme, included in the original ticket price. There was an intermission, during which free coffee was offered in the lobby, sometimes accompanied by a duo or quartet playing classical music, referred to in the programme as 'Baroque Chamber Ensemble'. Additionally, there were 'Special Wednesday Evenings' programmed, which were 'open to other media [...] to seek what is different, informative, artistic. Lectures, readings, concerts, dramas – anything of value that lets in fresh air'[58].

While some of these film shows overlapped with the programmes of regular repertory cinemas like the New Yorker and the Bleecker or with Cinema 16, this explicit intermediality was unique to the Charles. Not only did it bring together different genres of music, such as classical baroque performances and a Sunday afternoon contemporary jazz series called 'Jazz and Java', exhibitions of painting, photography and sculpture in the lobby, and dedicated special evenings to the different spheres of cinema, it did – as a commercial movie theatre - also have a more

eclectic audience. One of the audience-related remarks of Vogel's observer compares the Charles to the New Yorker, noting a certain steadiness in attention: 'It is definitely a committed, interested audience [...] and there is nothing like the great variation in attendance that I noticed at the New Yorker'[59]. However, the size of the audience as well as its response to the films seems correlated to how well-distributed the respective author was. Galewski's estimates in numbers of the audience reach from as low as 75 (for screening of Humphrey Jennings films) up to 400 (Rudy Burckhardt, Shirley Clarke, James Broughton), even reaching almost 'house capacity' for an evening of French filmmaker René Clair[60].

Filmmakers were regularly present during the screenings of their work at the Midnight Film Society on weekends, some of which involved discussions with the audience. Also, more established authors like Hilary Harris used the Charles as a testing ground for their works in progress. Together with a programme of his films in March 1962, including several of his award winning pieces, Harris showed a work in progress, stating that he wanted to get the audience's reaction, also mentioning the numerous difficulties he experienced during the production[61]. This aspect of the theatre as testing ground for unfinished pieces is especially significant in the context of its work as a commercial movie house. Confronting the audience, at times obviously unexpectedly, with unfinished films or even raw footage, had the effect of creating spontaneous reactions. It thus it created an in-between space for the development of a new film culture for independent film professionals on different levels, and it represented a field of experimentation for both makers and audience.

Audience as Actor

The concept of the amateur and the sense of community generated by non-industrial filmic practices dominated the discourse around the Charles. This indicates a transgression of forms, a position of 'in-between-ness', due to the theatre's modus operandi as a commercial cinema while at the same time partly functioning like a film society. Clearly, when applied to avant-garde filmmaking, the notion of the amateur seems ambiguous in its own right: a filmmaker who does not necessarily strive for working in or changing the industry, but aims for a public distribution and exhibition of his work. The domestic amateur-filmmaker, in most cases, will be content with showing the films to the narrower group of family and friends[62]. Bringing up themes already present during the first avant-garde, such as the relation between amateur and professional, between the everyday and the extraordinary, between vernacular uses of aesthetic norms and their deliberate manipulation, or, quite simply, between art and not-art, the Charles' exhibition practices indirectly imply a criticism of cinema as an institution.

Moreover, the Charles' practices of 'in-between-ness' in exhibition correspond to those of the filmmakers in the earlier stages of 'underground' cinema – positioned between market and art, between amateur and professional. It was precisely the director's aim of situating the Charles as a commercial movie theatre, while also providing a testing ground for filmmakers to show their unfinished, small scale productions in a kind of workshop situation, which created a space for experiencing the impact of new experimental work often for the first time. As filmmaker and performance artist Jack Smith later recalls in a 1972 *Village Voice* article describing 'the wonderful orgasmiatic explosion that was the Charles Theatre', seeing one's own work on the big screen of the Charles was a surreal experience[63]. The Charles thus transformed the rare experimental setting of an artists' studio space into the everyday experience of going to the movies, helping filmmakers to see their own work with the aesthetic distance of a spectator in the audience[64].

Judging from its *Village Voice* ads, the Charles, with its appearance as 'grassroots slum-located culture center'[65] addressed its audience in a colloquial way, establishing a community similar to that of a film society whose members form part of a specific social group that shared tastes furthered through relatively coherent programming. By comparison, the film series 'Art in Cinema' organised by Frank Stauffacher and taking place at the San Francisco Museum of Art from September 1946 on, claimed direct engagement of the audience in the programme note for the very first of their series. It stated the programme's mission to establish film as a form of art and contrasted avant-garde films with 'Hollywood fantasies, before which sits an audience passively and uncreatively'[66]. However, since Stauffacher's programme, at least in its first phase, was strictly confined to avant-garde films, they correlated with the educational aspirations of an art institution. In a more radical sense, this concept of an audience activated by art films seems to be behind many of the Charles' special programme shows which were frequently characterised by a casual atmosphere that enabled interaction and exchange. Stan VanDerBeek's film night on February 24, 1962 seems to be the most direct reference to the activated audience, its opening described by Mike Galewski:

> [T]o put the audience in an appropriately antic mood for his films he made his entrance this way: There was an off-stage bugle or trumpet fanfare, the house curtain went up and there was revealed S. Vanderbeek standing with his back to the audience.[67]

In conjunction with the theatrical atmosphere of his performance-screening, VanDerBeek had a short pamphlet distributed among the audience, explicitly entitled 'If the Actor is the Audience'. In it VanDerBeek declares that an audience 'must move and act' and suggests that art galleries should be screening films in the evenings, in order to ensure a distribution for film art and 'break the stranglehold that commercial cinema has on the eye and on the senses'[68].

Bypassing the conventional mode of commercial film distribution is here foregrounded as a political act, a kind of win-win situation where the ensuing economic freedom of the filmmaker is accompanied by the audience's sensual activation as similarly hinted at in Stauffacher's programme notes. However, VanDerBeeks notion of the audience becoming the actor, which reinforces the Charles' programming policy, requests a much more active spectator, leaving behind the seat in the dark auditorium to physically take possession of the films.

In creating a community like a film society while operating as a commercial theatre and at the same time opening space for showing unfinished films, the Charles generated a transgressive space at a time when independent and underground filmmaking was evolving rapidly. Crossing boundaries between art forms, housing concerts, theatre, fine art and films, the Charles was important for an emergent media practice in the beginning of the 1960s which included live art and performance, aiming at blurring the boundaries between art and life. By providing a space for experimentation located between art and business it offered a space of becoming much needed by filmmakers while at the same time making their films accessible to an eclectic audience[69] .

Berit Hummel studied at Freie Universität Berlin and at the Academy of Visual Arts, Leipzig. She obtained a Master of Art in Context from Universität der Künste, Berlin. Between 2012 and 2016 she was DFG fellow at the International Graduate Research Program 'The World in the City: Metropolitanism and Globalization from the 19th Century to the Present' at

Technische Universität Berlin. Her PhD project investigates the ways in which everyday urban milieus figure in artistic practices and representations during times of radical urban transformation, focusing on early 1960s New York underground and artists' cinema. Currently she is teaching at the Institute of Architecture / TU Berlin and at FU Berlin.

Notes

[1] The Charles' booking reports mark the theatre as 'rented' every Wednesday for shows of films distributed by Artkino, some press articles state that the Charles managers forgot to book a film for their film series screened for the neighbourhood's Ukrainian community.

[2] Creighton Peet, 'Amateur Night for Movie Makers', *Today's Living Magazine. New York Herald Tribune*, June 24, 1962, 5, 15. Respective notes appeared in the New York Times and Herald Tribune on December 27, 1961, the day of the festival, announced as 'open-house film festival' (Tribune) where '[a]ny director who has footage he would like projected before an audience is invited' (New York Times) and stating that '[t]he parade of experimental films will continue to be screened until the supply is exhausted.' (Tribune)

[3] Howard Thompson, 'Screen: An Experimental Program', *New York Times*, August 6, 1962, 37.

[4] David E. James, 'Introduction', in David James (ed.), *To Free the Cinema. Jonas Mekas & the New York Underground* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1992): 4.

[5] The term ›underground‹ has been used in connection with the 1960s independent film scene interchangeably with labels such as Avant-Garde or New American Cinema. In the present context Sheldon Renan's definition focusing on the filmmakers practices and their conditions will be adopted: 'The underground film *is* a certain kind of film. It is a film conceived and made essentially by one person and is a *personal statement* by that person. It is a film that dissents radically in form, or in technique, or in content, or perhaps in all three. It is usually made for very little money, frequently under a thousand dollars, and its exhibition is outside commercial film channels.' (Sheldon, Renan, *An Introduction to the American Underground Film* (New York: E.P. Dutton & Co, 1967): 17.) The heyday of underground cinema is frequently localized in the years between 1959, when the ground-breaking films *Shadows* (Cassavetes 1959) and *Pull My Daisy* (Leslie/Frank 1959) first came out; and 1966, when the breakthrough of Andy Warhol's *Chelsea Girls* in commercial distribution changed the parameters of the scene (David E. James, *Allegories of Cinema. American Film in the Sixties* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1989).

[6] Haidee Wasson, *Museum Movies: MoMA and the Birth of Art Cinema* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2005): 27.

[7] Compare Scott MacDonald's remark on the impact of film exhibition on the filmmakers: 'Once an audience for avant-garde work had been created, filmmakers realised there was some reason, beyond their own pleasure, to *make* work.' Scott MacDonald, *Art in Cinema. Documents Towards a History of the Film Society* (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 2006): 14.

[8] Many of the primary sources used for this article are from the Charles Theatre Collection, acquired in 2012 from Walter Langsford by MoMA Film Study Center, NYC. In two historiographic descriptions of underground cinema the peculiarity of the scene is mentioned.

Hoberman and Rosenbaum provide recollections from the Charles in their *Midnight Movies* (1983) and there is also a subchapter on this theatre in a dissertation investigating the institutional basis of 1960s New York underground cinema (James Kreul, *New York, New Cinema. The Independent Film Community and the Underground Crossover, 1950-1970* (Dissertation, University of Wisconsin-Madison, 2004).

[9] Charles Tepperman, *Amateur Cinema. The Rise of North American Moviemaking, 1923-1960* (Oakland: University of California Press, 2015), predominantly chapter 5 and 7; Patricia R. Zimmermann, 'Hollywood, Home Movies, and Common Sense: Amateur Film as Aesthetic Dissemination and Social Control, 1950-1962', in *Cinema Journal*, vol. 27, no. 4, (1988), and 'The Amateur, the Avant-Garde, and Ideologies of Art', in *Journal of Film and Video*, vol. 38, no. ¾ , (1986). Filmmaker and critic Lewis Jacobs saw two reasons behind the 'phenomenal post-war revival' of experimental film. Firstly, MoMA's programmes of films rented at low cost to non-profit groups, universities, colleges and museums accompanied by programme notes on the history of cinema. Secondly, he mentions 'the entirely new and heightened prestige that film acquired through its service to the war effort', granting the wider public access to a broad spectrum of film formats and subjects other than Hollywood films (Lewis Jacobs, 'Experimental Cinema in America (Part Two: The Postwar Revival)', in *Hollywood Quarterly*, vol. 3, no. 3 (Spring 1948): 278. Another factor were the large stocks of surplus 16mm film and equipment sold by the U.S. Army at low cost, used by many of the underground and experimental filmmakers (see, amongst others, Jonas Mekas quoted in Ronald Sukenick, *Down and In. Life in the Underground* (New York: Beech Tree Books, 1987): 145.

[10] Howard S. Becker, *Art Worlds* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2008): 94.

[11] Besides pursuing their own filmmaking, both Mekas and Deren were major contributors to the discourse around underground filmmaking. Maja Deren had since her seminal *Meshes of the Afternoon* (1943) both made films and wrote about filmmaking practice. Jonas Mekas, voice of the underground film movement, co-founded the journal *Film Culture* in 1955 as well as the distribution network *Film Makers Cooperative* in 1962, published his sometimes polemic film criticism in a weekly column in *Village Voice* and organised numerous film screenings and showcases in various cinemas around Manhattan (see list in David E. James, 'Introduction', in David E. James (ed.), *To Free the Cinema. Jonas Mekas & the New York Underground* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1992): 323-24.

[12] Maya Deren, 'Amateur vs. Professional', in *Film Culture*, no. 39 (Winter 1965): 45-6.

[13] Jonas Mekas, 'Movie Journal', in *Village Voice,* January 12, 1961: 11.

[14] In his statement *The Future of the New American Cinema*, New York filmmaker Edouard de Laurot writes: 'We propose that the artist does not express himself, but expresses himself to others. Through his art he creates a freedom to become, to attain being, not only for himself, but for all men. [...] The film-artist today must be committed to the expression of the latent forces of becoming, and derive a new aesthetic, not from experimental vagaries, but from a deep, truthful and imaginative perception of reality.' Edouard de Laurot, 'The Future of the New American Cinema', in *Film Culture,* no. 24 (1962): 21.

[15] The Hollywood production code officially remained in force until 1968 regulating content of films by giving details on what could be depicted in films and how.

[16] Maya Deren, 'Some Metaphors for the creative process', in *Village Voice*, July 21, 1960: 6, 8.

[17] The small Provincetown Theatre was home to the amateur theatre group Provincetown Players who rented out on evenings without performances. Deren's shows drew a large crowd. As filmmaker Stan Brakhage remembers: 'After the first showing, the place was packed and hundreds had to be turned away. The theater sold out night after night, and it became quite the

thing to do in six months, to go see "Meshes of the Afternoon" and listen to this crazy

woman spouting film art. [...] From these public presentations sprang all kinds of possibilities for film.' (Stan Brakhage, *Film at Wit's End. Eight Avant-Garde Filmmakers* (New York: McPherson, 1989): 94.

[18] The 16 stood for the film format 16mm, mass medium in educational film after WWII and chosen by many independent filmmakers due to its lower costs. The 'Canyon' in the artist run Canyon Cinema by contrast refers to the topographical location of the society in Canyon, California. Baillie describes the informal atmosphere: 'I realised that making films and showing films must go hand in hand, so I got a job at Safeway, took out a loan and bought a projector. We got an army surplus screen and hung it up real nice in the back yard of this house we were renting. Then we'd find whatever films we could, including our own little things that were in progress [...] and show them.' Baillie in Scott Macdonald, *Canyon Cinema. The Life and Times of an Independent Film Distributor* (Philadelphia, Temple University Press, 2008): 6f. Also Cinema 16 started small scale, 'organized on a shoestring by people with more enthusiasm than experience', but on another level with 14.000 people attending the first four months of screenings at Provincetown Playhouse (Amos Vogel,' Cinema 16. A Showcase for Nonfiction Film', in *Hollywood Quarterly*, 1950: 420). Having to be converted into a film society for legal and financial reasons, Vogel stated among its aims '[t]o promote, sponsor and organize the exhibition and distribution of documentary, sociological, educational, scientific and experimental motion pictures; to thereby further the appreciation of the motion picture as an art and as a tool of education; to thereby encourage production of such films [...]'. (Amos Vogel, 'Statement on Cinema 16', in *Amos Vogel Papers*, Columbia University Archives, Special Collections, (MS#432), Box 1, Folder 1, Series I.1).

[19] See the accounts by Jonas Mekas in Scott MacDonald, Jonas Mekas, *A Critical Cinema 2. Interviews with Independent Filmmakers* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1992): 77-108.

[20] See: Ben Davis, 'The Bleecker Street Cinema. From Repertory Theater to Independent Film Showcase', in *Cineaste*, vol. 38, no. 1 (2012): 14-19.

[21] The declining production of the Hollywood film industry led to a growing interest in and demand for films that had been out of distribution for some time, as well as for foreign films (cf. Bosley Crowther, 'Old Film Friends. Revivals and Mr. Lloyd From Out the Past', in *New York Times*, June 10, 1962: 111.).

[22] Jonas Mekas, 'Movie Journal', in *Village Voice,* September 14, 1961: 13.

[23] Quoted in: Pete Hamill, 'The Movie Makers of Off-Broadway', in *New York Post Magazine*, November 11, 1962: 4.

[24] Jonas Mekas, 'Movie Journal', in *Village Voice*, October 5, 1961: 13. James (1992) lists the open house screenings at the Charles as one of the showcases organised by Jonas Mekas during the 1960s, however none of the sources confirm Mekas' involvement as organiser of these screenings.

[25] Looking at Langsford's biography and documents from the *Charles Collection*, the reopening of the Charles in October 1961 seems less accidental. Langsford had been the Charles' manager already when Dan Talbot operated it as a Lower Eastside dependence of his New Yorker theatre. Judging from the files, the Charles had been operated under Talbot's direction from March through July 1961 with Langsford as manager and varying staff members. Talbot seems to have tested a different exhibition policy at the Charles, showing double features only, each for a week on varying days (*Film Booking Notebook*, Charles Theatre Collection, Museum of Modern Art / Film Study Center, New York, NY, Box CT 8, Folder: Film Booking Notebook, n.p.)

[26] The Charles brochure announced an exhibition program of 'new paintings, drawings, sculptures and photographs by accomplished New York artists' (*Charles Brochure*, Charles

Theatre Collection, Museum of Modern Art / Film Study Center, New York, NY, Box CT 1, Folder: Press Releases - January 1962, n.p.) while early press releases advertised a neighbourhood based program featuring local artists from the East Village.

[27] There are clearly many more photographs and motifs that represent Langsford and Stein's work at the Charles. Other archived photographs, for example, show the two carrying cans of 35 and 16mm film into the lobby, or inspecting filmstrips together with a female employee (specified as 'Wilhelmina Pfeiffer' on the reverse). One of the photographers assigned by the Charles during the July 1962 Film Makers' Festival was Peter Moore, a key figure in documenting ephemeral life art, happenings and performances, in the New York scene at the time.

[28] Jesse Zunser, 'New Audiences for Old Films', in *cue,* April 14, (1962): 8.

[29] Ibid.

[30] *Charles Brochure*, n.p.

[31] E.g. An excerpt from a draft of an ad to be published in August 1962 in the downtown Manhattan weekly *The Villager* intended to announce longer summer hours reads: 'Walter called the other day to tell me that business was too good to close up now and besides, it's not really hot enough for the beach (I think he's putting me on!) so we are staying open to receive the crowds (you)' (*Charles Ad* (draft), Charles Theatre Collection, Museum of Modern Art / Film Study Center, New York, NY, box CT 2, Folder: Advertising Copy – July 1962).

[32] Anon., Charles Theatre & Show Business Join to Aid New Talent, *Show Business*, July 7, 1962: p. 1, 3; Anon., *New York Post*, June 17, 1962.

[33] Wanda Hale, 'Movies: The Charles Shows "The Flower Thief"', in *Daily News*, vol. 44, no. 17, July 14 (1962): 25.

[34] *Press Release Fifth Film-Makers' Festival*, Charles Theatre Collection, Museum of Modern Art / Film Study Center, New York, NY,Box CT 1, Folder: Press Releases - Feb. - Apr. 1962. Ticket price for the first weeklong festival was $1.25.

[35] Ibid.; In one of his 'Movie Journal' columns in the Greenwich Village weekly *The Village Voice*, Jonas Mekas had announced already around the time of the Charles opening in October 1961 the new theatre's invitation to all filmmakers to contribute to their programme (Mekas October, 1961: 13). However, according to Langsford, correlating to the Charles' image of improvisation, the idea for the Film Maker's Festival originated in a programming accident: '"We weren't making any money, and on Wednesday nights we started showing Ukrainian films to try to get some of the local crowd. But the Ukrainian films were pretty awful, and one Wednesday we found we didn't have any left. So we decided to invite some people down, our friends and some of the young film makers, and have them show their films. Somehow the word got around and instead of the 40 we originally expected, 400 showed up."' (Pete Hamill, 'The Movie Makers of Off-Broadway', in *New York Post Magazine*, November 11 (1962): 4.)

[36] Ibid.

[37] Eileen Zabotinsky, 'Grab-bag of Talent In Film Festival', in *The Villager*, 1962: 'The Film-makers Festival at the Charles Theatre is a marvellous grab-bag of talent and fun, resembling the old-time amateur nights at the movies where you never knew whether the next act was going to be a stumbling tap-dancer or a someday Fred Astaire [...] except the talent shows up with cans of 35 or 16 mm film instead of dancing shoes.'

[38] Howard Thompson, 'Screen: An Experimental Program', in *New York Times*, August 6, (1962): 37.

[39] Ibid.

[40] Brakhage (1989): 159.

[41] Archer Winsten, '"Flower Thief" at Charles Theater'. *New York Post*, July 15, 1962.

[42] Anon., 'New Wave, U.S.A.', in *Newsweek*, vol. LX, no. 5, July 30 (1962): 56.

[43] I.e. running for a longer time in a block instead of being screened within the framework of a special event or evening, such as the Midnight Film Society screenings each Friday and Saturday night or the Wednesday open houses. *The Flower Thief* was shown together Vernon Zimmermans *To L.A. with Lust* (1961) with high attendance, subsequently the Charles showed further programmes with double features by independent and underground filmmakers until a second weeklong Film-makers Festival in September, after which the regular programme started again.

[44] *Charles Ad*, Village Voice, July 26, (1962): 10. Before its run at the Charles, Rice's *Flower Thief* (1960) already had a well visited show at Cinema 16 in April 1962. Cinema 16 being a non-commercial film society, no press reviews appeared after the show.

[45] Eugene Archer, 'Screen: "Flower Thief." Avant-Garde Movie at the Charles Theatre', in *New York Times*, July 14 (1962): 11.

[46] For processes of cross-fertilisation between experimental film and New Theatre, Happening and performance, see Sally Banes, *Greenwich Village 1963. Avant-Garde Performance and the Effervescent Body* (1993); David E. James, *Allegories of Cinema. American Film in the Sixties* (1989); and David Sterritt, *Screening the Beats : Media Culture and the Beat Sensibility* (2004).

[47] Ken Jacobs in Scott MacDonald, *A Critical Cinema 3. Interviews with Independent Filmmakers* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1998): 369. Jacobs further says about the Charles: 'It was absolutely wonderful, utopian, and usually there was a pretty good audience. There were all kinds of films in the most perfect sequence: irrational, beyond any curator's imagination.'

[48] Thompson, 'Experimental Program': 37. An article published in *New York Herald Tribune*'s *Today's Living* magazine provides a similar account of the audience: 'The atmosphere is warm, friendly and as relaxed as possible in a room full of violent individualists. Nobody stays put. There is much changing of seats, visiting, and talking before the show starts and during the two coffee breaks. Most conversations begin "Have you seen my film on ...?"' (Peet (1962): 5) The film scene itself was characterised by tight networks of personal relationships between filmmakers, thus enabling a good portion of independent production as well as distribution. Many films were produced with equipment borrowed from friends and were oftentimes finished in editing suites during the night when those facilities remained unused by the people who owned them. One example was filmmaker Shirley Clarke letting Jonas Mekas and his brother Adolfas use her moviola to edit their films.

[49] See amongst others his seminal, albeit formalistic, *Visionary Film. The American Avant-Garde* (1974).

[50] Scott MacDonald, *Cinema 16. Documents Toward a History of the Film Society* (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 2002): 405.

[51] Scott MacDonald, *A Critical Cinema. Interviews with Independent Filmmakers* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2005): 28. On its printed programmes, the Charles advertised itself as 'the most informal theatre in town' (*Charles Brochure,* 1962, n.p.).

[52] An article by New York Times film critic Bosley Crowther on the 'large-sized educational and art-world trend' of film societies, reporting growing numbers of both societies and their members, cites a 1953 Cinema 16 survey on its audience: '[The survey] found that 75 per cent were college graduates, predominantly employed in the arts and professions, and that 41 percent were over 30.' (Bosley Crowther, 'The Film Societies. Lively Interest Manifest in Cultural Groups', in *New York Times*, September 19 (1954): Section 2, 1.)

[53] Langsford might have adopted the programme category 'Film Society' from his work for The New Yorker, which had a Film Society format on Monday nights to show historic films.

As a legal form, the society also granted a more liberal handling of censorship rules 60 The

mission of the Charles' Midnight Film Society was according to the programme notes 'to screen films the regular public can seldom, if ever, see – films that are new, great, or simply worth seeing but are not shown in commercial houses because they are considered too experimental, too traditional, too historical, too foreign, too political, too what-have-you.' (*Charles Brochure,* 1962, n.p.).

[54] Reports in Amos Vogel's papers (Columbia University Archives, New York) date from January 8 through April 23, 1962, during which time wrote weekly reports that detailed his observations, the reactions of other members in the audience, facts such as the number of attendees in the audience, and sometimes his own personal opinions. The fact that Galewski frequently seems to recognise members of the underground film scene in the audience or on the screen suggests that he was, to some extent at least, involved.

[55] Mike Galewski, Letter to Amos Vogel, February 12, 1962, Columbia University Archives, New York, NY, Amos Vogel Papers, MS#1432, Box 1, Folder 5, n.p.

[56] Galewski letter to Amos Vogel, January 28, 1962. The unknown work appears to have been by experimental filmmaker Charles I. Levine who was then only just starting to make films.

[57] *Ibid.* Galewski writes on Markopoulos acting in the film: '[I]n the film I spied Gregory Markopoulos fiddling around with a camera, making set-ups and in general acting as though this was an experimental film about the making of an experimental film.'

[58] *Charles Brochure*, n.p. These evenings also showed the work of filmmakers expressing themselves in other media, such as Robert Downey Jr. whose play *What Else Is There?* was performed in this series shortly before the Charles' close-down in November 1962.

[59] Galewski letter to Amos Vogel, March 17, 1962. Other comparisons regarding the audience include a remark on the screening Carl Dreyer's film *The Passion of Joan of Arc* (1928) which appears to have drawn a considerably larger audience at the Charles than it previously did at The New Yorker. (Galewski letter to Amos Vogel, February 12, 1962)

[60] Also the audiences' reactions, even though affirmative in general, seem to have varied. Galewski reports a 'polite applause' (Galewski letter to Amos Vogel, April 1, 1962) for the work of Francis Lee, while the films by Shirley Clarke 'had one of the most enthusiastic receptions [...] ever seen at the Charles' (Galewski letter to Amos Vogel, April 8, 1962). At a screening by filmmaker Carmen D'Avino, Galewski reports the 'familiar faces of aficionados', and he mentions here filmmaker Gregory Markopoulos and Herman Weinberg, 'all conspicuous by their absence' (Galewski letter to Amos Vogel, April 23, 1962).

[61] Galewski letter to Amos Vogel, March 11, 1962.

[62] There are, however, certain parallels in the two realms of non-industrial filmmaking. Both turn to their immediate surroundings as subject for their films, directing the camera lens at their family at home or on holiday or at their peers and the urban environment they relate to. In this sense, the city functions as equivalent to the domestic amateur's backyard, a terrain that is going to be appropriated by way of filming it, by giving it an aesthetic form.

[63] Jack Smith, 'Taboo of Jingola. The Art of the Audience', in *Village Voice*, December 21, (1972): 75. 'People brought their own films and saw them on the huge Charles screen—a truly surrealistic experience—to see those films on that huge Hollywood screen—and they looked damn good.' Jack Smith's own film *Flaming Creatures* (1963), which he claimed to have initially made specifically for the Charles (ibid.), premiered in April 1963 at the Bleecker Street Cinema. The film subsequently caused a moral outrage due to its allegedly pornographic content, being later indexed and confiscated during the pre-World Fair police deployments, directed against New York's subcultures in early 1964, when also cafés and theatres showing underground films were shut down by law enforcement. Jonas Mekas was arrested for exhibiting the film in spite of this prohibition.

[64] Later venues or cinemas showing underground films such as the Gramercy Arts Theatre or the overtly shabby Gate Theatre had predominantly small and often only mobile screens. In his 1968 article 'Experimental Films', film critic Manny Farber polemically describes the 'theaters of the Underground' as 'five or six docile customers in an improbable place that looks like a bombed-out air shelter or the downstairs ladies room at the old Paramount' (Manny Farber, 'Experimental Films' [1968], in *Negative Space. Manny Farber on the Movies* (New York: Praeger, 1971): 246). In addition, from the middle of the 1960s onwards, larger institutions mainly committed to contemporary art, such as the Museum of Modern Art or the uptown Jewish Museum, influenced the dissemination and reception of the underground film scene by organizing screening series and events on avant-garde, and later specifically on underground, film, thus introducing yet a different context of exhibition.

[65] James and Jonathan Rosenbaum Hoberman, *Midnight Movies* (Cambridge: Harper & Row, 1983): 42. The Charles opened again in early 1963 as 'The New Charles Theatre' run by Audubon Films' Radley H. Metzger, distributor and filmmaker who subsequently worked mainly in the sexploitation film genre. Programming at the New Charles followed a rather conventional arthouse policy, showing a mixture of foreign and American films.

[66] 'Programme Announcement for Art in Cinema, First Series', reprinted in: Scott MacDonald (2006): 36.

[67] Galewski letter to Vogel, February 26, 1962. The VanDerBeek shows were programmed on February 23 and 24, 1962. Galewski's report refers to the February 24 show which drew, according to his observations, 350 to 400 people, a crowd relatively large for the Midnight Film Society shows. He further remarks: '[G]enerally, this audience was "with it" and all of them had obviously come expressly for the Vanderbeek films.'

[68] Stan VanDerBeek, *If the Actor is the Audience. Notes for "Films-Flims," a retrospective of the works of Stan VanDerBeek*, Columbia University Archives, New York, NY, Amos Vogel Papers, MS#1432, Box 1, Folder 5. The one page pamphlet included a short questionnaire, to be returned to VanDerBeek, inquiring about a potential interest in buying films from that night's screening and the home availability of equipment for projecting 16mm or 8mm films.

[69] Langsford had planned to take his support for filmmakers even further by installing studio space with editing facilities in a new cinema he planned to run as a showcase for historical films at The Windsor, located near the Charles. The 320 seat Windsor Theater had opened as a nickelodeon around 1900 and had operated as an action house before Langsford took over. He planned to run it as a revival theatre showing mainly silent film and early talkies with a film museum and library in its lobby. The opening program in October 1962 consisted of Charlie Chaplin's *The Cure* (1917) and Erich von Strohheim's *Foolish Wives* (1922). Unfortunately, soon after the first show both the Charles and Windsor had to close due to bankruptcy. See: Eugene Archer, 'Windsor Theatre to Revive Films', in *New York Times*, September 5, 1962.

The Inhotim Cultural Institute: Affective Coding and the History of Museums in Brazil

Alice Heeren

Abstract

The birth of the modern museum in Brazil was intimately tied to the developmentalist ideals of early twentieth century. The Museu de Arte Moderna de São Paulo (The Museum of Modern Art of Sao Paulo - MAM-SP) and the Museu de Arte Moderna do Rio de Janeiro (The Museum of Modern Art of Rio de Janeiro - MAM-RJ) were founded amongst efforts to create a new modern identity, a project spearheaded by the Brazilian Modern Architectural Movement. Affonso Eduardo Reidy, Oscar Niemeyer and Roberto Burle-Marx were among the most notorious contributors to the movement in architecture and were central in configuring the spatial and ideological forms of the art institutions born in the middle of the century. Their goal was to "sell" an image of modernity, tropicality and cultural effervescence both in Brazil and abroad. They achieved this by mobilizing affective as well as semiotic and semantic signs in a construction of *brasilidade* intimately tied to ideals of modernity.

The Instituto Cultural Inhotim, inaugurated in 2002 by the mining entrepreneur Bernardo Paz, is now the largest collection of contemporary art in Brazil. It is also the largest institution in the country spatially. By looking at Inhotim as continuing the legacy of the developmentalist museums in Brazil, I argue its spatial structure is ambivalent and fragmented, but its discourse is unified by the way in which affective experiences are curated, a feature that it inherits from older museums, but maximizes in a way not seen before in other institutions. At Inhotim this model is pushed further and rather than a supplement, affective coding becomes the central mechanism through which the museum configures narratives and its own institutional identity. Furthermore, I show how this new form of viewing and experiencing the space of the museum takes unexpected turns—many times escaping the control of the museum's curators and artists—and promoting a heightened awareness of institutional mechanisms. I argue it is because of the very configuration of affective chains and the nature of the affective sign that these have the propensity to escape the confinement of carefully crafted narratives.

Introduction

An elevated passage in some grey metropolis cuts the screen diagonally. The music that accompanies the image is a high-pitched melody that gains intensity as the scene cuts from one place to another. A dozen people, seemingly asleep or dead lay on the suspended pathway. The shot widens, more people one on top of the other block the entire way. It cuts to a birds-eye view of empty highways, no cars; no one, but a pile of bodies that line the sidewalks. Now the camera angle is low, more people lay in strange poses, bright yellow and purple structures appear blurred in the background. Another overhead passageway, more corpses, an overcast view of a market, the floor filled with unconscious people. The music thickens, a low beat intervenes, it mimics a heartbeat. It fades into the background and pushes to the fore. Another low shot, now people lay in a white concrete passageway lined by vegetation. The camera moves closer, it shows specific individuals, they sit on café tables or call centre desks, their head falling back or folding onto their arms in their slumber. The camera closes on a young woman, a breeze hits her hair, she opens her eyes. The music begins a crescendo, now the images alternate faster, the heart beat is closer, the bodies begin to rise in awkward manners. Close-ups revert to wider and wider shots as more and more people rise. They are in the streets, inside restaurants, in the middle of public squares and at office desks. Buildings appear in the background and a recognizable geography comes to the fore: subsequent snapshots show the streets of Belo Horizonte in the inland state of Minas Gerais in Brazil and the Institute Cultural Inhotim, the contemporary museum only sixty kilometres north of the city. The chain of bodies delineates a path, it runs from Belo Horizonte's urban fabric to different installations located within the grounds of Inhotim, shots of the Adriana Varejão gallery, Chris Burden's *Beam Drop*, Dan Graham's *Bisected Triangle* and Hélio Oiticica's *Magic Square No. 5* alternate with the images of the city. More and more individuals are awake, they fill the museum passageways and rise to stare straight at the art installations. Like the bodies, the music continues to

accelerate and rise. The alternating cuts stop, a young man rises, the music stops, he stares straight at the camera (or is it staring beyond it). It cuts to a wide view of Burden's *Beam Drop* and the group that stands staring at it. The sound now is of birds chirping in the forest below. The screen goes blank, black backdrop, the soft music which started the video returns. One sentence appears in the centre of the shot in white simple lettering: Inhotim. Impressionante. The logo of the museum and website address appear below.

This is the 2009 advertisement video for the Inhotim Cultural Institute, now the largest museum of contemporary art in Brazil, both spatially and in terms of collection. The museum was first conceptualized in the 1980s by the mining entrepreneur Bernardo Paz, opening to the public in 2004.[1] The video is an unexpected advertisement choice for a museum, and yet, it transmits Inhotim's curatorial project, as well as its aspirations better than any other of the museum's attempts. A few aspects distances Inhotim from traditional museums: the most discernible is its spatial configuration. This ever-changing structure is now made up of twenty-three galleries, mostly housing only one work of art or a group of works by a single artist; and twenty-one outdoor installations, scattered on a small area of the parks' 3000 acres of artificial lakes, botanical gardens and protected forest. The unique galleries have been designed through collaborations between the artists and various architects, and instead of a unified space conceptualized by an individual, Inhotim consists of independent yet correlated units using different museum models to frame better each work of art. Furthermore, most of Inhotim's collection is made up of works from the 1960s onwards and features large environments, installations, sculptural projects and site-specific works, all very difficult to convey through static images and traditional advertisement techniques. A traditional museum advertisement emphasizing its building would also be unsuccessful since many of the scattered exhibition pavilions and sculptures around the museum are small buildings locked within areas of vegetation or unimpressive architecturally. Those that are architecturally relevant cannot stand

in for the entirety of the museum and its expansive area on their own. The mixture of a botanical garden, a sculpture garden, Biennale-like pavilions, site-specific artworks, and outdoor installations makes the capturing of the museum's logic in one image spread or even a two-minute video impossible. Instead, the advertisement created in 2009 for the museum turns to the aspect that seems to unify this otherwise fragmented structure. The advertisement shows the way affective signs have been instrumentalized to the point that this mechanism can be understood as the museum's model.[2]

I argue Inhotim's spatial structure is ambivalent and fragmented, but its discourse is unified by the way in which affective experiences are curated, a feature that it inherits from older museums in Brazil and abroad, but maximizes in a way not seen before in other institutions. Particularly, I will explore how Inhotim draws on earlier Brazilian institutional models of the developmentalist museums as I will call them, which focused on the power of space to heighten affective experiences through a carefully orchestrated outside/inside dichotomy[3] in a performance simultaneously of modernity and *brasilidade* or Brazilian-ness. At Inhotim this model is pushed further and rather than a supplement, affective coding becomes the central mechanism through which the museum configures narratives and its own institutional identity. Collecting choices, the organization of space and language all come together for the creation of a series of affective environments which promote another relationship between the museum space and its viewers. However, I also want to show how this new form of viewing and experiencing the space of the museum takes unexpected turns—many times escaping the control of the museum's curators and artists—and promoting a heightened awareness of institutional mechanisms: how the museum frames the artworks—spatially and ideologically— and how meaning is constructed. I argue it is because of the very configuration of affective chains and the nature of the affective sign that these have the propensity to escape the confinement of carefully crafted narratives. When they circulate beyond their initial systems,

these signs expose contradictions and relations beyond what they have been evoked to do and configure spaces for critical thinking about universals that shape museums as institutions and Inhotim in its own specificity.

First, I will discuss the history of museums in Brazil, the political and ideological moment that gave rise to the developmentalist museum, its characteristics and main examples in the country as well as how Inhotim takes up this legacy. Secondly, I will return to the advertisement video discussing it further in relation to affective mechanisms and the anxieties caused by the fluidity of these systems. Finally, I will turn to three specific case studies (The Cosmococas, Adriana Varejão and Cristina Iglesias galleries) within the Inhotim grounds to showcase how the mechanisms of affective coding play a central role in the museum's practice, while at times challenging its own institutional structure.

The Developmentalist Museum

The history of Brazilian museums is intimately tied to the history of developmentalism. The ideas that will culminate in the creation of the Museu de Arte Moderna de São Paulo (The Museum of Modern Art of São Paulo - MAM-SP) and the Museu de Arte Moderna do Rio de Janeiro (The Museum of Modern Art of Rio de Janeiro - MAM-RJ) were also the ones that allowed the consolidation of the developmentalist project and of the Brazilian modern architectural style. Developmentalism[4] is a term coined in the post-war era in relation to the ongoing political projects in Latin American countries. It was based in the notion that countries in the South could develop if their governments adopted the right policies. Since the assumption was that Latin America was in an earlier stage of evolution (economically, politically and socially) it could arrive at the stage of countries such as England and the US if it mimicked their own developmental strategies while accounting for contemporary economic variations. However, more than a project of modernization, developmentalism was a

performance of modernity, its focus very much in attracting foreign investment and presenting a façade of rapid industrialization. Museums played a huge role in the masquerade of Brazil as the country of the future. More than developing both economically and socially and industrializing all part of its very large geography, Brazil engaged in a performance modernity in its culture and especially through modern architecture.[5] MAM-RJ, the Museu de Arte Contemporânea de Niteroi (Museum of Contemporary Art of Niterói – MAC-Niterói), designed in 1996 and arguably the culmination of developmentalist architecture in Brazilian museum history,[6] together with Inhotim constitute a lineage of developmentalist museums in the country. This relationship if clear if one is attentive to their shared strategies despite their apparent structural differences.[7] I will now turn to these three examples to highlight these similarities.

MAM-RJ was built between 1952-67 and its front façade is a testament to the developmentalist strategy in its projection of modernity. A slab concrete structure with two strips of windows that cover nearly the whole façade, it resides in front of small water pools and promenades created by Roberto Burle Marx. Its nod to International Style rationality is framed by the fourteen concrete porticos ten meters apart with two interiors and two exterior pillars forming a V. Designed by Affonso Eduard Reiddy, the porticos at MAM-RJ make pillars unnecessary in the inside of the pavilion resulting in one hundred and forty by twenty-eight meters of open space. Windows run through both sides of the building opening to the Guanabara bay, the internationally known postcard view of Rio de Janeiro. Burle Marx had a significant influence on the spatial organization of Reidy's MAM-RJ, just like he did at Inhotim.[8] He used plant beds, water pools, as well as rocks to both reference the architecture and challenge it. The variety of plants and the possibility of them growing beyond limits are ideas that developed into a notion of controlled wilderness, where the landscaper does not create effects through the trimming of plants, but "discovers the entwinement of the tropical nature."[9] The plants outgrow

their limits and ultimately, Burle Marx's gardens create another relationship between the inside and outside of the museum structure.

MAC-Niterói was inaugurated in 1996 and created to house the João Sattamini collection of Brazilian contemporary art, the largest of the sort in the country before the expansion of Inhotim.[10] One of the central aspects of this institution—like the other developmentalist museums—is its building. It was built in five years and is located at the top of a hill, right across the water from Rio de Janeiro facing the picturesque view of its Bay. At 16 meters in height, the museum is suspended by a cylindrical structure of 9 meters in diameter that sits atop a pond of 817 square meters. A large ramp takes the visitors up to the museum and continues to direct their path through the structure. This impressive and memorable architectural endeavour creates an atmosphere of contemplation and takes the visitor on a journey through the museum space. The row of windows frames the view highlighting its horizontality. It allows a privileged look at Rio de Janeiro's monuments—both natural and man-made—markers of this widely known sight: Sugarloaf Mountain, MAM-RJ, and the sculpture of the open armed Christ. Nevertheless, this architecture is not conducive to display and many concessions have had to be made when hanging and structuring exhibitions of the collection, as the pieces cannot distract from the view.[11] Exhibitions are not meant to compete with the structure of the museum, but attempt to complement it.

The designs of MAM-RJ and MAC-Niteroi recuperate myths of tropicality and modernity that have grounded identity by turning to construction technologies that give a building like Niemeyer's its curves and appearance of weightlessness and connecting both the internal space of this building and Reiddy's to the environment of the Guanabara Bay. Since the "discovery" of Brazil by the Portuguese in the sixteenth century, the beauty and the immensity of the Guanabara Bay, the entrance to the Rio de Janeiro coast, has been exalted in narratives, songs,

drawings, prints, and paintings alike. As Lúcia Lippi Oliveira and Carlos Martins have argued, Rio de Janeiro has been one of the most imagetically reproduced cities in the world.[12] The view of the Guanabara Bay is one of its most iconic landscapes in the construction of the exotic and tropical American continent, as well as the ultimate symbol of *brasilidade*.[13]

Contrasted with the monumental and unified structure of Niemeyer's MAC-Niteroi, which appears to isolate the outside severely from the inside of the structure, Burle-Marx's intervention on the configuration of MAM-RJ makes use of different meaning-making strategies. Nevertheless, even though the formal and constructive characteristics of MAM-RJ and MAC-Niteroi vary considerably, the affective strategies structuring their space and discourse are remarkably similar and remote to a contemporary reconfiguration of much earlier questions. In both museums, the outside is welcomed in, however this outside is the Rio de Janeiro Bay, an acceptable insertion in the museum space because it is manageable and already proven carrier of affective signs of *brasilidade*. It is interesting in the case of the postcard views of the Guanabara Bay how it works affectively because it has a mythological underpinning remoting to the sixteenth century and related to the ideal of the earthly Eden. While in the develomentalist era the instrumentalization of ideals of Brazil as the country of the future, modern, tropical, and culturally effervescent were being slowly built into the national unconscious, today these are already established myths with their own sets of affective signs that continue to circulate and are mobilized even in the most unstable political periods as showcased by recent state propaganda.[14]

Inhotim is a present instance of what I have termed the developmentalist museums in Brazil.[15] Different than MAM-RJ and MAC-Niterói, Inhotim lacks the identifiable unity of the architectural structure these early museums had. MAC-Niterói, for instance, is a building immediately recognizable and has a significant impact on the landscape. Its strong verticality

and imposing form play a role in its display strategies. MAM-RJ also is a building that is located and built to impact the landscape. On another hand, Inhotim's landscape is marked by its horizontality and its adaptability to the natural topography as it is locked between the mountains of Minas Gerais. It is a fragmented design of scattered pavilions and immense area that has no apparent centre but stretches out into different sites. This configuration is one of the museum's selling points, it takes stock in recent museological discourses of flexibility and critiques of traditional models such as the white cube. And yet, it poses incredible difficulties to an institution attempting to locate itself within national museum history as well as play a role in regional politics.[16]

While Niemeyer's conception of space led him to build a museum where the architecture determines the path of the visitor through the structure as in MAC-Niteroi, Burle-Marx's influence on MAM-RJ which is brought to fruition in Inhotim is the ways spaces can be more fluid.[17] Nevertheless, the outside/inside relationship in Inhotim continues to remote to strategies central to the earlier museums. In MAM-RJ and MAC-Niterói while the structure welcomes the view of Guanabara Bay in, it also isolates the visitor from the urban fabric of Rio de Janeiro—with all its social and structural problems. The affective signs of awe and pride over the beauty and fascination of the Brazilian idyllic landscape and their insertion in the museum space are carefully curated not to be tainted by fear and disgust at the body of the Other and the chaotic metropolis that lies beyond.[18] Inhotim similarly welcomes in a curated "outside" while isolating the visitor from other instances of it. Nevertheless, Inhotim's configuration of this outside/inside dichotomy is more complex and layered than its precursors because of the specificity of its space. It is something of a Russian doll: while the exhibition pavilions are the inside to the outside botanical gardens; the botanical gardens are the inside to the outside forest that makes up a large part of the museum's space, but is only viewed from a few vantage points within the grounds. Finally, Inhotim's overall area is the inside to the

outside city of Brumadinho, the impoverished region connecting the museum to the capital Belo Horizonte. Many works at Inhotim explore these many outside and inside relationships. Nevertheless, these complex relationships and the constant invasion of an uncurated outside is a node of great anxiety for the musem staff because it escapes the official discourse.[19]

The museum's labyrinth configuration and the possibility for a multiplicity of is made possible by how the galleries at Inhotim are specific to the artworks; and in turn, how in these work-specific galleries, the use of different museum models and styles of architecture frame each individual work of art. Consequently, Inhotim rather than a unified structure is a compound of scattered pavilions with crisscrossing roads that connect the different areas. Nevertheless, due to the fragmented nature of its pavilions, one single processional path is nearly impossible to orchestrate. This is one of Inhotim's greatest features, as well as the one that creates the most anxiety. It is the anxiety generated by this openness that yields its limit cases. It is here that affective technologies have the most impact and how they function showcase both their potential to create critical spaces and limit the openness in place. I turn now to the specific case of Inhotim starting with a discussion of affect theory and how it manifests in the advertisement video entitled "Stendhal Syndrome," a synecdoche of the museum's larger strategy.

Stendhal Syndrome

The advertisement video commissioned by Inhotim in 2009 and developed by the media company Filadélfia Comunicações was broadcast in the local TV for a short period after its launch. Now it exists only in Inhotim's Youtube channel both in its Portuguese and English versions.[20] I am interested in how this 1'53" advertisement hints at important aspects of Inhotim: namely the technologies of affect that are key for structuring the museum's space and

identity. Especially, how it plays on ideals of *brasilidade* and trademark strategies of the Brazilian developmentalist museum. The narrative, beginning with a fallen world and slowly depicting its revival has several peculiarities and resonates the central ideas within affect theory.[21] Affect theory is a growing field of study and I draw here on two camps within the recent turn to affect: on one hand, the cultural theorist Brian Massumi, with his focus on bodies in movement and the effects of affect at the surface of those bodies; and on the other, Sara Ahmed, in her discussion of the circulation of affects and the role of these economies in shaping the boundaries between bodies.[22]

Massumi defines affect "as an excess (…) as an intensity (…) as a system that is not organized through difference, one that is not semantically or semiotically ordered (…)[23] Affect, he argues, is registered and retained by the body, but it does not stay static, stable enough—or for long enough—for meaning to attach to it, for the signified to be attached to a signifier. However, as Ahmed specifies in her *The Cultural Politics of Emotion* "the distinction between sensation and emotion can only be analytic, and as such, is premised on the reification of a concept… It allows us to associate the experience of having an emotion with the very affect of one surface upon another, an affect that leaves its mark or trace.'"[24] As such, affects can become communicable and usable only insofar as they are arrested and given meaning within a system of affect that is structured through analogy, not difference. It is in this moment that they become qualified affects (Massumi) or emotions (Ahmed) and are thus affective signs, not just impulses or intensities, fully formed signs that have been literalized.

Nevertheless, this process of literalization, of becoming sign, cannot be understood in the moulds of semiotic or semantic systems as conceptualized by Ferdinand d' Saussure or Charles Sanders Pierce.[25] Rather than based on difference, the affective sign is based on analogy: I share an understanding of the emotion because I have an experience of it myself, not because

I know what it is not. It is also not a system of sameness: I don't experience the same impulses that resonate in fear or disgust because I inhabit another body, but I have my own experience with the world and as such have felt intensities that resonate when an affective sign such as fear or disgust is evoked: I recognize it even if I do not share in one direct experience of it. Another peculiarity of a system of affectivity is that affective signs are involved in sort of colonization as they do not circulate alone, but inhabit other signs, circulating through them and gaining affective value as they move. Affects such as love and fear Ahmed notes "do not reside positively in a particular object or sign. It is this lack of residence that allows fear to slide across signs and between bodies. This sliding becomes stuck only temporarily, in the very attachment of the sign to a body, an attachment that is taken on by the body."[26] This sliding and moving is key as this is how affectivity becomes a chain of signification. As the signs fluctuate from one semiotic or semantic chain to another, they carry traces of the previous signs they inhabited, creating associative chains that lend affective signs the potential to be an extremely large reservoir for discourses.

In Inhotim's advertisement video, the evocation of fear of a post-apocalypse cityscape is juxtaposed to a raptured experience of awe and beauty. The emptied streets, the collapsed corpses, the stillness of unknown circumstances against a backdrop of tall buildings and highways recall already worn out feelings of impotence, fear and despair that are as common to the everyday contemporary life. These affective signs travelled through images of First World War trenches, Hiroshima and Nagasaki, Nazi concentration camps, to contemporary renderings of Guantanamo Bay, Middle Eastern war zones and several spectacularized Hollywood films. As Anna Gibbs has pointed out, the media "acts as vectors in affective epidemics in which something else is also smuggled along: the attitudes and even the specific ideas which tend to accompany affect in any given situation."[27] What is smuggled along, the parasitic affective sign and the many previous referents it carries, is what interests us here.

In the case of "Stendhal Syndrome," it is the expectation of a new renascence, a totally new experience that will revitalize a disenchanted world. While in one hand the empty and fallen bodies are one side of this story, their awakening is equally significant. As they rise they trace a path, they all look forward, we follow them as they stare at the beyond until we catch up to it: Inhotim. Impressionante. This notion is apparent by the translation of the video's only verbal cue in the English version. By replacing the Portuguese word *impressionante* for *stunning* rather than *impressive*, the institution yields to the notion of the sublime. Evoking the Stendhal Syndrome, the psychosomatic illness caused by the confrontation with immense beauty, the video hits its acme putting forth a contemporary art institution, historically bound to Brazil, but to where all eyes eventually turn. The affective sign of awe is the one that is capitalized on here. Awe not at the artworks specifically, as in much of the video they are but backdrops, but to the immensity of the institution itself: it speaks to the experience of the space of the museum as much as to the artworks housed there. The final scene in front of Chris Burden's *Beam Drop*, the sound of the forest below attests to that. The video is ambitious, megalomaniac some might say, but it speaks to a will to define the institution through these affective experiences rather than its commitment to education, contemporary art, the environment or the community, which the museum also asserts, but with much less fanfare. In Paz' words: "in a few years, you won't come from London to Brazil, you will come from London to Inhotim."[28] It is an attempt to make the periphery centre by recuperating the strategies that made the centre the centre in the first place.

Not only rivalling Rio de Janeiro, but also European and North American museums, this commitment to technologies of affect as model has raised the museum to international status. The most vocal compliments to Inhotim have come from abroad. Marie-Cécile Burnichon wrote for *Artpress* that Inhotim is "a globally unique venue, not only because of its collection of contemporary art and commissioned outsized site-specific productions, but even more for

their presentation in one of the world's richest botanical gardens."[29] Guy Trebay from the *New York Times* points out that "Paz has acquired and assembled more than 3,000 acres of fields, forests and truck farms, and reshaped the terrain to accommodate a collection of artworks that would be impressive anywhere but are very nearly magical when placed in a semitropical setting designed in the vaguely surrealist style of the Brazilian landscape architect Roberto Burle Marx."[30] Finally, Edward Leffingwell calls it "an elegantly organized campus of handsome modernist pavilions with engaging works, Inhotim yields an exhilarating and unforgettable experience in the mountains of Minas Gerais."[31] It is within semantic signs such as *magical*, *exhilarating*, *globally unique*, and *unforgettable* and especially *semitropical* and *vaguely surrealistic* that awe and beauty, tropicality and pride, newness and originality—and the affective ideal of the sublime, so old to museum practices[32]—ultimately travel to Inhotim. It is also this language that the museum uses to capitalize on these affective signs: Schwartzman calls Inhotim a "place like no other" while Paz affirms that this space is where artists "dreams can come true."[33] These metaphors are ingrained in the discourse of the space through the artworks, advertisement strategies, and the staff's discourses. I am not arguing that trafficking in labels that have been attached to your institution is a new strategy because it is certainly not, what I am trying to highlight is that rather than trafficking on the value of its collection such as MoMA and The Met are able to do, or its tradition as The National Gallery or the Tate, or even on its innovative mission as in the Brooklyn Museum or the Tate Modern, which Inhotim could have attempted to do, the museum highlights the experience, at the affective level, of being there as one like no other.[34]

As Gibbs statement above highlights however in affective systems something is always smuggled along because of the nature of the affective sign. Its ground in a system of analogy that carries traces of previous signs it has inhabited is responsible for the excess within the chain of signification. The "Stendhal Syndrome" advertisement is no exception. More than just

the presences, the absences also resonate and carry through their own affective signs. The footage shows Inhotim connected—through a sort of human umbilical cord—to the symbols of the city of Belo Horizonte. However, the actual path through the impoverish region of Brumadinho that physically connects Inhotim to the capital of the state of Minas Gerais is only implied. The advertisement shows Inhotim as a place where all the heads turn to, and where the vectors of people converge. It visually implies an idyllic landscape common in the language of tropicality ingrained in Brazilian identity. The overlapping of semantic constellations like tropical and international, technologic and idyllic, are recurrent in Inhotim's discourse. The international museum scene, Rio de Janeiro and even the landmarks of Belo Horizonte are the outside the museum lets in, Brumadinho and the environs where the museum in fact is located, is the outside it disavowals.

Another aspect, is how the video showcases the spatial configuration of the museum and its specificity. It shows how the spaces in Inhotim are connected through crisscrossing roads, the bodies outlining the multiplicity of maps that exist within the structure, a central aspect of the museum's model. Since no overarching building or one singular narrative connects the spaces of the museum, the experiences are created through the movement of the audience. Drawing from Burle Marx's conception of space, it is the very movement of the viewer that creates the image of the museum. The movement of the bodies, that which essentially creates the experience however is annulled in the advertisement where the bodies are static lining up from the city to the museum, their only movement, retrospectively shown, is to fall and rise.

As in affective impulses that can only be understood retrospectively when intensities are literalized, the video is constructed in a somewhat historical loop, from the end to the beginning; the events have already happened and what we see is the video being rewind to start over. Like the bodies that rise, as if rewinding and marking the movement of their implicit fall,

experience, as Massumi notes, is not understood cognitively by that body at the time of the experience, but recorded affectively by it to be conceptualized later. Thus, the affects are registered by the body, its sources and contexts infolded into it, and its traces later qualified. Thus, by denying movement what the narrative in "Stendhal Syndrome" denies is how the narrative of the museum is created in practice: a narrative that is constructed as it is shared, by those who propose it and those who explore it. It is also ephemeral, it cannot be repeated as the movement and the body is not the same twice. The bodies in the video, in their stasis highlight the mode of experience where the aspiration of the multigenerative space of Inhotim does not happen, where affectivity is arrested and subsumed and rewound, to be repeated. By delimiting a specific path, which viewers do not travel, but simply stand in passively, the video showcases an image of the museum that reveals the anxieties about such an open-ended structure.

Another example of this anxiety is how, from 2004 onwards, there has been many attempts to control the movement of bodies across the museum space. While early maps of the grounds showed the paths across the museum without delimiting one specific continuous road, newer versions use colour coding to suggest routes and narratives across the space. Furthermore, the changes made to the Cosmococas gallery also calls attention to the growing discomfort with this labyrinth nature of the museum. It is with this specific example that I move to the next section and attempt to show how the ideas I have delineated in the previous sections work in the museum.

Affective Coding and the Institution of the Museum

The Cosmococas gallery inaugurated in 2010 to house the five installations—*Transhiscapes, Onobject, Mairelyn, Nocagions* and *Hendrix War*—from the *Cosmococas* series of Hélio Oiticica and Neville D'Almeida, is a one-story gallery inhabiting a small elevation in the grounds. It is a low building made up of six rooms and its configuration is something of a five-

point star where the central room is the only circulation area to which all other rooms are attached.[35] These four entrance/exit points were meant to be identical as were the entrances to each of the five installations extending from the central circulation area. The architects of the building clearly attempted to create a non-hierarchical and labyrinth space, which would not favour one path through but open the space for different excursions across. [36] Nevertheless, since its inauguration the gallery has been organised by wall texts and even at times the closure of some of its entrances, regulating the path through the work and disavowing the labyrinth quality of the experience. One clear narrative is established and it is not the initially intended open-ended one, the labyrinth and non-hierarchical quality of the space is lost. This repeats throughout the museum and the consequences of this anxiety about narratives that are not completely encompassed or planned, where the smuggled in affective signs insist on coming to the fore, is one of the most telling features of Inhotim.

In the Adriana Varejão Gallery, again the official narrative and the affective experience of the spaces of the museum collide.[37] Affective signs that have smuggled in within other semantic and semiotic chains disrupt the space and bring in a disavowed outside world. The Adriana Varejão gallery is one of the most notorious endeavours of Inhotim.[38] Part of the second phase of constructions on the grounds, it was designed to house a group of works by the Brazilian artist who gives it its name. A collaborative project between the Varejão and architect Rodrigo Cerviño Lopez, the gallery was inaugurated in 2008. It is a suspended box sitting in the middle of a small hill. Created by using reinforced concrete, it brings together Le Corbusier's rationality with one of Niemeyer's trademarks: how the architect made his buildings seem weightless. The building is a box that although reminiscent of Le Corbusier's Domino frame does not takes advantage of the free walls, but turns willingly in to the closed-off white cube model.[39] It is a space with a clear processional path, which runs from underneath the structure, through a set of stairs to the rooftop where a ramp leads the viewer outside. The gallery houses

six pieces: *Celacanto provoca Maremoto* (Coelacanth causes tidal wave - 2004-8), *Linda do Rosário* (2004), *O Colecionador* (The Collector - 2008), *Carnívoras* (Flesh eating - 2008), *Panacea Phantastica* (2003-8) and *Passarinhos - de Inhotim a Demini* (Birds – From Inhotim to Demini - 2003-8).[40] Each of the works, in a way or another, play with the grid. Interestingly, the building designed to house these works dialogs with this structure as well.

Rosalind Krauss states in her 1979 essay "Grids" that: "there are two ways the grid functions to declare the modernity of modern art. One is spatial, and the other is temporal."[41] It turns its back on nature while it claims itself ubiquitously the form of the art of our time. Nevertheless, Krauss continues: "as the experience of Mondrian amply demonstrates, development is precisely what the grid resists."[42] The grid, like the white cube, is remarkably static; it refuses to change and defines relationships through its rigidity. Its premises are eternality, universality and autonomy. Grids are ultimately myths[43] as Krauss points out: "For like all myths, [the grid] deals with paradox or contradiction not by dissolving the paradox or resolving the contradiction, but by converting them over so that they seem (but only seem) to go away."[44] Furthermore, Krauss advocates in her essay for the spatializing of the mythical narrative to "display the features of the contradiction and to show how these underlie the attempts of a specific mythical tale to paper over the opposition with narrative."[45] The Varejão gallery and the works housed there are, in many ways, a materialization of the procedure laid out by Krauss. They spatialize several contradictions within Brazilian history exposing them using the grid.

The Collector from the Saunas series, sitting on the wall facing the viewers entering the gallery, is a mural depicting a space generated by a computer algorithm. It is an empty architecture created by painting overlapping grids of monochromatic tiles in different tones of blue; the setting seems highly artificial and is a direct counterpoint to the main work on this floor: *Linda do Rosário*. Part of Varejão's Charques series, *Linda do Rosário* is a wall that could have come

straight from one the rooms depicted in *The Collector*. However, rather than pristine, it is shattered, more ruin than a piece of an environment, showcasing flesh pouring from its inside. Adriano Pedrosa has written "*The Charques* series turns architecture into body, walls into limbs and bricks into entrails."[46] The red entrails coming out of the painted tile grid wall in *Linda Do Rosário* poses a question to the artificiality and cleanliness of *The Collector* while simultaneously challenging the massive grid structure that is the Varejão Gallery. The crumbling of a building in downtown Rio de Janeiro in 2002 known for its illicit romantic encounters inspired the work and the resonance of the piece with both disgust and a certain fascination, profane and sacred is derived of the contradictions between the different materials represented there: flesh and tiles.

Tiles, a common element of many of Varejão's pieces, are part of the history of Brazil. Recurrent in the baroque constructions of the 17th and 18th centuries in the states Bahia, Rio de Janeiro and Minas Gerais, the blue and white tile was a trope absorbed from Portugal during the colonization. This staple of Baroque architecture was used in the early reign of Portugal in Brazil "as a form of ecumenical persuasion" of the natives, and the stories depicted in the tiles were examples of the cultural colonization of the Indian population.[47] This material in turn had a long history from the influence of Muslim arts in the Iberian Peninsula and trade routes coming from the East into Portugal in the early modern period. Le Corbusier was the first to suggest that the tiles be used in modern buildings such as the Ministry of Education and Health of 1936. From that point forward, they consistently appeared in other Brazilian modern designs like the Francisco de Assis church by Niemeyer in the Pampulha Complex and the Pavilion for the 1939 New York World Fair. In her use of this material, Varejão weaves together several moments of Brazilian history. Varejão embraces the tiles and their controversial nature: modern and traditional, reminiscent of Brazil's colonial past and absorbed as a symbol of the "dawning of a new age" by modern architecture in the country of the future. The tiles thus have

a sacred connotation as they are commonly seen in Baroque churches depicting stories from the Bible, nevertheless, as the entrails spill from the wall, the vividly abject character of the sculpture evokes ambiguous feelings, both disgust and bewilderment. The uniformity of the tiles so expressive in *The Collector* are disrupted in *Linda do Rosário* by an affective chain of disgust and abjection that cannot be quite pinned down. It is exacerbated by the boxed-in space of the gallery, its artificial lighting, pristine light grey walls and air-conditioned setting. It is the contrast between this space and the work that makes the experience of *Linda do Rosário* so impactful. This would not have been the same if the gallery had windows or was open to the outside in any form as the natural landscape would assuage the contrast between the rigidity of grid of tiles and the formlessness of the entrails.

On the second floor of the gallery, the four walls are lined with Varejão's painting made up of large white-and-blue tiles. *Coelacanth causes tidal wave* is a work marked by the fragmented and apparent disorder of its structure. The work implies a cataclysmic event that required a reordering of the tiles, which now have been placed randomly; the whole of the original image lost in the reconfiguration of the pieces. The title is a sentence that was often found written in walls of Rio de Janeiro during the seventies. It is a quote from National kid, a favourite TV show of the time; the coelacanth, a one-meter fish found on African and Indonesian shores could supposedly cause tidal waves. The implication is that the event that caused the crackling and dismantling of these tiles was the consequence of something that seemed minimal occurring in a different place and time—like the coelacanth that in its path across the waters of Indonesia causes a tidal wave bringing destruction to America. Or, like the beginning of the developmentalist ideology during Getúlio Vargas' Estado Novo that culminated in the Brazilian military coup. The title and the configuration of the work also speaks of event chains that just like chains of signification have impact across time and space because a residue remains, something travels along the waters from Indonesia to America, something at times

imperceptible that remains latent and gains force as it circulates. This is how affective signs also operate, they are smuggled in, parasitic within established chains of semantic of semiotic signs, but gain strength as they circulate becoming full-fledged affective epidemics.

Like in *Linda do Rosário*, it is crackling marks on the tiles that break the symmetrical rationality of the grid, they seem to echo the curves of the images depicted in them, a design reminiscent of a Baroque aesthetic which challenges the rigidity of the square tiles. The whole of the design however is lost to the viewer because of the fragmentation and reordering caused by an event we have no knowledge of. Following the narrative set up by Varejão's works and the structure of the gallery that houses it, it is possible to propose one narrative; the Baroque aesthetic, in its informal, unregulated sensuality, has infiltrated the rational, orderly modernist grid. Like in the other instances of the appropriation of the grid in Brazil: namely the Concrete and Neoconcrete movements in visual arts and the influence of Le Corbusier in modern architecture, in Varejão's work, the grid is always in tension with the aspects that define it. In the path that takes the viewers from the outside through the Varejão Gallery and the works housed in it, the grid spatially orders the mythic narratives that define Brazilian history and ideals of *brasilidade*. It reveals the contradictions that condition the love affairs in the Linda do Rosário Hotel or the artificiality that surprises the ideal space of *The Collector*. Just as the walls of *The Collector* can be inlaid with guts, muscle and nerves, as suggested by *Linda do Rosário*, so the violence and the turbulence of Brazilian history—the colonial and dictatorial past—can come crashing, like a tidal wave, into the tiles of Varejão's *Coelacanth*.

Spatializing the narrative reveals the contradictions with which Varejão plays in her work. It also frees the affective signs that were locked in the timelessness and spacelessness of the grid. In fact, Varejão traffics in these signs to configure a group of works that critiques several aspects of Brazilian identity and the cultural manifestations that have for long represented it

such as modern architecture. By evoking signs that resonate within already established chains of signification, of the performance of modernity and *brasilidade* of the Brazilian Modern Architectural movement and its chosen precursor, the Brazilian Baroque,[48] and giving them new spaces to circulate, Varejão's works trigger unexpected narratives. While the white cube provides a repeated affective experience of the disembodiment of the I/*Eye* and through this communicates a series of ideologies: the autonomy of art, the difference between high/low art, and the primacy of the Art History canon in all its Anglophonic bias.[49] The labyrinth and multigenerative configuration of the Inhotim grounds appear at first to reject these universals. Nevertheless, they remain central and are even more oppressive because of the viewer's heightened affective sensibilities.

In the rooftop of the gallery, as the visitors exit into the landscape from the closed interior, they are confronted by the drastic climate change and the view of the botanical gardens. Most importantly, they encounter Varejão's *Birds –From Inhotim to Demini*, a large U-shaped bench that circumscribes the rooftop of the gallery. In this piece, delicate images of birds are drawn on white tiles; they look like species found in traditional catalogues—a style reminiscent of nineteenth-century natural history books. These animals are frozen in flight, locked in the tile grid, their movement eradicated.

The work also resonates with another: a square shaped bench sitting by the entrance of the gallery, next to the pool of water below. This piece is entitled *Panacea Phantastica*. While in *Birds* the animals no longer fly, in *Panacea*, the hallucinogenic plants depicted in each white tile have been rendered innocuous. The plants are only a representation of their nature in Varejão's *Panacea*; now neatly organized on the grid, they no longer have any effect and they exist only as an instance of the visual. Just as the body in the white cube that has lost its affective dimension, the plants have no smell, taste, tactile quality or materiality, they are an

instance of the grid, static, pristine and ordered. The tension displayed in the juxtaposition of *The Collector* and *Linda do Rosário* is repeated in *Panacea*: it is a play between asceticism and excess. Faced with the immensity of the vegetation just beyond the square gridded rooftop, again this interplay of control and wilderness surfaces: the viewers, like the creatures in *Birds*, sense that they also have been locked in a grid. Through the spatialization of the contradictions of the grid through the structure of the gallery, they see themselves as nothing more than instances of the visual, the ultimate effect of the white cube on the body. This resonance is triggered as the viewers finds themselves inside a giant grid. Standing in the middle of the square rooftop of the Varejão gallery, suddenly the grid floors gain life. It separates the viewers from the disorderly curves of the vegetation beyond, just like one of Varejão's birds caged in the tiles. We are like *Linda do Rosário,* a pristine grid with a fleshy interior. At Inhotim, the body appears to have been freed from the grid and the white cube, the processional path and the bodily structure that usually organizes museum space eradicated. Nevertheless, the affective system that constructs the narrative of the Varejão Gallery exposes the ubiquity of these universals within the apparent open ended configuration of the museum. In the juxtaposition of the artworks, the architectural structure of the galleries and the surrounding environments, emerges the latent white cube and the grid, its artificiality, its isolation of the body from itself, and its stasis. Another instance of how affective signs trigger underlining features of the narrative is when these challenge the institution in its own specificity as the Cristina Iglesias Gallery does.

The Cristina Iglesias Gallery houses the work *Vegetation Room* by the artist. A site-specific gallery, the work was born of discussions between the Inhotim curators and Iglesias and is based on her series *Habitaciónes Vegetales (*2000-)—constructed in the interphase between architecture, sculpture and earth art.[50] The walls are made of synthetic materials but mimic the natural landscapes with its mirrors and organic patterns. Although small, the structure is a

labyrinth of corridors with several entrances and few exits. Mirrors cover the outside walls of the gallery, which reflect the vegetation surrounding the structure enhancing the sensory impression of closeness. The internal walls, made of resin are pale green and cast in an organic pattern. The artificiality of the inside walls and the ambiguity of the outside ones are further disturbed by the persistent sound of running water, which the spectator expects to find at every turn, but is unable to locate.[51] Navigating from one entry to the other, the viewer eventually encounters a stream running under an iron grid at the centre of the structure. Framed by the walk through the forest to arrive at the work, the sensory experience of closed vegetation and water gains meaning.

The short walk through dense vegetation in a narrow dirt path to the Iglesias Gallery is an essential part of viewers' experience of this work; it is as much part of the piece as walls of the gallery and its organic patterns. The recurrent smell of damp earth and the sense of inhabiting the dense, moist vegetation is a synesthetic experience intensified by the encounter with the gallery and its configuration. It is an experience marked by a natural/artificial dichotomy, one that gains new layers during the height of the dry season (June-August typically for this region of Brazil). During this time, the effort necessary to frame the experience of a gallery like this one, to cause this resonance between the work and the rich landscape, is time-consuming and extremely expensive. Rather than natural, it is highly curated and constructed through intense labour. The need to incessantly water the vegetation, to create this synaesthesia between smell, sight, sound and even taste is a highly costly process, both regarding water expenditure and human labour. Thus, the affective potential of the Cristina Iglesias gallery surpasses the discourse of tropicality and the commitment to the site, highlighting the mechanisms through which this sensorial experience—the sublime enhancing these ideals of a tropical, luscious, colourful landscape—are constructed and how much the museum has invested in it, physically and ideologically.

The experience of the Cristina Iglesias gallery can at times be a contained one proposing a tension between artificial and natural materials grounded in the relationship of the gallery with its surroundings. Nevertheless, at times, the affective signs that gives meaning to this work—the smells, the taste, the colours—travel beyond the curated sphere of discourse to highlight the internal machine of the museum. The constant sight of employees watering the grounds of the museum, the massive water reservoirs found in hidden clearings around Inhotim and the contrast felt between the dry landscape on the road outside the gates of the museum are all brought to fore by the experience of the Cristina Iglesias gallery. The viewer becomes highly aware of how stark the difference is between the dried vegetation, continuously covered by a thin layer of red dust found everywhere around the museum and the green luscious vegetation and colourful orchids on the Inhotim grounds. The museum is seen even more critically as the visitor recounts the constant warnings of water shortage on diverse regions of the country.[52] Even within the Inhotim grounds and despite the constant efforts of the museum staff, the dryness of the climate at times invades burning the beautiful green lawns. This contrast between the grounds and the region around it also highlights the poverty of the municipality of Brumadinho seen in the structures—residential and commercial—on the sides of the roads that take the viewer away from Inhotim and back to Belo Horizonte. This interstitial space is the one disavowed by the "Stendhal Syndrome" advertisement video, but an inescapable presence in the experience of Inhotim. It frames and resonates with it; it is the uncurated outside that refuses the stay away.

Conclusion

The turn to affect in museums is undoubtedly a direct reaction to the artistic practice of the 1960s onwards that have privileged large environmental installations and increasingly affective experiences. Inhotim's collection clearly showcases this trend as it encompasses works by

earlier artists that pioneered environmental and participatory art such as Helio Oiticica and Lygia Pape and contemporary practitioners known for their engagement of another type of experience as in Olafur Eliasson and Janet Cardiff.

The contribution of the study of affect to museum however is not limited to a better understanding of these contemporary works of art. It is in how it allows for a better understanding of meaning making systems and illuminates a feature of discourse that has been understudied. Chains of signification are separated in units of semantic, semiotic or affective signs, but complex clusters where all signs circulate and influence one another. The instrumentalization of affect in the evocation of the sublime for instance, has been a part of the experience of the museum since its birth in the 18th century and of works of art long before that. However, how affective signs and affective systems operates and how their specificity impacts the construction of narratives within and outside the museum needs to be better explored. In the case of Inhotim this study is paramount since, as I have argued, the museum cannot be understood without taking under consideration how it mobilizes affective signs in the construction of new experiences. It inherits this from the developmentalist museums in Brazil and from an entire national discourse that capitalized in myths of *brasilidade* often inhabiting the national unconscious on the strength of mobilized affective signs such as awe, pride, love and disgust.

Another feature of systems of signification that the study of affective signs highlights is the way these systems are mouldable, but not passive. It showcases how once signs begin to circulate they escape the confines of the established narratives resulting in new ramifications that at times are unforeseen by the agents involved in the making. This feature has the potential for exposing the very mechanisms through which meaning is constructed and as such are nodes of great anxiety. The "Stendhal Syndrome" video highlights how this anxiety is present in

Inhotim and is as essential to its identity as the affective systems it engenders. This was already a feature of the developmentalist museum, but because of its contained space, the uncurated outside was easier to limit. At Inhotim, the multigenerative and labyrinth configuration of its grounds makes the circulation and interaction between bodies and signs much harder to contain.

The affective sign because of the its specificity—a parasitic sign that is only communicable through a set of analogies rather than differences—is a large reservoir of discourse which carries along the chain traces of its previous hosts. Their mobilization thus results in the colonization of discourse from within which has proven to be extremely efficient. It is a better understanding of these signs and how they are instrumentalized in the museum and outside of it that will allow us to build on or resist them.

Alice Heeren is a PhD student at Southern Methodist University in the RASC/a: Rhetorics of Art, Space and Culture Program. Her research centres on affect theory, media and memory studies as discussed in relation to modern and contemporary art and architecture in Brazil and the construction of national identity. She holds a MA in Modern Art History, Theory and Criticism from the School of the Art Institute of Chicago and has worked as an editor for the Routledge Encyclopaedia of Modernism, as well as an intern at MoMA.

Notes

[1] During the 1980s, Paz began acquiring the land around the area, however, it was the 1984 visit of landscape designer Roberto Burle Marx that the Inhotim project began. During the same period, advised by his close friend Tunga, Paz sold most of his paintings by early Brazilian modernists and began collecting Brazilian art from the 1960s to the present. This shift in focus solidified between 2001 and 2005 when Paz expanded his collection to include a younger generation that had emerged in the 1990s, such as Ernesto Neto, Olafur Eliasson and Rirkrit Tiravanija. The works acquired and commissioned around this time have a central place in the museum and have influenced the direction of its collection. Inhotim received visitors for the first time during the 2002 São Paulo Biennial, and although this was in the context of a one-day event aimed at art professionals, it marked a transitional moment for the institution. In that same year, a new team of curators joined the staff: Rodrigo Moura, the curator of the Museu de Arte da Pampulha in Belo Horizonte; Allan Schwartzman, one of the founding staff members of the New Museum of Contemporary Art in New York; and Jochen Volz, previously the curator at Portikus Frankfurt am Main. In 2004, two new galleries specific to the work of Brazilian artists Tunga and Cildo Meireles were added to the three existing galleries that housed temporary exhibitions. With this expansion and the opening of the museum to the public, the name was changed from *Centro de Arte Contemporânea Inhotim* to *Instituto Cultural Inhotim*. After being headed during two years by Eungie Joo following Jochen Volz's appointment as Head of Programmes at the Serpentine Gallery in London, in 2013 Rodrigo Moura, who by then had been at Inhotim for nine years, assumed the curatorial directorship of the institute. Other curators and assistant curators have passed through and still work at the institution among them Lucas Sigefredo and Tiago Batista.

[2] The relationship of affect theory and museum theory has been recently discussed in a series of articles in the *Journal of Curatorial Studies*. See: *The Journal of Curatorial Studies* special volume entitled "Museums and Affect" edited by Jennifer Fisher and Helena Reckitt, Vol.4, Is. 3 (October 2015).

[3] Rodrigo Moura in his text for the *Inhotim: Through* catalog already calls attention to how the "clash between art exhibits and the surrounding landscape" in Brazilian modern and contemporary museums—particularly in MAM-RJ, MAM-SP, MAC-Niterói, the Biennial Pavilion and Museu de Arte da Pampulha (Museum of Art in Pampulha, installed in the former casino in Niemeyer's Pampulha Complex), is characteristic of Brazilian institutions. He does not go on, however, to discuss the possible causes of this architectural consensus, only how Inhotim "introduces a new facet to the relations binding architecture, landscape and the museum." See: Rodrigo Moura, "A museum in the backlands," in *Through: Inhotim*, edited by Adriano Pedrosa and Rodrigo Moura, (Belo Horizonte: Instituto Cultural Inhotim, 2009).

[4] See: Raúl Prebisch, "Commercial Policy in the Underdeveloped Countries," *American Economic Review* 49, (May 1959): 251–273; Raúl Prebisch, *The Economic Development of Latin America and Its Principal Problems* (New York: United Nations, 1950); and Immanuel Wallerstein. "After Developmentalism and Globalization, What?" *Social Forces*, Vol. 83, No. 3, (2005): 1264. Faced with the lack of market for its primary exports in the period after the 1929 crash, countries in Latin American devised projects based on import substitution, fostering investment in the domestic production of previously imported goods and increase in import tariffs to protect the new homegrown industry. This system created dependency on

foreign loans and investment in the expectation that the sheltering of internal economy by market regulation would lead to accelerated development and to an equal footing with first-world economies. This belief weakened in the 1970s and collapsed in the 1980s, nevertheless neodevelopmentalist projects resurfaced in the late 1990s, early 2000s and have only recently shown their devastating effects.

[5] These contradictory aspects of Brazilian modernity (that at times were productive) have been discussed by several scholars, amongst them Guilherme Wisnik and Roberto Conduru in their texts for *Brazil's Modern Architecture*, edited by Elisabettta Andreoli and Adrian Forty (London: Phaidon, 2004); Lauro Cavalcanti, *When Brazil was Modern* (New York: Princeton Architectural Press, 2003); and Nestor Garcia Canclini, *Hybrid Cultures: Strategies for Entering and Leaving Modernity* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesotta Press, 2005).

[6] This is also applicable to the Bienal Pavilion building in the Ibirapuera Park which houses the collection of MAM-SP, as well as the building of the Museu de Arte Contemporêna da Universidade Federal de São Paulo (MAC-USP). However, because the histories of these institutions and their relationship with their buildings is circuitous, I will focus on the more straightforward examples of MAM-RJ and MAC-Niterói here. This focus also springs from necessity for the coherence of the argument, since both MAM-SP and MAC-USP have changed locations repeatedly and have been and are still today housed in buildings that were not built for housing a modern museum.

[7] The inauguration in 2002 of the Museu Oscar Niemeyer in Brazilian's southern capital of Curitiba marks an even more contemporary instance of the developmentalist museum legacy and an even larger Nieyemerian project than MAC-Niterói.

[8] MAC-Niterói and MAM-RJ are projects in which Niemeyer and Burle Marx did not collaborate, better exemplifying the divergence in their thinking. While there is no landscape work in MAC-Niteroi's plan, the architectural project for MAM-RJ is signed by Affonso Eduardo Reiddy. In both MAM-RJ and Inhotim Burle-Marx's design constitute a very small percentage of the overall experience. In the former he designed the gardens around the museum—and that is why I focus on his contribution here—and some other features, but the larger project for the Flamengo Park where the museum sits is by Maria Carlota Costallat de Macedo Soares (better known as Lotta whose contribution to Brazilian history of landscape design has been many times silenced). Furthermore, at Inhotim, Burle-Marx's contribution is of sketches for around ten percent of the current area, the project is by Luiz Carlos Orsini. Burle-Marx's legacy in both these projects is much more of a wider understanding of space, landscape design and its configuration, which is why he is important for this study.

[9] Siqueira. *Burle Marx*, 33.

[10] Luiz Guilherme Vergara, *"In Search of Mission and Identity for Brazilian Contemporary Art Museums in the 21st Century: Case Study: Museu de Arte Contemporânea de Niterói,"* (Dissertation, New York University, Department of Education, 2006).

[11] Rodrigo Moura already calls attention to this feature in his discussion of museum history in *Inhotim: Through.*

[12] Lucia Lippi Oliveira, *O Brasil dos imigrantes* (Rio de Janeiro: J. Zahar, 2001) and *Americanos: representações da identidade nacional no Brasil e nos EUA (*Belo Horizonte: Editora UFMG, 2000).

[13] It is against this backdrop that the exaltation of Burle-Marx and Niemeyer's style as tropical must be understood. Aleca Le Blanc, Roberto Conduru, Valerie Fraser and others have both touched on aspects of this discourse that is central to developmentalist rhetorics, particularly the ideal of *brasilidade*. The idea of a "tropical modernism" was one the Brazilian government and the modern architects in the country cultivated. Lucio Costa throughout his career oscillated between arguing the traditional *casas grandes,* Baroque architecture and the curves of the Brazilian topography influenced the Brazilian modern movement. Niemeyer spoke at

times of women's curves and at others of the waves of the ocean as having influenced his style. Whatever the version of the tale, the central idea was that Brazilian Modern Architecture from being made in Brazil somehow inherent a series of features that were essentially Brazilian and characteristically tropical. How this ideal of *brasilidade* inculcated into the national imaginary is key as it exemplifies a circuit of affective signs that remotes back to sixteenth century discussions of *terra brasilis* as idyllic. On the question of "tropical modernism" in Brazil see: William J. R. Curtis, *Modern Architecture since 1900*, 3rd ed. (London: Phaidon Press, 1996), 386; Daryle Williams, *Culture Wars in Brazil: e First Vargas Regime, 1930-1945* (Durham, N.C.: Duke University Press, 2001), 207- 210; Aleca LeBlanc, "Building the Tropical World of Tomorrow: The Construction of Brasilidade at the 1939 New York World's Fair," *Hemisphere: Visual Cultures of the Americas* 2, 1 (2009): 26-45; Valerie Fraser, "Cannibalizing Le Corbusier: The MES Gardens of Roberto Burle Marx," *Journal of the Society of Architectural Historians,* vol. 59, No. 2 (June, 2000): 180-193; and Roberto Conduru, "Tropical tectonics," in *Brazil's Modern Architecture*, edited by Elisabettta Andreoli and Adrian Forty (London: Phaidon, 2004), 58-105. Fernando Luis Lara has traced how Costa constructed this discourse through both his writing as an architect and the leader of the modern movement in Brazil and in his position at the *Instituto Nacional do Patrimônio Artístico Nacional* (IPHAN). See: See Fernando Luiz Lara, *The Rise of Popular Modernist Architecture in Brazil,* (Gainesville: University Press of Florida, 2008); Ibid, "Modernism made Vernacular," *Journal of Architectural Education*, (2009): 41-50; Ibid, "Brazilian Popular Modernism: Analyzing the dissemination of Architecture," *Journal of Architectural and Planning Research* 23, n.2, (2006): 91-112; and Ibid, "One Step Back, Two Steps forward: the maneuvering of Brazilian Avant-Garde," *Journal of Architectural Education 55/4*, (May 2002): 211-219.

[14] The impeachment of president Dilma Rousseff, the overwhelming discourse of hate, homophobia, racism and sexism that has overflown the Brazilian middle class, the demobilization of the socialist project embodied by Rousseff and Lula's Worker's Party, as well as the rise of a right wing government desperate to smother corruption scandals while implementing a retrograde neoliberal project that would never have passed the scrutiny of a general election make up the current landscape of Brazilian politics. In this moment, the ruination of what is left of the ideal of Brazil as intrinsically modern, lusciously tropical, economically rising, culturally effervescent, and racially democratic would seem inevitable. Nevertheless, what has occurred in a repeat of the military period (1964-85) is a mobilization of this affective system. Images of this lost Brazil and the ideal of the country of the future is again sutured together in the green and yellow CBF (Confederation of Brazilian Football) shirts and carnival like protests of a middle class called to the street by a co-opted media and corrupt corporate money; it is sown together in the cries for developmentalist era economic growth through the exploitation of the poorer (and overwhelmingly black) population; it is found in the seams created by the forced junction of Brazilian Belle Époque oligarchical politics, civil-military power backed by force, and contemporary right wing neo-corporativism that works to silence nearly fifteen years of social betterment and civil rights movements. In my master thesis written in 2011 at the School of the Art Institute of Chicago from which this study springs, I was already concerned with a worrisome dimension of the optimism of the neodevelopmentalist project of the early 2000s: the possible amnesia regarding the flaws of the developmentalist project, in particularly in its inability to deal with social questions and prejudices leading to the complete breakdown of the country's economy and setting the stage for the military coup (a repeat of the 1960s). This concern which I absorbed from readings of diverse scholars studying Brazilian contemporary art as well as artists now reads as something of a disheartening reality. The affective signs that created the notion of Brazil as the country of the future are constantly being remobilized both by the left party of Rousseff and Lula and right

wing politicians such as Michel Temer and Aécio Neves in their struggle for power in a very unstable Brazilian scene. As such, understanding how these signs work is an urgent project.

[15] The recent resurgence of the developmentalist ideology comes as a response to the period between the 1970s and 1990s, when neoliberal politics were widespread in Latin America and hampered the region with the "free-market" approach of its programs. However, this neodevelopmentalist ideology emerges with key structural changes: namely, national specificity and well-articulated meaning making strategies. Shahrukh Rafi Khan argues that although Neodevelopmentalism is not a term widely used by economic scientist, it is relevant for the current period in underdeveloped countries sprung by the failure of the neoliberalist economics widespread in the 1980s and 1990s: "While the term neo-developmentalism is not yet used in the development economics literature, a strong case could be made that it should be." See: Shahrukh Rafi Khan, "WTO, IMF and the Closing of Development Policy Space for Low-Income Countries: A Call for Neo-Developmentalism*," Third World Quarterly*, Vol. 28, No. 6, (2007): 1073-1090.

[16] The political rivalry between the coastal state of São Paulo (constantly supported by the state of Rio de Janeiro) and inland Minas Gerais has a long history. Between 1898 and 1930, the old Brazilian republic was controlled by the "politica Café com Leite" (the Coffee and Milk politics). Referring to the major exportation products of these states, this period was marked by an unofficial policy where the powerful coffee producers and kettle farmers of São Paulo and Minas Gerais, would alternatingly align to support a candidate to the presidency. This period ended when in 1928 president Washington Luis (from São Paulo) endorsed another candidate from that region, Júlio Prestes, causing the falling out of the political leaders of the two states. With the economic breakdown of 1929 and the coffee prices dropping vertiginously however the São Paulo coffee barons lost their political power allowing Getúlio Vargas, supported by the state of Minas Gerais, to rise to office and establish what would become a fifteen-year dictatorship. These two states—and the southeast region of Brazil as a whole—are today still large political forces in the country, and the old rivalry is still very much in play. Inhotim has impacted the current political struggle between the two states mainly for three reasons: its collection is recognized as the largest one of contemporary art in Latin America, its visitor infrastructure is unprecedented for a museum in the country, and its tourist appeal is undeniable. Bernardo Paz is also very much part of this history, he owns major mines in the state. As the name already reveals Minas Gerais (general mines) is the largest exporter of metal in the country and Paz owns some of the larger producing mines in the state. Although these social-economic relationships are outside the scope of this paper to not recognize that the same struggle for legitimacy that MAM-RJ and MAC-Niteroi were involved in still plays a central role in Inhotim is to lose sight of what the label "developmentalist museum" signals as a wider project.

[17] The artificial lakes and most of the design of the Inhotim grounds were elaborated by Luiz Carlos Orsini inspired by Burle Marx's original project, which covered only 10% of what the museum is today. For more on the impact of Burle Marx on Orsini's final configuration of Inhotim see: Silva, Roberto (2006,), *New Brazilian Gardens*, London: Thames & Hudson, pp. 101-5.

[18] Sara Ahmed in her *The Cultural Politics of Emotion* is central to my thinking of affectivity with its focus on specific universal emotions like fear, disgust, love, and pride and how they are mobilized in different manners within the body politics. I will return to this later in my discussion of affect theory and how it plays into the discursive chains at Inhotim.

[19] This invasion of the unmanageable outside was a locus of great anxiety for earlier museum also. During the exhibition *Opinião 65*, artist Helio Oiticica invited individuals who lived in the favela da Magueira to wear his *Parangolés* that were being shown at MAM-RJ. The result

was the expulsion of the group from the interiors of the museum in one of the most iconic moments of 1960s Brazilian art.

[20] See it in the Inhotim YouTube channel: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=7BXKCiB2g1g&list=UUCWIlQwPzICO85Fvxf9px7w
With the original title "Sthendhal Syndrome" in the Youtube page of Filadélfia Comunicações at: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=f-6J-OeSfSI

[21] Brian Massumi, "The Autonomy of Affect," *Cultural Critique*, No. 31, The Politics of Systems and Environments, Part II, (Autumn 1995): 83-109, *The Politics of everyday fear* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1993), and *Parables of the Virtual: Movement, Affect, Sensation* (Durham & London: Duke University Press, 2002); Todd Cronan, 'The Aesthetic Politics of Affect,' *Radical Philosophy*, 172 (March/April 2012): 51-3; Sarah Ahmed, "Affective Economies," *Social Text* 79, Vol. 22, No. 2 (Summer, 2004): 117-139 and *The Cultural Politics of Emotions* (London: Routledge, 2004); Anna Gibbs, University of Western Sydney, College of Arts, and MARCS Auditory Laboratories. *Contagious feelings: Pauline Hanson and the epidemiology of affect (*Bundoora, Vic. LaTrobe University, 2001) http://handle.uws.edu.au:8081/1959.7/9779 and "Dissaffected," *Continuum: Journal of Media & Cultural Studies,* Vol. 16, N. 3 (2002): 335-341.

[22] Many critics of Affect Theory's, Ruth Leys among its most prominent, argue that the main problem with Massumi's rational is that he denies intentionality in that he terms affect as independent of signification and meaning and as such existing in a different order than cognition. What this critique ignores is Massumi's discussion of the second layer process of qualifying affect and infolding of context, which is where Ahmed and Massumi intersect in my reading. It is this differentiation between qualified and unqualified affects that counterweights the criticism wagers by critics like Leys, and it is also along this axis, I argue, that the Affect theory lines led by Massumi and Ahmed find common ground. For the main critique to the Affective Turn see: Ruth Leys, "II – Affect and Intention: A Reply to William E. Connolly," *Critical Inquiry*, Vol. 37, No. 4, (Summer 2011): 799-805 and "The Turn to Affect: A Critique," *Critical Inquiry*, Vol. 37, No. 3, (Spring 2011): 434-72. See also:

[23] Massumi, "The Autonomy of Affect," 85-7.

[24] Ahmed *The Cultural Politics of Emotions,* 6.

[25] Ferdinand d'Saussure, *Course in General Linguistics* (Open Court Classics, 1998) and Charles Sanders Pierce, *Philosophical Writings of Peirce* (New York: Dover Publications, 2011). There is an array of studies of these two theoreticians work and the systems of linguistic and imagetic signs have been dissected by others from Roman Jakobson to Erwin Panofski. The ramifications of these analyses are too complex and varied to go into here, the important point is that the understanding of these systems of sign as rooted in difference fist conceptualized by Saussure is almost an unanimity among later proponents of structuralism and semiotics and it is here that I argue the affective system of sign differs.

[26] Ahmed *The Cultural Politics of Emotions*, 64.

[27] Gibbs *Contagious feelings,* 2.

[28] Cristina Ruiz*, Interview with Bernardo Paz, The Art Newspapers*, issue 218, (November 2010).

[29] Marie-Cécile Burnichon, "Le Modèle Inhotim," *Artpress* 384, (2010).

[30] Guy Trebay, "Planet Art," *The New York Times*, (September 2009).

[31] Edward Leffingwell, "Brazil Report," *Art in America*, (March 2009).

[32] Etienne-Louis Boullée was one of the earlier precursors of the monumental public museum inspired by Solomon's temple or Rafael's School of Athens. His drawings and plans show large interiors with abundant classical elements like the rotunda and columns all framing a sublime experience. The immensity these structures were meant to convey, the magnitude of the environment against to the scale of the human body, looked to prepare the viewer for the

experience of art. Boullée's monumentality and love for geometry, his reliance on the rotunda and the possibility it gave for large open spaces, attends to overwhelm the visitor and arise feelings of bewilderment and awe. Similarly, the lighting emanating from above and entering a structure lined with statues of great thinkers and allegorical virtues was meant to give pause and demand reverence from those entering it. This early understanding of the role of space in the institution cannot be underestimated as it has shaped the history of museum buildings and is at play in Frank Lloyd Wright's Guggenheim, as much as in the developmentalist museums such as MAC-Niteroi and MAM-RJ in their evocation of the Guanabara Bay to traffic in the sublime and in Inhotim. For more on Etienne-Louis Boullée see: Emil Kaufmann, *Three Revolutionary Architects: Boullée, Ledoux, and Lequeu* (Philadelphia: The American Philosophical Society, 1952) and Jean-Claude Lemagny, *Visionary Architects: Boullée, Ledoux, Lequeu* (Los Angeles: Hennessey & Ingalls, 2002).

[33] Allan Schwartzman, "A place worth knowing," in *Through: Inhotim*; and Cristina Ruiz, *Interview with Bernardo Paz, The Art Newspapers*, issue 218, (November 2010).

[34] Several other videos and promotional material of the institution makes exactly this point. For another advertisement with a similar affective universe see: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=eG_-rifzOqk&list=UUCWIlQwPzICO85Fvxf9px7w&index=140

[35] Images of the gallery and the design plans can be seen in the portifolio of Arquitetos Associados, the architectural firm responsible for the project. Interestingly, their explanation of the project adds another glimpse into the initial goals of the gallery that I argue have been subverted to regain control over the experience and the narrative. The section on program reads: "The building defines a single level on which is the gallery and treats the roof as a green terrace which lends continuity to the existing landscape. The gallery is formed by five exhibition rooms which, as requested by the museum's curatorial team, should not be shaped in hierarchy, promoting a visitation free from routes suggested by the space." See: http://www.arquitetosassociados.arq.br/?projeto=galeria-cosmococas-inhotim&lang=en

[36] For images of the Cosmococas gallery structure and the installations see: http://inhotim.org.br/inhotim/arte-contemporanea/obras/galeria-cosmococa/

[37] For images on the Adriana Varejão Gallery at Inhotim as well as the works housed there see: http://www.inhotim.org.br/inhotim/arte-contemporanea/obras/galeria-adriana-varejao/

[38] The gallery received the *Prêmio Rino Levi Ex Aequo 2008*, from the Instituto de Arquitetos do Brasil (São Paulo).

[39] The Domino frame conceptualized by Le Corbusier in 1914, was the synthesis of his Five Point architecture, its simple structure embracing the five premises: the pilotis, the roof garden, the free plan, the horizontal window, and the free façade. In the Varejão Gallery, the open block is locked; a reinforced concrete grid overtakes the windows and marks the façade. The pilotis are implied, but the structure remains a Domino frame, making Le Corbusier's rational a veiled presence.

[40] For more on Varejão's work see: Louise Neri, "Brave New World: Adriana Varejão's Baroque Territories in *Adriana Varejão*, (São Paulo: O Autor, 2001).

[41] Rosalind Krauss, "Grids," *October*, Vol. 9, (Summer 1979): 50-4.

[42] Krauss, "Grids," 50.

[43] Krauss, "Grids," 54 and O'Doherty, *Inside the White Cube: Ideology of the gallery space.*

[44] Krauss, "Grids," 54.

[45] Krauss, "Grids," 55.

[46] Pedrosa, *Inhotim: Through*, 46-7.

[47] Neri, "Brave New World," 14.

[48] Brazilian artists and architects were deeply influenced by the European avant-garde movements, but the 1930s demanded a new national identity and they were committed to

creating art that was modern, yet symbolic of Brazil. In architecture, the questions of foreign influences and the search for the "new" was central to the ideas of the most prominent figures in the field and Lucio Costa found in the colonial period the reference that better translated into the national sphere the premises of the international discourse. Plain, simple, and unadorned colonial architecture perfectly embodied the precepts of the International Style in architecture led by Le Corbusier and Mies van der Rohe. This process of finding a suitable predecessor was not a straightforward one and although Costa initially focused on colonial plantation architecture, later, as the modern style—led specifically by Niemeyer—became more "irrational" playing with the free form and making use of the flexibility allowed by reinforced concrete, Costa recalibrated his discourse to elevate the *Baroque Mineiro*—the expression of 18th century mining cities of Minas Gerais—to the position of *genius loci* of Brazilian identity. Minas Gerais became the representation of the perpetual forward-looking nature of the Brazilian people. See: Lúcio Costa, Razones de la Nueva Arquitectura – 1934 – Y Otros Ensayos (lima: Embajada del Brasil, 1986. Also about this process of historicizing see: Lauro Cavalcanti, Modern e Brasileiro: A história de uma nova linguagem na arquitetura (1930-60) (Rio de Janeiro: Jorge Zahar Editor, 2006); Frés el-Dahdah, "Lúcio Costa Preservationaist," Future Anterior: Journal of Historic Preservation History, Theory and Criticism, Vol. 3, No.1 (summer 2006): 58-67; Fernando Luiz Lara, "Chapter Three: Designed Memories, the roots of Brazilian Modernism," in in *Memory and Architecture*, edited by Eleni Bastéa (Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 2004), 79-97; Richard J. Williams, "One: The Politics of the Past," in Richard J. Williams, *Brazil: Modern Architecture in history* (London: Reaktion books, 2009). For Lúcio Costa's own understanding of his work at IPHAN see: Ana Luiza Nobre (org.), Lúcio Costa: Encontros (Rio de Janeiro: Azougue editorial, 2010), 104-5, 148-173, 214-225.

[49] The white cube model, dissected in Brian O'Doherty's famous *Inside the White Cube: Ideology of the gallery space* has become over the years the most dominant museum model. Its isolation from the outside world and intimate one-to-one framing of viewership has had several effects on the subject who engages with art as well as the art created to inhabit that space. O'Doherty discusses in his introduction how the gallery space as a non-space works to annul the space-time matrix, consequently annulling body at the level of sensation. The ideal body within the white cube is the static *Eye*. O'Doherty notes that this is the goal to which the white cube as a display structure was devised. In the white cube, the *I* is reduced to the *Eye* and the spectator is reduced to an instance of the visual. This process of annulment serves to reaffirm the autonomy of art and to isolate from the impulses generated by the outside world, which could resonate with the affective experience of the artworks creating new discursive spaces. For more see: Brian O'Doherty, *Inside the White Cube: Ideology of the gallery space* (California: Univ. of California Press, 1999).

[50] See video about this project in Inhotim's YouTube channel: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=wu-aKqZ8xoI&list=UUCWIlQwPzICO85Fvxf9px7w See also the details of the work including the low relief resin walls and water stream from 1:58 min to 2:26 min, and the path to the gallery as shown in the video from 3:00 min to 3:31 min. Also for images of the gallery and the work see: http://www.inhotim.org.br/inhotim/arte-contemporanea/obras/vegetation-room-inhotim-2010-2012/

[51] It is interesting that this sound of running water reappears at other moments in the Inhotim grounds, such as in Cildo Meireles' *Desvio para o Vermelho.* The museum favors resonances that are not just visual—as common in many museums—but of the other senses.

[52] The question here is not regarding the environmental impact of the museum's use of water, as they have looked for alternatives to maintain their water supplies. The focus is on how the experience of the museum and their efforts to frame this experience resonates in other moments of the visitors' lives, which are not exclusive to their time spend in the grounds and how these

affective signs would be triggered at other moments resonating with the museum experience and leading to critical thinking regarding the mechanisms for crafting experience inside and outside the museum, how things gain meaning and how meaning is framed.