



THE UNIVERSITY *of* EDINBURGH

Edinburgh Research Explorer

Framing Colomina

Citation for published version:

Kaminer, T 2009, 'Framing Colomina', *Footprint*, no. 4, pp. 129-38.
<<http://www.footprintjournal.org/issues/show/agency-in-architecture-reframing-criticality-in-theory-and-practice>>

Link:

[Link to publication record in Edinburgh Research Explorer](#)

Document Version:

Publisher's PDF, also known as Version of record

Published In:

Footprint

Publisher Rights Statement:

© Kaminer, T. (2009). Framing Colomina. Footprint, (4), 129-38.

General rights

Copyright for the publications made accessible via the Edinburgh Research Explorer is retained by the author(s) and / or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing these publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

Take down policy

The University of Edinburgh has made every reasonable effort to ensure that Edinburgh Research Explorer content complies with UK legislation. If you believe that the public display of this file breaches copyright please contact openaccess@ed.ac.uk providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.



Framing Colomina

Tahl Kaminer

Traditionally, the primary object of study for the architectural historian has been either the building or the architect's life and oeuvre. Reading *Vers une architecture*, for example, was a means of studying not the book itself but Le Corbusier and his designs. Sometime in the 1990s several architectural historians shifted their attention from buildings to publications, exhibitions, films and photographs produced by architects. Previously deemed to be mere instruments enabling access to the buildings themselves, these 'side products' of the discipline have themselves become the objects of scrutiny. Among architectural historians who began researching these media products are Beatriz Colomina, Christine Boyer, and Catherine de Smets,¹ scholars of diverse generations employing disparate approaches and methodologies in their research. To a certain extent, even Adrian Forty's Barthian-structuralist argument for the significance of architectural vocabulary in the opening pages of *Words and Buildings* participated in this shift.² More than any other work, however, it is Beatriz Colomina's *Privacy and Publicity* that has come to represent this growing interest of architectural historians.³

It is reasonable to attribute this shift to the late twentieth-century expansion in media available to and used by architects; however, it can also be seen as an implicit rejection of the idea of architecture as agency and therefore related to the architectural retreat from social concerns into the realm of culture, beginning with the dissipation of modernism

three decades ago. Whereas the focus on the building as a physical object locates architecture firmly in the realm of material production - as part of what Marxists call the structural base - culture has generally been associated with the superstructure, thus at a certain distance from material reality. In the 1970s, Charles Jencks redefined architecture as a mode of communication, rejecting any idea of architectural efficacy in the social sphere; Colin Rowe located the essence of architecture in ideal geometric types, distanced from everyday life and society; Robert Venturi, despite using reality as a point of departure, proposed a new symbolic language for the discipline; Peter Eisenman studied the formal language of architecture.⁴

The growing interest of architectural historians in media is intimately related to these changes within the discipline in the last decades - the growing interest in linguistics, representation, and formalism, and the waning desire to affect society. These changes, in turn, relate to the rise of post-industrial society and its response not to the social critique of society - the demand for higher wages, equality and job stability - but to the artistic critique of society - the demand for freedom, creativity and difference. 'Culture' was the realm in which this critique could be best addressed. Neo-Marxist scholars, following Gramsci and Althusser's recognition of the role of the superstructure - however limited - in shaping society, turned to the study of culture. Neoconservatives, in contrast, understood 'culture' as a sphere totally independent from the material

base. Satisfying individual desires via culture was for the neoconservatives the means of escaping the impasse of the period - the economic downturn, political stagnation and social disintegration - and directly related to the restructuring of society and economy which followed, namely, the passage from Keynesian to neoliberal economy. Thus, the architectural retreat from social concern was part and parcel of a much broader transformation taking place.⁵

Within the context of such broad transformations, the participation of architectural historians in these changes has, perhaps, relatively minor significance for society. However, when assessed within the narrow framework of the relation of the discipline of architecture to society, the role and relevance of the work in question is clear: identifying legitimate fields of operation for the discipline by offering interpretations and understandings of architecture that implicitly express society's specific worldview or 'logic'. *Privacy and Publicity* is reviewed here as a means of taking a closer look at the specific interests and methodologies of one of the best known examples of this recent trend among architecture historians. As this review article directs to Colomina some of the questions she poses to Loos and Le Corbusier, it ends up being, no less than *Privacy and Publicity*, an 'excursion in the superstructure' and a journey into fiction. The 'journey' suggests that understanding architecture as a form of cultural representation leads to a closed circuit - perhaps reflective or even reflexive, but with little consequence for understanding the material world. The retreat from social concern offers no exit route, no efficacy, and no agency. The following review article employs Colomina's own methodology in order to demonstrate that as long as the architectural discipline continues to understand its production merely in terms of cultural representation, it will remain 'locked' in a hall of mirrors.

Privacy and Publicity studies mass media, the

public and the private, feminism, and the work of the modernist masters Adolf Loos and Le Corbusier. The book's narrative, a rich tapestry of interwoven storylines, leads the reader on a surprising, even bewildering journey, ultimately reshaping the reader's understanding of early modernism. Colomina launches this journey by contrasting Loos's instructions to destroy his Vienna archive with Le Corbusier's obsessive collecting and archiving. Through the ensuing chapters, 'Archive', 'City', 'Photography', 'Publicity', 'Museum', 'Interior' and 'Window', the author describes the introduction of mass media into modernist architecture, emphasising the publicness involved in publishing photographs, books or making films of interiors. The uncanny, Freud's *unheimlich*, lurks in the margins of the narrative, in the passage from interiority to exposure, from the human to the mechanical eye, in the feeling of concealment which underlies the story.

The narrative fluctuates between several protagonists and the intersections of their stories. The structure emulates a complex novel, with the intersections serving as the nodes in which one protagonist takes over the lead role from another. The protagonists - mass media, Le Corbusier and Loos, the public-private, the interior-exterior, the inside-outside, femininity, and the camera - relate to each other. Mass media, for example, serves to study Le Corbusier and Loos - and vice versa, the two architects become a means of studying architectural mass media. Alternatively, the study of the interiors of Loos and Le Corbusier leads to the exposing of the role of femininity in early modernism and mass media. Colomina's positions are not transparent. The flowing narrative masks her methodology of work and the ideology it expresses, ignoring Barthes's warning that 'the capital sin in criticism is not ideology but the silence by which it is masked'.⁶

Colomina's analysis of the work of Loos and Le

Corbusier suggests 'thinking of architecture as media'.⁷ Consequently, one of her aims is to overturn the assumption that modernist architecture was part of a pure, 'untainted' high art: '[T]he concept of the "machine age" has served the critical purpose of sustaining the myth of the "modern movement" as an autonomous artistic practice.'⁸ She adds that:

*The conventional view portrays modern architecture as a high artistic practice established in opposition to mass culture and everyday life [...] it has neglected the overwhelming historical evidence of modern architecture's continuous involvement with mass culture.*⁹

Colomina prefers to see Le Corbusier's liaison with mass media as 'the insertion of architecture into the contemporary conditions of production',¹⁰ to which it is necessary to compare Walter Benjamin's dictum in 'The Author as Producer': 'Before I ask: what is a work's position *vis-à-vis* the production relations of its time, I should like to ask: what is its position *within* them?'.¹¹ In contrast to Benjamin, Colomina rids the term 'production' of its Marxist overtones and its relation to the structural base; instead, 'production' in *Privacy and Publicity* relates architecture to mass media and mass culture. The prefix 'mass' suggests that mass media and mass culture are an expression of industrial production - as in the mass production of newspapers, for example. However, 'culture' is within the realm of the superstructure, and much of the new media of the twentieth century blurs the differences in mode of production between 'mass' and its reverse; 'mass' ends up referring to the scale of circulation and popularity rather than the mode of production. Mass culture belongs to the superstructure no less than high culture, and Colomina's use of 'production' takes part in the retreat from 'society' into the safety of 'culture'. The architect is here reduced to a producer of culture.

An important issue in *Privacy and Publicity* is what seems to be at first merely a subtext: questioning

the architects' treatment of women. Throughout the book the author refers to femininity with allusions that are left undeveloped, as though they were a separate, less important story than the one being told. When discussing the photographs of the Villa Savoye, for example, such remarks are left hanging in the air, unresolved:

*[A]nd now, where did the gentleman go? Because of course, as you would have noticed already, the personal objects are all male objects (never a handbag, a lipstick, or some piece of women's clothing). But before that. We are following somebody.*¹²

It is Colomina's remark on femininity in the closing paragraph of the book that leaves little doubt regarding its central role, tying together some of the narrative's 'loose ends':

*Given that the media are so frequently identified with the feminine, it is not surprising to find that this slippage is not neutral in gender terms. Male fashion is uncomfortable but provides the bearer with 'the gaze', 'the dominant sign'. Woman's fashion is practical and modern but turns her into the object of another's gaze [...]. If for Le Corbusier the woman is the very figure of modernity, the status of that figure remains troubling.*¹³

Examining the covert while ignoring the overt is a strategy used repeatedly throughout the book. Colomina plays the role of a detective, searching for her evidence with a magnifying glass. She exclaims, for example, that '[t]he look into these photographs is a forbidden look. The look of a detective'.¹⁴ Like Chandler's Philip Marlowe, she reveals gaps and inconsistencies in the search for evidence: 'yet another passage remarkably omitted in the first English version of his [Loos's] text "Architektur" (1910)', she notes in one instance.¹⁵

The critic or interpreter's search for evidence -

whether in a text, photograph or any other document - is common practice. Gombrich had called such activity 'historical detective work'.¹⁶ Nevertheless, it seems that Colomina goes much further than others, rigorously examining every hidden detail. Robin Evans has written of this type of work that:

*The trouble with most criticism, and particularly that brand of interpretive criticism associated with iconology, is that meaning is assumed to exist behind, beneath or within the subjects of criticism. The task of the critic is to delve into, uncover, disclose, reveal, divulge, discover, unfold and show to the reader what lies hidden or unseen [...] we might well ask what lies beside, above and in front of the subject of criticism too.*¹⁷

Privacy and Publicity manifests the belief that truth is always obscured and concealed, that truth cannot exist at face value. Thus the detective strategy creates the danger of overemphasising the insignificant and overlooking the substantial. This issue can be expanded by questioning the legitimacy of photographic evidence. The book offers a clear argument to buttress Colomina's reliance on photographs:

*The building should be understood in the same terms as drawings, photographs, writing, films, and advertisements; not only because these are the media in which more often we encounter it, but because the building is a mechanism of representation in its own right.*¹⁸

This argument illustrates the idealism at the centre of Colomina's methodology, an idealism which dematerialises the realised building itself, reducing the material object to 'a mechanism of representation'. It is possible to identify another motivation for the author's reliance on photographs, suggested in Barthes's description of the panorama as a view that 'permits us to transcend sensation and to see things *in their structure*'.¹⁹ Colomina's

use of photography is similar: photographs create a distance between the viewer and what is being observed, a distance that enables the viewer to discern the structure of things. The photograph removes the distorting, limiting effect of experience, permitting an intellectualised mode of viewing. In this sense, the role of the photograph in *Privacy and Publicity* echoes the role of the panoramic view as described by Barthes or that of the 'disinterested' aesthetic reception of art.

Tafari has already drawn the correlation between the panorama and a mechanical vision device in Le Corbusier's Beistegui apartment: 'The distance interposed between the penthouse and the Parisian panorama is secured by a technological device, the periscope.'²⁰ Colomina substitutes a camera for the periscope and inverts the model, looking at, rather than from, Le Corbusier's work, or, in fact, at photographs of the work. Barthes goes on to say: 'This activity of the mind, conveyed by the tourist's modest glance, has a name: decipherment.'²¹ The distance at work in Colomina's gaze reflects the remoteness of her objects of analysis from the world of material production.

The doubt regarding the act of decipherment, raised above in the quotation from Evans, can be expanded to questioning the validity of photographs as evidence. The understanding of the photographic image as neutral, objective and truthful - expressing the perception of the photograph as a trace of reality - was fundamental for establishing the role of the press photograph as well as for the use of images as court evidence. Such an understanding was prominent also in the art world among photographers such as Paul Strand and Edward Steichen. The critique of this view has its own history, dating back to the Surrealist onslaught on objectivity and reason.

Michelangelo Antonioni's film *Blow Up* (1966) examines certain aspects of the photograph that

can cast serious doubts over Colomina's use of it as evidence. The film's protagonist, Thomas, is both a fashion and art photographer. Inspired by the excellent light conditions, he photographs a couple in a park. The photographed woman raises his suspicion by pursuing him and demanding the film roll, and consequently Thomas develops the negative and prints the images. After examining the prints with a magnifying glass, he blows up sections of the images. Thomas believes he can detect in the blow-ups evidence of a murder. He returns to the park, discovers a body in the bushes. Later his prints and negative, as well as the body, disappear, leaving Thomas to question his experience. The methodology employed by Thomas - the inspection of a photograph with a magnifying glass and the enlargement of the image - parallels Colomina's careful study of architectural photographs and segments of the photographs in order to identify the necessary evidence 'concealed' within the images. Antonioni has said of this process that 'it was precisely by photographing and enlarging the surface of the things around me that I sought to discover what was behind those things'.²² However, as the image is blown up it also becomes more diffuse, blurry and, consequently, more difficult to decipher.

Early in the film, a friend of Thomas, a painter, provides an explanation of the methodology employed by Thomas - and Colomina, by extension - when speaking of his own paintings: 'They don't mean a thing when I do them, I find something to hang on to ... it adds up. It's like finding a clue in a detective story.' Many of the meanings Colomina identifies in Le Corbusier's photographs were, in the first place, 'inserted' by her; the evidence is not planted, but is misconstrued, subordinated to a preconceived idea, 'adding up'.

While *Blow Up* raises doubts about the relation of photographs to reality, and about the act of magnification as a means of discovering clues,

Peter Greenaway's film *The Draughtsman's Contract* (1982) goes further, demonstrating that representations are open to multiple interpretations, and in doing so, shaking the foundations of *Privacy and Publicity* by undermining the validity of images as evidence. Here a master draughtsman is commissioned to create twelve drawings of a mansion. Mr. Neville, the arrogant draughtsman, understands his work as objective: 'I try hard never to distort or dissemble', he announces. His use of a viewing apparatus in order to create an 'exact' duplication of reality strengthens the similarities between the drawing and the representation's claim of a direct link to reality. Evidence of a murder is found in Mr. Neville's drawings, and is used to frame him, leading to his lynching in the final scene. Mrs. Talmann, the daughter of the owner of the mansion, is the first to point out this evidence, describing the suspicious items of clothing that have invaded Mr. Neville's drawings, before continuing: 'Do you think that before long you might find the body that inhabited all those clothes?'; Mr. Neville: 'You rush ahead, Mrs. Talmann. The items are innocent!'; Mrs. Talmann: 'Taken one by one they would so be construed, taken together could be regarded as witness to misadventure.'

It is tempting to see Mr. Neville as Le Corbusier, believing in the innocence and objectivity of both his designs and their representation, and Mrs. Talmann as Colomina, interpreting the representations and uncovering evidence that will 'frame' Le Corbusier for a crime [fig. 1]. However, the film suggests other interpretations of the drawings, thus casting doubt over the validity of Mrs. Talmann / Colomina's reading. Mr. Noise, one of the courtiers, tries to sell the drawings to Mr. Talmann by claiming they include allegorical evidence of his wife's infidelity. Mrs. Talmann retorts to her husband's accusations by saying that the courtiers 'see, then, what they have long been searching for' - an accusation which could also be directed to Mrs. Talmann / Colomina.

The multitude of interpretations in *The Draughtsman's Contract* is enabled by a limiting of vision,²³ which is also one of the themes of *Privacy and Publicity*. Colomina describes a photograph of Charlotte Perriand, a collaborator of Le Corbusier, in which Perriand 'is almost an attachment to the wall. She sees nothing'.²⁴ Another instance is Le Corbusier's framing of the landscape in the Beistegui apartment: 'the views from the inside and outside spaces of the apartment are also technologically controlled'.²⁵ Yet it is Colomina who limits her readers' vision by excluding alternative interpretations. This control already begins with the description of the images; in the following example she describes a woman appearing in the film *L'Architecture d'aujourd'hui*: 'She is wearing "inside" (informal) clothes and high heels and she holds to the handrail as she goes up [...] She appears vulnerable. Her body is fragmented'.²⁶ The description is neither objective nor innocent - it is already an interpretation. It is Colomina's description of the still which turns it into 'evidence'. Thus, Colomina, like Mrs. Talmann, relies on the presumed link of representations to reality while, in effect, manipulating their interpretation, and consequently shaping the reader's understanding of architectural history.

It is apparent by now that Colomina is questioning the place of femininity in Le Corbusier's work. She judges Loos in a similar manner earlier in the book; he is an easy target:

*And when this 'degeneration' becomes clearly identified as homosexuality, Loos's raid against ornament is not only gender-loaded but openly homophobic. The main target of Loos's attack becomes the effeminate architect, 'the decorator'.*²⁷

Suggesting that men born long before women had voting rights were patriarchal is a redundant argument; it is self-evident. The justification for such a pursuit would be that Le Corbusier and Loos figure

as a means of exposing a social code that exists and persists even today, namely, that architecture is tainted by patriarchy. Consequently, it can be claimed that Le Corbusier does not appear in *Privacy and Publicity* as an individual, but rather as the figurehead of the modernist movement, as a public figure. Colomina, therefore, like her protagonists, projects the private into the public sphere, from interior to exterior. The traces of structuralism throughout the book suggest that it is Le Corbusier the public figure and the social code which are 'framed' in the book. However, such a critique of ideology remains within the superstructure, addressing ideals, ideas, and worldview while ignoring the structural base.

Earlier it has been suggested that *Privacy and Publicity* can be seen as a novel; more precisely, it can be described as a detective novel. However, the nature of the evidence Colomina has collected implies another possibility. Mrs. Talmann's observations regarding the draughtsman's drawings - 'taken one by one they would so be construed, taken together could be regarded as witness to misadventure' - could be directed also to the photographic evidence Colomina collects. A series of photographs does not only create a complete picture; it also forms a film sequence.

Colomina attributes to Le Corbusier the sensibilities of a film director and associates moving image with his work: 'The house is no more than a series of views choreographed by the visitor, the way a filmmaker effects the montage of a film'.²⁸ And also: 'The repetition of units with windows at slightly different angles, different framings, [...] suggests again the idea of a movie strip, each apartment's window a still'.²⁹ If *Privacy and Publicity* and its narrative can be understood as a film, then the position Colomina occupies is that of the director. The detective in this *film noir* is the camera, Colomina's alter ego. Both the camera and the alter ego are extensions of the subject - the former as an artificial limb, the latter as the double of the subject.³⁰ The camera is often in




Fig. 1: Le Corbusier frames the view - the landscape - and imposes on it a controlling geometry with the window frame and subdivisions. He ends up 'framing' himself (published by permission of Pictoright). Greenaway's draughtsman imposes his own rigid geometry on the landscape, but is later 'framed' for murder by his own device (courtesy of BFI Stills).

the background, but in the last chapter, 'Windows', it moves to the fore, assuming the leading role. As the plot develops, the camera transforms. From being a passive mechanical device used by a photographer to collect the evidence, it proceeds to become an independent witness. The photographer - the subject - disappears and the camera becomes an 'objective' surveillance camera:

*In the corner of the room a camera is set on a tripod. It is the reflection on the mirror of the camera taking the photograph. As viewers of this photograph we are in the position of the photographer, that is, in the position of the camera, because the photographer, like the visitor, has already abandoned the room.*³¹

Yet the camera is also associated with the window of the house: 'With Le Corbusier the erected man behind Perret's *porte-fenêtre* has been replaced by a photographic camera.'³² The camera ends up becoming the house itself, an objectified subject rather than a purely mechanical device, the interface between inside-outside, interior-exterior: 'But that which is transparent, like the glass in our window, also reflects (as becomes evident at night) the interior and superimposes it onto our vision of the exterior. The glass functions as a mirror when the camera obscura is lit.'³³ '[i]f the window is a lens, the house itself is a camera pointed at nature. [. . .] Just as the camera can be taken from Paris to the desert, the house can be taken from Poissy to Biarritz to Argentina.'³⁴ This transformation is reminiscent of a rule in screenwriting: the protagonist should transform in tandem with the development of the film's plot. The character 'goes through an arch'.³⁵ Thomas, the photographer in *Blow-Up*, is the epitome of such a transformation. Colomina's camera does the same. *Privacy and Publicity* can be described, therefore, as a compelling script and an excellent 'film'. The house becomes a communication machine, the materiality of the building completely dissolved. The architect ends up a producer of cultural objects, the building merely a

means of communication.

This review article has confronted Colomina with some of the same questions she directed at Loos and Le Corbusier. It has demonstrated not the unquestionable sophistication and ingenuity of her method, but the 'closed circuit' which is its consequence. Mass media, while embedded in contemporary everyday life, is a form of mediation and representation which is only indirectly related to lived experience or material reality. 'Architecture as a means of communication' is precisely the remedy prescribed by Charles Jencks to the discipline's ailments in the 1970s. Lost in the study of the media, the meaning, and the communicativeness of architecture is the ambition to reconstitute architecture as a social and material agency, and a discipline actively engaged with society. The demolition of postwar architecture in the West in recent decades is, arguably, the manifestation of a profound desire to obliterate the traces and memory of social democracy; similarly, the modernist belief in the power of architecture to transform society has not only been discredited, but rendered irrelevant by architects and critics. The work of architecture historians such as Beatriz Colomina is an expression of this troubling retreat from social concern, an expression which inevitably takes part in the 'cultural trajectory'.

Notes

1. See, for example, Felicity D. Scott, 'Acid Visions', *Grey Room*, 23, 2006, pp. 22-39; Catherine de Smets, *Le Corbusier, Architect of Books* (Baden: Lars Muller Publishers, 2006); Christine Boyer has closely studied 'the big books of architecture' - the publications of firms such as OMA and MVRDV; see also the recent exhibition curated by Beatriz Colomina, and now a book, 'Clip, Stamp, Fold: The Radical Architecture of Little Magazines of 196X-197X'.
2. Adrian Forty, *Words and Buildings: A Vocabulary of Modern Architecture* (London: Thames and Hudson, 2000), pp. 11-15.
3. Beatriz Colomina, *Privacy and Publicity: Modern Architecture as Mass Media* (Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press, 1994).
4. Charles Jencks, *The Language of Post-Modern Architecture* (London: Academy Editions, 1977); Colin Rowe and Fred Koetter, *Collage City* (Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press, 1983); Colin Rowe, *The Mathematics of the Ideal Villa and Other Essays* (Cambridge, Mass.; London: MIT Press, 1987); Robert Venturi, *Complexity and Contradiction in Architecture* (New York: The Museum of Modern Art, 1977); Peter Eisenman, *Houses of Cards* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1987); Peter Eisenman, 'Notes on Conceptual Architecture: Towards a Definition', *Casabella*, 359-360, 1971, pp. 49-56; Peter Eisenman, 'Post-Functionalism', in *Architecture Theory since 1968*, ed. by K. Michael Hays (Cambridge, Mass.; London: MIT Press, 2000) pp. 236-39.
5. Cary Nelson & Lawrence Grossberg (eds.), *Marxism and the Interpretation of Culture* (Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 1988); Daniel Bell, *The Cultural Contradictions of Capitalism* (London: Heinemann, 1976); Jürgen Habermas, 'Modernity - an Incomplete Project', in *The Anti-Aesthetic: Essays on Postmodern Culture*, ed. by Hal Foster (New York: New Press, 1998), pp. 1-15; Jürgen Habermas, 'Modern and Postmodern Architecture', in *Rethinking Architecture: A Reader in Cultural Theory*, ed. by Neil Leach (London; New York: Routledge, 2002), pp. 227-35; Luc Boltanski and Ève Chiapello, *The New Spirit of Capitalism* (London; New York: Verso, 2005).
6. Roland Barthes, 'What Is Criticism?' (1963), in *Critical Essays* (Evaston: Northwestern University Press, 1972), p. 257.
7. Colomina, *Privacy and Publicity*, p. 15.
8. *Ibid.*, p. 159.
9. *Ibid.*, p. 14.
10. *Ibid.*, p. 159.
11. Walter Benjamin, 'The Author as Producer', in *Thinking Photography*, ed. by Victor Burgin (London: Macmillan Press, 1982), p. 17.
12. Colomina, *Privacy and Publicity*, p. 289.
13. *Ibid.*, p. 335.
14. *Ibid.*, p. 289.
15. *Ibid.*, p. 42.
16. E. H. Gombrich, *Symbolic Images: Studies in the Art of the Renaissance* (London: Phaidon, 1972), p. 6.
17. Robin Evans, 'In Front Lines That Leave Nothing Behind', in *Architecture Theory Since 1968*, ed. by K. Michael Hays (Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press, 1998), p. 482.
18. Colomina, *Privacy and Publicity*, pp. 13-14.
19. Roland Barthes, 'The Eiffel Tower', in *Rethinking Architecture: A Reader in Cultural Theory*, ed. by Neil Leach (London; New York: Routledge, 2002), p. 175.
20. Manfredo Tafuri, in Beatriz Colomina, *Privacy and Publicity*, p. 303.
21. Barthes, 'The Eiffel Tower', p. 176.
22. Seymour Chatman, *Antonioni: or, the Surface of the World* (LA: University of California Press, 1985), p. 3.
23. [The draughtsman's mechanical] 'grid is the most ubiquitous emblem of the film's concern with restricted vision', Amy Lawrence, *The Films of Peter Greenaway* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997), p. 51.
24. Colomina, *Privacy and Publicity*, p. 296.
25. *Ibid.*, pp. 301-03.
26. *Ibid.*, p. 293.
27. *Ibid.*, p. 38.
28. *Ibid.*, p. 312.
29. *Ibid.*, p. 323.
30. 'Surrealist photography was to become the photography of the camera-as-prosthetic-device.' Rosalind E.

Krauss, 'Photography's Exquisite Corpse', in *In The Mind's Eye: Dada and Surrealism*, ed. by T.A.R. Neff (Chicago: Museum of Contemporary Art, 1985), p. 44; 'Alter ego: 1. A second self. 2. A very close and intimate friend (Latin: other self).' *Collins English Dictionary* (London: William Collins Sons & Co., 1982).

31.Colomina, *Privacy and Publicity*, p. 327.

32.Ibid., p. 311.

33.Ibid., p. 80.

34.Ibid., p. 312.

35.See, for example, Robert McKee, *Story: Substance, Structure, Style and the Principles of Screenwriting* (New York: Regan Books/HarperCollins, 1997).

Acknowledgement

This review article is based on a paper written at the Bartlett, UCL, in 2002, for an MSc. History and Theory course directed by Adrian Forty.

Biography

Tahl Kaminer received a PhD at the Technical University of Delft for his research tying architecture to the social via the 1970s disciplinary crisis, and, previously, an MSc. in Architecture History and Theory at the Bartlett, UCL (2003). He is a founding member of 66 East, Centre for Urban Culture, an Amsterdam-based foundation involved in the study of the urban environment, and a practicing architect. He has recently co-edited the NAI publication *Houses in Transformation*.