

ARHITEKTURA KAO LUKSUZNA ROBA

Korištenje nekih pojmova koje je Piero Sraffa osmislio u okviru teorije o proizvodnji roba pomoću roba¹ omogućuje odrediti polazišta mogućem razvoju čitanja i analize arhitekture, oslobođenog niskog i nikad eksplicitnog moralizma nekih kasnih sljedbenika Manfreda Tafuria. Posljednja i krajnja logička posljedica razvojnog procesa njegova pristupa arhitekturi je dobrovoljna nemogućnost razgovora: ukoliko je sveprisutna logika kapitala trajno posvojila napetost napredovanja avangardi, ne postoji nikakva istinska mogućnost „oslobođenja“ kroz projekt.² U optici koherentnog prianjanja intelektualne radnje i čitanja postojećeg, šutnja postaje jedini prihvatljiv kritički stav spram suvremenosti: nakon što je razotkrio mehanizme gradnje i manipuliranja sporazuma, koji djeluju kroz supsumpciju utopijske dimenzije moderne arhitekture, kritičaru i historičaru ne preostaje ništa drugo doli istraživanje povijesti razdoblja koja prethode dobu pune ekspanzije kapitala kako bi se mogli prigodno posvetiti arhitekturi, oslobođenoj svih drugih problema osim sebe same (i stoga autonomnoj). Apsolutnost i ulančanost logike koju postavlja Tafuri predstavljala je križ i nepremostivu zapreku za one koji su se htjeli kretati njegovim tragom, faktički ih onemogućivši, i zato se u akademskim i izdavačkim krugovima povezanim s arhitekturom mogu pojaviti tek povremene aluzije, što ih

FABRIZIO
GALLANTI

FABRIZIO
GALLANTI

Using some concepts elaborated by Piero Sraffa in the framework of his theory on the production of commodities by means of commodities¹ makes it possible to determine the starting points for the possible development of an interpretation and analysis of architecture that would be free from the creeping and never explicit moralizing of some later followers of Manfredo Tafuri.

The final and ultimate logical consequence of the evolutionary process of his approach to architecture is the voluntary aphasia of discourse: if the pervasive logic of capital has permanently appropriated the tension of progress of the avant-gardes, there is no genuine possibility of “liberation” through the project.² In view of the coherent adherence between intellectual action and the reading of reality, silence becomes the only acceptable critical attitude towards the contemporary situation: having revealed the building mechanisms and consensual manipulation, operated by subsuming the utopian dimension of modern architecture, the critic and the historian have no other option but to investigate the history that preceded the epoch of the full expansion of capital in order to be able to focus efficiently on architecture, freed from all other issues but itself (and therefore autonomous). The absoluteness and concatenation of the logic imposed by Tafuri has been a cross and an unsurpassable obstacle to those who wanted to follow in his footsteps, which

ARCHITECTURE AS A LUXURY COMMODITY

je moguće svesti na mrmrljajući moralizam, koje se uglavnom odnose na odnose trenutno najpopularnijih projektanata prema mehanizmima ekonomske i političke moći kasnoga kapitalizma. Takvi odjeci ocrtavaju siromašnu kritičku i teorijsku produkciju koja prati sve naglašeniji ulazak na scenu jedne arhitekture koju je sretno apsorbiralo postvarenje kapitala, bez dijalektičkog odnosa prema izvoru na koji se odnose. Uglavnom, ne postoji kritička i historiografska konstrukcija koja bi se nastavila na Tafurieva razmišljanja radi njihova osuvremenjavanja i ponovnog otvaranja diskusije o nekim osnovnim konceptualnim postavkama. Tafuri više djeluje na psihičkoj razini, kao ostatak savjesti (i možda indignacije) koji izbija, iako nikada prodoran i središnji. Nadalje, kao što je već komentirao Umberto Eco,³ korištenje ovih fragmentarnih i namjerno kriptičnih navoda služi uspostavljanju bliskosti između autora i čitatelja, koji su u krasno doba svoje mladosti mogli dijeliti kakav marksistički hir. Tafuri je postao *private joke*, usputna napomena koja govori da se ne treba smesti trijumfom predstave (kako bi se ubrzo mogli prepustiti da nas otruje, no barem svjesno i time udvostručavajući zadovoljstvo grijehom), prenoseći ipak sudove s političke, odnosno kolektivne razine na onu moralnu i etičku, i stoga pojedinačnu.⁴ I svakako sudovi s okusom moralizma nisu potpuno i istinski takvi, jer se ne

mogu pripisati nekom skupu određenih etičkih i ideoloških vrijednosti, nego prije skrivaju ocjenu prikladnosti načina, gdje raditi za „zločeste“ nije pogrešno po sebi, već nezgodno s obzirom na različite komunikacijske strategije i stvaranje određene medijske vidljivosti. U najboljem slučaju, kada su sigurni da ih nitko ne sluša, pojavljuju se podrugljivi osmijesi i ogovaranja o diskraziji između obećanja o objektivnosti i napretku koje prenose različiti repertoari oblika i neizbježne ako ne ontološke nekompatibilnosti ekonomskih i političkih sustava koji mu podržavaju širenje.⁵

Aktualna arhitektonska produkcija ima ipak neophodnu potrebu biti popraćena kritičkom praksom, koja ocrtava strukturalne slabosti njenog odnosa prema moći i koja se ipak može oblikovati pozitivno, u smislu sugestije i prefiguracije pozicija, pristupa, tendencija, morfoloških i funkcionalnih odluka u odnosu na ono što smatraju središnjim elementom vlastitog objašnjenja, a bilo je maknuto s vidika: javnosti. Artikulacija obnove kritike arhitekture prolazi kroz procese koji pokušavaju rekonstrukciju javne sfere, unutar koje se mogu smjestiti i analizirati projekti i urbane promjene što mijenjaju prostore u kojima se odvija život.

Naime, čini se da se većina aktualnih zbivanja u arhitekturi događa u izoliranom sustavu i kontroliranim uvjetima, odnoseći se na tek nekoliko ograničenih subjekata, koji

proved virtually impossible, and in fact the academics and publishers linked to architecture can utter at most some sporadic allusions, reducible to grumbling moralization and mostly referring to those architects who are currently in fashion with the mechanisms of economic and political power of late capitalism. Such echoes indicate the poverty of critical and theoretical production that accompanies the ever more conspicuous situation of an architecture that has been happily absorbed by the reification of capital, without any dialectic relation to the source they are referring to. Briefly, there is no critical and historiographical construction that would continue Tafuri's reflections in order to modernize his ideas or to reopen the debate on some basic conceptual premises. Tafuri's impact is rather on the psychological level, as a remnant of consciousness (and perhaps indignation) which occasionally breaks out without ever becoming assertive or central. Moreover, as Umberto Eco once observed,³ the use of these fragmentary and deliberately cryptic references serves to indicate the complicity between the authors and their readers, who may have shared some inclination to Marxism in the blissful times of their youth. Tafuri has become a private joke, an occasional hint suggesting that one should not get tricked by the triumph of the spectacle (and then let oneself be quickly intoxicated, although at least consciously, which doubles the

pleasure of vice) and yet transferring the judgments from the political and therefore collective level to the moral and ethical one, which therefore refers to individuals.⁴ However, judgments with the taste of moralization are not completely and genuinely such, since they cannot be ascribed to a common set of ethical and ideological values; instead, they conceal an assessment of instrumental conveniences, in which working for the "bad guys" is not wrong in itself, but rather inappropriate with regard to various communicational strategies and achieving some visibility in the media. At the best, when they are sure that nobody's listening, they utter giggles and gossips on the misbalance between the promises of objectivity and progress, propelled by some formal registers, and the inevitable, if not ontological incompatibility of the economic and political systems that support its expansion.⁵

The current architectural production, however, has the pressing need of being accompanied by a critical practice, which would outline the structural weaknesses of its relation to power, yet could nevertheless be formulated in positive terms, through the suggestion and foreshadowing of positions, attitudes, tendencies, or morphological and functional decisions that refer to and consider as the key element of their own explanation that which has been excluded from the horizon: the public.

čine krajnje točke pojednostavljenih triangulacija: naručitelji, sustav masovnih medija (koji je izgubljen između strukovnog i akademskog ambijenta, s jedne strane, gdje se iznalaze ostvarenja unutarnjih zakonitosti, i sredstava masovne difuzije, s druge strane) i na kraju projekatanata. U tom izmještanju moći slučajno se kao rubni element prikazuje javnost, koja je svedena na pasivnu ulogu promatrača ne toliko arhitektonskog objekta, kao prostora i mjesta rada, već kao elementa uklopljenog u struju komunikacije. Postupno izostavljanje hipoteze o odgovornosti prema kolektivu kristalizacija je tendencija koje su već sadržane unutar iskustva moderniteta.

„Uns trägt kein Volk.“ Na simpoziju u Jeni 1924. godine Paul Klee zahtijevao je neophodnu, a izostalu, podršku naroda za podržavanje dubinske reforme umjetničkih i projektantskih disciplina, koja bi potom mogla sudjelovati u jednom općem pokretu društvenog i političkog napretka. U svojoj kolektivnoj dimenziji, Bauhaus je za njega predstavljao početnu jezgru zajednice, koja bi umjetniku omogućila da ga prati stalni dijalog s javnošću (koju Klee naziva narodom), što bi mu osiguravalo autoritet.⁶

Ako je svaki interpretativni pristup čiji je izvor, čak i vrlo dalek, u marksizmu, kastriran cenzorskom potrebom za potpunom koherentnošću, koju baca Tafurieva sjena, uzeti kao polazište

hladni realizam Piera Sraffe može dati koordinate novom pristupu, koji teži proširenju polja aktera koji su uključeni u trenutni sustav nekritičkog prihvaćanja i umorne rasprave oko arhitekture.

Za Sraffu je proizvodnja robe, analizirana kao apstrakcija preko rafiniranog sustava matematičkih jednadžbi čija jednostavnost plijeni, nezavisna od krivulja potražnje i ponude te se stoga ne odnosi na pitanja nestašice i obilja.

Kada robe korištene u proizvodnom procesu (Sraffa koristi pšenicu, željezo kao pojednostavljenja jednog uravnoteženog sustava) premaše zamjenu iskorištenih zaliha, stvara se prva kontradikcija, koju Sraffa identificira prepoznajući novu vrstu proizvoda, nazvanu „luksuznom robom“, koja se ne koristi ni kao proizvodno, niti kao sredstvo za opstanak. Proizvodi, kako oni osnovni, neophodni za proizvodnju drugih proizvoda, tako i luksuzni, povezani s pretjeranom vrijednošću, koja ponovno uspostavlja uravnoteženost jednadžbi, oblikuju kružne sustave, zajamčene ekonomskom morfologijom međusobnih odnosa. Primijenivši Sraffina konceptualna pravila može se smatrati da je arhitektura luksuzna roba, s obzirom da je povezana sa stvaranjem viška čija je vrijednost istinska i neizbježna i nije nikada osnovni proizvod koji se koristi u proizvodnji drugih roba.

Proglašeni nihilizam Manfreda Tafuria i uopće historiografije

Articulating the renewal of architectural criticism is going through processes that try to reconstruct a public sphere within which one could position and analyse projects and urban transformations that would change the spaces in which life evolves.

In fact, it might seem that most of the action in current architecture is taking place in an isolated system in vitro, referring to a limited number of subjects that constitute the extremes of simplistic triangulations: the commissioners, the system of the mass media (blurred between the extremes of the professional and academic milieu, where internal legitimization is realized without the instruments of mass diffusion), and finally the architects. In this displacement of power, the public may appear as a marginal element, reduced to the passive role of the observer, not so much of the architectural object, but rather of the space and place of life, as an element inserted into the flow of communication. The progressive omission of the hypothesis of a responsibility towards the collective represents the crystallization of tendencies that were already present in the modernist experience.

“Uns trägt kein Volk.” At the Jena symposium of 1924, Paul Klee demanded the necessary, yet missing support of the people for a profound reform of art and architecture as

disciplines, which could then participate in a more general movement of social and political progress. In its collective dimension, Bauhaus was for him the initial core of a community that would make it possible for the artist to be in constant dialogue with the public (which Klee called “the people”), which would grant him authority.⁶

If all interpretative approaches that have their source, however distant, in Marxism get castrated by the censorial need of extreme coherence, projected by Tafuri's shadow, adopting the cold realism of Piero Sraffa as a reference point might supply the coordinates for a new approach, seeking to expand the field of agents involved in the current system of uncritical acceptance and weary debate around architecture.

For Sraffa, the production of goods, analysed abstractly through a refined system of mathematical equations of fascinating simplicity, is independent from the curves of demand and offer, for which reason it cannot refer to the issues of scarcity and abundance.

When goods used in the process of production (Sraffa uses wheat and iron as simplifications of a balanced system) surpass the mere substitution of used resources, it creates the first contradiction, which is identified by Sraffa as he recognizes the emergence of a new class of products, the “luxury commodities,” which are used neither in production,

i teorije koja se razvila na temelju iskustava venecijanske škole arhitekture sedamdesetih godina može se radikalizirati pomoću izravne primjene Sraffine misli: ne postoji izlaz ili spas (ili ako postoji može biti iščitano samo kroz djelomičnost rezultata i namjera, suočenih s realitetom mogućeg – tako se na primjer može interpretirati u osnovi pozitivno vrednovanje frankfurtskih radova Ernsta Maya),⁷ ne zato što je kapital izoštrio svoju sposobnost usvajanja ukidajuće i transformirajuće vrijednosti avangarde, već zato jer arhitektura proizvodi objekte (građevine i projekte) koji su u svojoj biti roba, čak luksuzna, odnosno ne usko neophodna za održavanje ekonomskih sustava u kojima nastaje. Zanimljivo je primijetiti kako Sraffa razlaže formalne modele kojima opisuje ili projektira stvarnost, koji su ne-povijesni, čime postaje moguće zaobići vremensku cezuru koju je uveo Tafuri.

Ako upotreba Sraffine hipoteze i modela uništava bilo kakvo preživljavanje utješnih čitanja arhitekture i eliminira loše probavljene ostatke posthumnih interpretacija Tafurija (jer podzemni moralizam implicira da arhitekti mogu ili su mogli izabrati, kada u stvarnosti nikada nije bilo tako), onima koji se bave arhitekturom, s terijskog ili kritičkog stajališta, nameće se obaveza stvaranja okolnosti kako bi narod, već odsutan i dalek za Kleea, ponovo postupno dobio na prisutnosti.

Neizbježnost takvog djelovanja ovisi o širenju društvene baze aktivne u procesima urbanih i teritorijalnih promjena, što se sada događa na svjetskoj razini, koja je komplementarna širenju kolektivnog sudjelovanja u ekonomskim i političkim procesima, i stoga sposobna oblikovati moguće modele ponovnog konstituiranja i transformiranja modela suvereniteta.⁸ Polazeći od prihvaćanja Sraffine interpretacije moglo bi se hipotetski stoga smatrati arhitektonska djela (izgrađene građevine i projekte) kao čistu luksuznu robu. Sraffina hipoteza polazi od kvalitativnog vrednovanja samih roba, no uzete su u obzir samo kao relevantni faktori u međusobnim odnosima koji su algebarski opisani, i gdje razlikovanje između osnovnih proizvoda i proizvoda koji to nisu ovisi upravo o njihovom mjestu unutar proizvodnog procesa. No ako se vratimo praksama koje su uobičajene u ekonomiji i upravljanju, različitim metodama analize proizvoda (s korolarima povezanim s utjecajem na tržište, procjenom korisnika, razinama zadovoljstva, komercijalnim uspjehom, odnosima utroška/utrška, itd...), arhitekture bi mogle biti podvrgnute različitim procjenama i čitanjima od onih koja ritualno bivaju stvarana i reproducirana unutar aktualnih kulturnih krugova vezanih za projekt. Prijedlog je to koji ne podrazumijeva toliko slijepo prihvaćanje trgovačke logike koja pripada suvremenim uvjetima, koliko razumno umanjeње

ARHITEKTURA KAO
LUKSUZNA ROBA

ARCHITECTURE AS A
LUXURY COMMODITY

nor for survival. Products, both the basic ones, indispensable for producing other products, or the luxury commodities, associated to the surplus value, which re-establishes the balance of equations, form circular systems, guaranteed by the economic morphology of reciprocal relations. Applying Sraffa's conceptual rules, one may consider architecture to be a luxury commodity, since it is associated to the production of intrinsic and inevitable surplus value, and never functions as a basic product used in the production of other goods.

The alleged nihilism of Tafuri and, more generally, the historiography and theory elaborated on the basis of experiences of the Venetian school of architecture in the 1970s, can be radicalized by directly applying Sraffa's ideas: there is no escape or salvation (and if there is, it can be interpreted only from the partiality of results and intentions, faced with the reality of the possible – for example, the essentially positive evaluation of Ernst May's work at Frankfurt can be interpreted that way),⁷ not because capital has perfected its capacity of co-opting the destructive and transformative mind-set of the avant-garde, but because architecture produces objects (buildings and projects) that are essentially commodities, even luxury commodities, since they are not strictly necessary for sustaining economically the systems in which they emerge. It is interesting to observe how Sraffa elaborates the formal

models for describing or even designing the reality, which are non-historical, thus allowing him to avoid the chronological gap introduced by Tafuri.

If using Sraffa's hypothesis and model destroys the remnants of any comforting readings of architecture and eliminates all badly digested rests of posthumous interpretations of Tafuri (since underground moralization implies that the architects can or could choose, when in reality things never worked that way), those involved with architecture from a theoretical or critical standpoint have the duty of creating the conditions in which the people, already absent or distant for Klee, could gradually acquire a new presence. The inevitability of such action depends on expanding the social base that is actively involved in the processes of urban and territorial transformation currently taking place on the global level, which is complementary to the expansion of collective participation in economic and political processes, and therefore capable of creating possible models for reconstituting and transforming the models of sovereignty.⁸ Starting from the acceptance of Sraffa's interpretation, one may hypothetically consider works of architecture (constructed and planned buildings) as pure luxury commodities. Sraffa's hypothesis starts from a quality assessment of commodities as such, but they are considered merely as the relevant factors in relations that are taking place between them,

svetosti kritičkog čina povezanog s arhitekturom. Prvi logički korak, u kojem se arhitekturu izjednačilo s luksuznom robom, moraju ipak slijediti prijedlozi koji mogu ponovno dovesti analizu proizvoda u društvenu i kolektivnu sferu i koji stoga izvode *detournement* metoda vanjske procjene u odnosu na arhitekturu, čvrsto u rukama interesa ekonomije tržišta.⁹ Ne radi se ipak o zamjeni koncepta javnosti s onima konzumenata ili klijenata, koliko o postavljanju hipoteze koordinata jedne teorije i kritike arhitekture koja bi mogla imati zadatak čitanja i izražavanja društvenih efekata projekta, efekata koji u brojnim prilikama, bilo negativnog bilo pozitivnog predznaka, mogu biti smatrani kolateralnim, odnosno otuđeni od kontrole namjera projekta, onih naručitelja i onih projektanata.

Moguće je ocrtati prvu skicu potencijalnih i heterogenih uporišta, oko kojih valja zgrušati iskustva *konkretne* kritike arhitekture.

Prvi bi prilozima mogli uključivati koncept mnogostrukosti jezika, na način Giancarla De Carla s kraja osamdesetih godina; razmatranje psihičke dimenzije arhitekture, koju insinuirao rad Jeana-Françoisa Chevrieria; uključivanje vremenskog unutar opisnih praksi urbanog, što je usavršio Stefano Boeri; i konačno definiciju tehničkih objekata Sanforda Kwintera. Koncept višestrukosti jezika, usavršen unutar vanjskih

seminara ILA&UD, koje je De Carlo vodio u Urbino i Sieni na prijelazu osamdesetih u devedesete godine, uvodi mogućnost polifonične modulacije poruka sredstvom arhitektonskog projekta, oslonjenu na racionalnost modernističkog tipa, odnosno sposobnu zadovoljiti osnovne zahtjeve udobnosti i jednostavnosti upotrebe. Za De Carla dijaloško uključivanje (koje je uslijedilo nakon faze njegova rada na temi sudjelovanja) razlučivanja korisnika moralo je omogućiti da se djelo obraća različitim publikama, koje su se okupljale privremeno prema svojim prolaznim interesima. Za De Carla, koji je ovo razmišljanje oblikovao u sazvučju s konceptom uslojavanja značenja (*layering of meanings*) Alison i Petera Smithsona, primjer (to značajniji s obzirom na njegovo opiranje korištenju učenih navoda u argumentaciji) je bila kinematografija Charlia Chaplina, gdje se mnogostrukost jezika podudarala s uslojavanjem i supostojanjem narativnih tonova (komičnog, grotesknog, tragičnog, farse).¹⁰ Mogućnost razlikovanja načina projektiranja i naracije arhitekture, koji mogu uhvatiti eventualnu koegzistenciju različitih i eventualno kontradiktornih čitanja, stvorila bi stoga moguću platformu za analizu i otvorenu diskusiju.

Pristupi Chevrieria i Boeria predlažu smjerove koje valja slijediti, sugerirajući metodologije koje se trenutno ne koriste dovoljno. Za Chevrieria kritika koja uključuje psihološku ili

mathematically described, and in which differentiation between basic products and non-basic products depends precisely on their place within the processes of production.

Yet coming back to those practices that are typical of economy and business engineering, to various methods of analysing products (with corollaries related to the influence they have upon the market, the estimated number of users, the levels of satisfaction, the commercial success, the relationship between investment and profit, etc...), architecture may be subject to other types of assessment and interpretation than those that are ritually produced and reproduced within the current cultural circles linked to the project. It is a proposal that does not imply blind acceptance of the marketing logic that applies to the contemporary situation, but rather a reasonable decrease in the sacral character of the critical act related to architecture. However, the first logical step, in which architecture has been identified with luxury commodities, must be followed by proposals that might again conduct the product analysis within a social and collective sphere, and therefore perform a *detournement* of methods of heteronomous evaluation with respect to architecture, firmly in the hands of interests of the marketing economy.⁹ Nevertheless, it is not about substituting the concept of the public through that of the consumers or clients, but rather about reflecting on the coordinates for a

theory and criticism of architecture that would take on the task of interpreting and articulating the social effects of the project, effects that in many cases, be it negatively or positively, may be considered collateral, or rather alien to the control of the project's intentions, both of the commissioner and of the architects.

Thus it would be possible to construct the first landscape of potential and heterogeneous points of reference, to which the experiences of *concrete* criticism of architecture could be attached. The first contributions might include the concept of multiple languages as elaborated by Giancarlo De Carlo in the late 1980s; the considerations of the psychological dimension of architecture as indicated by the work of Jean-François Chevrier; the inclusion of temporality in the descriptive urban practices as perfected by Stefano Boeri; and eventually the definition of technological objects by Sanford Kwinter.

The concept of multiple languages, perfected at the external seminars of ILA&UD, led by De Carlo at Urbino and Siena at the turn of the 1980s and 1990s, introduced the possibility of a polyphonic modulation of messages carried by the architectural project, yet sustained by the rationality of a modernist type, that is, capable of satisfying the basic demands of comfort and simplicity of use. For De Carlo, the dialogic inclusion (which ensued already after the phase of working on the topics

psihičku dimenziju arhitekture mogla bi sondirati odnos realiziranog projekta s onima koji ga koriste, garantirajući lepezu pomnih i preciznih čitanja, prikladnih individualnostima pojedinaca koji stoga izmiču hipotezi o idealnim tipovima korisnika. Nadalje, pažnja usmjerena fenomenima poticanja psiholoških efekata omogućuje prijelaz iz isključivo vizualnog polja arhitekture, razmatrajući gamu različitih uvjeta u odnosu na načine korištenja djela.¹¹

Za Boeria uključivanje vremenske dimenzije unutar postupaka opisa gradskog, i stoga arhitekture, omogućilo bi oslobođenje od potpuno formalne i vizualne procjene, čime bi se garantiralo razumijevanje dugotrajnih efekata koje su djelo ili projekt potakli, a koji ne mogu biti izmjereni odmah. Ne radi se o uključivanju vremenske dimenzije urbanog, koliko o postavljanju hipoteze da se kritika arhitekture mora proširiti na produženo trajanje projekta, osmislivši načine usporenog praćenja projekta, čime postaje sposobnom izvijestiti o utjecaju na zajednice izravno dotaknute djelom.¹² Boeri sugerira neke narativne načine, prikladne za gradnju prikaza gradskog prostora, koji impliciraju fizičku prisutnost autora na mjestima kojima je oduzeta apstraktna udaljenost od objekta i nizanje pravilnih akcija. Kritička praksa koja preračunava ove sugestije u druga mjerila može pružiti neke elemente za upravljanje prethodno opisanim prevratom u analizi proizvoda.

Sanford Kwinter razvija dualizam, komplementaran ovdje skiciranoj hipotezi: svaka arhitektura je tehnički objekt i svaki tehnički objekt je arhitektura, smatrajući da se svakom objektu može pridružiti sklop društvenih praksi. Pažnja koju Kwinter sugerira da mora biti posvećena gomili izvedbenih akcija povezanih s arhitektonskim objektom, metaforički uspoređenim s logikom stroja (sata, panoptičkog sustava, razglasila), sugerira put za moguća odvajanja od konvencionalnih načina čitanja arhitekture.

Za Kwintera procjena efekata projektiranja u odnosu na izmještanje tijela, individualno i kolektivno, pomiče kritički naglasak prema politizaciji aktualnih projektantskih praksi.¹³ U svakom slučaju teorijski je moguće prijeći fine razlike između robe, proizvoda i tehničkog objekta.

Ovdje izloženi fragmentarni elementi, zajedno s daljnjim i brojnim drugim, koji bi morali stvoriti kritičku masu konstelacije doprinosa, potencijalno omogućuju da se kritika arhitekture kao luksuzne robe, u suglasju sa zatvorenom Sraffinom logikom, dogodi na način da se riječ luksuz postupno izostavlja, oslabljena u postupnom oniričkom zaboravu, zahvaljujući nesmiljenom ponovnom procvatu glasova imitacije naroda koji je evocirao Klee, što konačno može postati pozadina i akter akcije projekta.

of participation) of the differentiation of users was meant to ensure that the work would address different sorts of public, which would sporadically reunite according to their temporary interests. For De Carlo, who formulated that reflection in accordance with the concept of the layering of meanings as evolved by Alison and Peter Smithson, the model (which is significant regarding his reluctance to use erudite quotations in his arguments) was Charlie Chaplin's cinema, where multiple languages coincided with the layering and coexistence of narrative tones (comic, grotesque, tragic, farce).¹⁰ The possibility of differentiating between the modes of projection and narration in architecture, which could capture the possible coexistence of different, perhaps even contradictory readings, would thus create a potential platform for analysis and open discussion.

The approaches of Chevrier and Boeri propose various directions to pursue, suggesting methodologies that are today insufficiently practiced. For Chevrier, a criticism that would include the psychological or mental dimension of architecture might probe the relationship between the realized project and those who use it, guaranteeing a whole range of careful and accurate readings, adjusted to individual persons and thus evading the hypothesis of ideal user types. Moreover, paying attention to the phenomena that trigger various psychological

effects makes it possible to transcend the exclusively visual field of architecture, considering a whole spectrum of different circumstances in relation to the ways of using the object.¹¹ For Boeri, including the temporal dimension in descriptive urban practices, and therefore in architecture, would make it possible to get rid of the purely formal and visual evaluation, guaranteeing the comprehension of long-term effects triggered by the work or the project, effects that could not be measured from the immediate vicinity. It is not about including the temporal dimension of the urban, but rather about proposing that architectural criticism should extend to the whole duration of the project, providing the ways in which to observe it over a longer period of time, which would take into account the impact on the community that has been directly involved.¹² Boeri has suggested certain narrative methods, appropriate for constructing a model of urban space, which imply the author's physical presence in places, which would thus lose its abstract detachment and its series of isolated actions. A critical practice that would convert these suggestions into other scales might provide certain elements around which one might organize the subversion of the aforementioned product analysis. Sanford Kwinter has developed a dualism that is complementary to the hypothesis we have outlined here: each piece of architecture is a technological object and each

¹ Piero Sraffa, *Production of Commodities by Means of Commodities. Prelude to a Critique of Economic Theory*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1960. (hrvatski prijevod: Piero Sraffa, *Proizvodnja roba pomoću roba: preludij za kritiku ekonomske teorije*, Centar za kulturnu djelatnost Saveza socijalističke omladine, Zagreb, 1980.)

² Manfredo Tafuri, *Progetto e utopia. Architettura e sviluppo capitalistico*, Laterza, Bari, 1973.

³ Umberto Eco, *Lector in Fabula: la cooperazione interpretativa nei testi narrativi*, Bompiani, Milano, 1979.

⁴ Kontinuitet Tafurieva promišljanja primijenjenog na suvremenost evidentno je prekinut: kritika ideologije arhitekture još uvijek je otvoren teren, koji bi se mogao ponovno zaposjesti i istražiti, s drugim instrumentima i istražujući sredstva komunikacije koja omogućuju približavanje široj publici. Niz vježbi svjedoči o nužnosti postojanja (obaveze, gotovo proizašle iz beskrayne elaboracije gubitka) dijalektičkog odnosa s Tafurievom mišlju, ako ne i stvarnog čitanja i razvoj nekih pravaca koje je naznačio. Mogu se navesti kao postaje jednog podzemnog interesa, koji povremeno izbije na površinu, dva seminara, „Riscrivere Tafuri“ (Ponovo pisati Tafuria), koji je koordinirao Marco De Michelis pri venecijanskom IUAVU, akademske godine 2004.–2005. i „The critical Legacies of Manfredo Tafuri“ (Kritičke ostavštine Manfreda Tafuria), koji je koordinirao Daniel Sherer pri Sveučilištu Columbia, travanj 2006.

⁵ Bez tračka ironije, Jacques Herzog izjavljuje da najbolji klijent za arhitekta ne mora biti ni previše demokratičan ali ni previše autoritativan, implicitno se pozivajući na recentne projekte biroa Herzog & de Meuron u Kini. Nedavna polemika oko rezultata natječaja koji je raspisao Gazprom za svoje sjedište u Petrogradu indikator je složenog odnosa između političke i ekonomske moći, krajnje izgaranje neriješenih kontradikcija koje su se nakupljale godinama, i pokazuje da prividno lukave manipulacije nekih autora ne ulaze u bit izraza stvarnih odnosa kapitalističke proizvodnje i akumulacije.

⁶ Paul Klee, *Paul Klee in Jena – der Vortrag*, Kunsthistorisches Seminar/ Druckhaus Jena, Jena, 1999.

U izlaganju Klee spominje Bauhaus s bolnim tonom svijesti o stvarnom utjecaju u odnosu na zahtijevane promjene. „Našli smo dijelove, no nedostaje nam cjelina. Nedostaje nam ova krajnja snaga u odsutnosti naroda koji nas podržava. Mi tražimo podršku naroda: započeli smo u Bauhausu zajednicu kojoj smo dali sve ono što smo imali. Nismo mogli učiniti više...“

⁷ Manfredo Tafuri, Francesco dal Co, *Architettura Contemporanea*, Electa, Milano, 1975.

⁸ Ovome se gibanju može pridodati prijevod unutar polja arhitektonske struke aktualne filozofske rasprave o zamjeni koncepta „naroda“ konceptom „mnoštva“ (kao što je to analizirano u teoretskom radu grupe Krisis, Paola Virna, Antonia Negria i Michaela Hardta).

⁹ Pri koherentnoj, ako ne automatskoj, primjeni Sraffine vizije sva je arhitektura luksuzna roba, ne samo ona koja se odnedavno povezuje s naručiteljima uobičajeno povezivanim s luksuznim tržištem (Prada, Louis Vuitton, Tod's, itd.).

¹⁰ ILA&UD, *Reading and design of the physical environment*, Quattroventi, Urbino, 1992.

¹¹ Jean-François Chevrier, *Monumento e intimitad*, u: El Croquis (Herzog & de Meuron), 129/130, 2006.

¹² Stefano Boeri, *Eclectic Atlases*, u: VV. AA., *Documenta Documents*, 3, Kassel, 1997.

¹³ Sanford Kwinter, *Architectures of Time. Toward a Theory of the Event in Modernist Culture*, MIT Press, Cambridge MA, 2001.

technological object is architecture, considering the fact that a set of social practices can be associated to each object. Attention that must be paid, according to Kwinter, to the abundance of performative actions linked to the architectural object, metaphorically identified with the logic of the machine (a clock, a panoptical system, a sound system), suggests the possible ways of abandoning the conventional readings of architecture.

For Kwinter, taking account of the effects of architecture as to the displacement of the body, both individual and collective, shifts the critical emphasis towards politicizing current architectural practices.¹³ In any case, in theory it is possible to blur the borderlines between commodities, products, and technological objects.

The fragmentary elements presented here, together with many others, which should create a critical mass of contributions, might make it possible that the criticism of architecture as a luxury commodity, in accordance with Sraffa's hermetic logic, should evolve in such a way that the word "luxury" may be gradually omitted, weakened in progressive oniric oblivion, owing to the inexorable new thriving of the voices of a simulacrum of the people evoked by Klee, which could eventually become the background and the agent in accomplishing the project.

¹ Piero Sraffa, *Production of Commodities by Means of Commodities. Prelude to a Critique of Economic Theory* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1960).

² Manfredo Tafuri, *Progetto e utopia. Architettura e sviluppo capitalistico* (Bari: Laterza, 1973).

³ Umberto Eco, *Lector in Fabula: la cooperazione interpretativa nei testi narrativi* (Milan: Bompiani, 1979).

⁴ The continuity of Tafuri's reflection as applied to the contemporary situation has obviously been broken: criticism of the ideology of architecture is still an open field, which could be re-conquered and explored with other instruments and by searching for those means of communication that would bring it closer to the general public. A number of attempts testify of the necessity of existence (an obligation, almost a result of endless elaboration on the loss) of a dialectic relationship with Tafuri's ideas, perhaps even an actual reading and developing certain directions that he has indicated. Two seminars can be mentioned as stages of an underground interest, which occasionally breaks out: "Riscrivere Tafuri" (Rewriting Tafuri), coordinated by Marco De Michelis at IUAV in Venice, during the academic year 2004/2005, and "The Critical Legacies of Manfredo Tafuri", coordinated by Daniel Sherer at Columbia University in April 2006.

⁵ Without a trace of irony, Jacques Herzog has stated that the best client for an architect should be neither too democratic, nor too authoritative, implicitly referring to the recent projects of Herzog & de Meuron studio in China. The recent debate over the result of Gazprom's architectural contest for its centre in St Petersburg indicates the complex relationship between political and economic power, and the final explosion of unsolved contradictions that had been accumulating for years, showing that the apparently cunning manipulations of some authors do not hit the core of the actual relationships between capitalist production and accumulation of capital.

⁶ Paul Klee, *Paul Klee in Jena – der Vortrag*, Kunsthistorisches Seminar/

ARHITEKTURA KAO
LUKSUZNA ROBA

ARCHITECTURE AS A
LUXURY COMMODITY

45

Druckhaus Jena, Jena, 1999.

In his lecture, Klee mentioned Bauhaus in painful tones that reveal his awareness of its actual impact with respect to the demanded changes. "We have found some pieces, but we are still missing the whole. We lack that last power in the absence of the supporting people. We need people's support: in Bauhaus we initiated a community to which we gave everything we had. We couldn't have done more..."

⁷ Manfredo Tafuri, Francesco dal Co, *Architettura Contemporanea* (Milan: Electa, 1975).

⁸ To this motion we may add the translation within the field of architectural discipline, that is, the current philosophical debate on substituting the concept of "people" through that of "multitude" (as analyzed in the theoretical work of the Krisis group, Paol Virn, Antoni Negri, and Michael Hardt).

⁹ In the coherent, if not automatic application of Sraffa's vision, all architecture becomes a luxury commodity, rather than that which has recently become connected to the commissioners commonly related to the luxury market (Prada, Louis Vuitton, Tod's, etc.).

¹⁰ ILA&UD, *Reading and Design of the Physical Environment* (Urbino: Quattroventi, 1992).

¹¹ Jean-François Chevrier, *Monumento e intimidad*, in: *El Croquis* (Herzog & De Meuron), 129/130, 2006.

¹² Stefano Boeri, *Eclectic Atlases*, in: Various authors, *Documenta Documents*, 3, Kassel, 1997.

¹³ Sanford Kwinter, *Architectures of Time. Toward a Theory of the Event in Modernist Culture* (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2001).