

lacking the heroic scale of Levittown, Longstreth offers deeply contextualized readings. United by a disparaged, loosely modernist visual order, he explores their design histories, the motivations of those who built them, and how residents, businesses, and local officials have used and looked after them. His treatment of these places makes clear that daily life, local patterns, and social experience all serve as important criteria for evaluating historic worth. Here, we see most vividly how Longstreth aligns himself with J. B. Jackson and others in the cultural landscape tradition who believe the everyday matters. It is also where we see most clearly Longstreth's aspirations for how the nonmonumental can become operative in preservation. He does not merely remind us these kinds of sites are important. He points to the dearth of legal mechanisms, the development incentives, and, more fundamental, the lack of interest in such places on the part of most preservation professionals.

Resetting the course of preservation is demanding, and Longstreth sets an ambitious agenda, not only to expand our conception of worthy objects and ensembles but also to scrutinize the assumptions of preservationists, historians, and other like-minded practitioners. Examples of such new approaches are to be found. Several are included in the insightful *Cultural Landscapes*, a 2008 collection edited by Longstreth.¹ Another is a pedestrian mall that Randall Mason and others have written about that the city of New York devised in the 1970s to “clean up” Brooklyn’s “once thriving” Fulton Street department store district. It was realized, in fits and starts and with considerable racial and economic tensions, over the next three decades. In the process Fulton literally became an odd hybrid of urban interventions—a bus lane, new signage and street furniture, new commercial tenants—and, through it all, continued to serve as a regional destination for the city’s increasingly nonwhite working class. Starting in the mid-2000s, projects by various non-profit groups and local organizations chal-

lenged the view of the mall as blighted. Using interviews and archival work to find value in the unconventional scales, types, and tenures of business and in the importance of quasi-commercial activities and events, the agency of once invisible actors was recognized. The result was a new kind of plan that proposed neither restoration nor wholesale makeover but incremental enhancement. In this case, preservation found its way into socially situated planning proposals—that is, into political actions.²

In their clarity, rigor, and broad reach, the essays in *Looking beyond the Icons* confirm the wisdom Longstreth has gained through his distinguished career in preservation, landscape studies, and architectural history. But doing justice to such a legacy requires asking even more of preservation than the book seems to ask. Indeed, preservation must look beyond the icon, but it must also struggle further with conceptions of value, with the field’s place among other discourses of the built environment, and with its role in a system almost wholly grounded in the marketplace.

AUTHOR BIOGRAPHY

David Smiley is assistant director of the Urban Design Program at Columbia University’s Graduate School of Architecture, Planning, and Preservation and author of *Pedestrian Modern: Architecture and Shopping, 1925–1956* (Minnesota, 2013).

NOTES

1. Richard Longstreth, ed., *Cultural Landscapes: Balancing Nature and Heritage in Preservation Practice* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2008). See also Arnold R. Alanen and Robert Z. Melnick, eds., *Preserving Cultural Landscapes in America* (Baltimore, Md.: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2000).

2. Vicki Weiner and Randall Mason, *Fulton Street Mall: New Strategies for Preservation and Planning* (Brooklyn, N.Y.: Pratt Center for Community Development, 2006); Rosten Woo and Meredith TenHoor with Damon Rich, *Street Value: Shopping, Planning, and Politics at Fulton Mall*

(New York: Princeton Architectural Press, 2010). See also Randall Mason, “Theoretical and Practical Arguments for Values-Centered Preservation,” *CRM Journal* (Summer 2006): 21–48.

**Henri Lefebvre; Łukasz Stanek, editor;
Robert Bononno, translator**
Toward an Architecture of Enjoyment

Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2014.

lxi + 248 pages, 22 black-and-white illustrations (black-and-white and color in the Kindle edition).

ISBN: 978-081-667719-1, \$84.00 HB

ISBN: 978-081-667720-7, \$29.95 PB

Kindle, \$15.49

Review by Olga Touloumi

One of the most prolific and influential philosophers of the twentieth century, Henri Lefebvre transformed how we understand the built environment, discussing space as a social product. In his writings, he pioneered a widely influential Marxist perspective that called for a reconsideration of everyday life and the ordinary and a rejection of more conceptual and abstract approaches. The English translation of his seminal *The Production of Space* in 1991, in particular, provoked new discussions about the built environment throughout the humanities and especially in the social sciences. Yet while also widely employed by architectural and urban historians, these writings seemed to have surprisingly little to say specifically about buildings, framing architecture instead as inherently compliant to the forces of capitalism and the structural principles of division of labor, class hierarchy, and accumulation of wealth. *Toward an Architecture of Enjoyment* complicates these assumptions.

The core of the book is an unpublished eponymous essay written in 1973 and recently rediscovered by Łukasz Stanek, an architectural historian who has researched and written extensively on Lefebvre’s theories and their impact on the post–World War II built environment.¹ Edited by Stanek and translated

by Robert Bononno, who also did Lefebvre's *The Urban Revolution* (2003), the revived text illuminates a more expansive understanding of architecture as a spatial practice of the everyday, foregrounding individualized and vernacular approaches while highlighting the role of minor actors in the production of space.² Framing the essay is a forward by Stanek outlining the circumstances of his discovery entitled "A Manuscript Found in Saragossa" and an introduction in which Stanek explores, among other things, the historical conditions surrounding the production of the manuscript, bringing it in dialogue with its postwar French context of *grand ensembles* (modernist housing estates) and other architectural experiments, and the Programme commun du gouvernement (Common program of government) and the effort to include public opinion in urban planning—the subject of Kenny Cupers's recent *The Social Project* (2014).³

Toward an Architecture of Enjoyment began as a collaboration between Lefebvre and Mario Gaviria, a renowned sociologist who, like Lefebvre, dedicated his career to developing a Marxist theory of space. While researching touristic development in Spain, Gaviria commissioned Lefebvre to write an essay on "the architecture of pleasure." The two saw a revolutionary potential in leisure that the French left and in particular the Communist party dismissed as irrelevant to the Marxist social project. For Gaviria and Lefebvre, however, the concept of leisure as time spent outside the framework of capitalist production and consumption could radically unsettle class hierarchies and divisions of labor. But instead of a chapter on the particulars of the built environment of tourism, Lefebvre delivered a lengthy theoretical exposé on *jouissance*, or enjoyment—a concept that Bononno meticulously examines in a helpful translator's note as distinct and separate from its common psychoanalytic framings. Lefebvre separated the milieu of tourism from the idea of leisure while opening up the field of architecture to discussions of

bodily experience, participation, and individual spatial interventions. Not knowing what to make of the text, Gaviria buried it within his personal archives, where Stanek unearthed it in 2008.

Lefebvre's critique starts where Gaviria's expectations ended. Unlike Gaviria, Lefebvre draws a hard line between mass tourism and spaces of leisure. For Lefebvre mass tourism and the architecture produced to serve it constitute products of capitalism. Building programs typically associated with leisure, such as nightclubs, discotheques, and casinos, obey and reinforce the principles of capital accumulation. He distinguishes the buildings, however, from spaces of leisure, which materialize only outside the framework of capitalism, when the act of enjoyment does not feed back into the loop of surplus value production. In short, Lefebvre asks his reader to "not confuse the enjoyment of a space and the space of enjoyment" (52). He maintains that places like cloisters, Buddhist monasteries, ancient Greek temples, and the Baths of Diocletian exemplify a true architecture of enjoyment, while condemning entertainment venues, countryside vernaculars, Nicholas Schoeffer's Center for Sexual Relaxation, and the works of Claude Nicolas Ledoux, Gustave Eiffel, and Auguste Perret as a "caricature of enjoyment" (101).

His theory employs a dialectical model of thinking. On the one hand, Lefebvre places technocrats, capitalism, urban development, consumption, functionalism, and knowledge production as the epiphenomena of modernity. At the opposite pole he situates nature, the human subject-as-body, and sensations. Nature holds an especially prominent position. As Stanek remarks, Lefebvre calls for a new conceptualization of our relationship with nature that resists the exploitation of touristic development. Most of the architectural examples he offers, by contrast, articulate new encounters with the environment, where the senses rather than thought drive the experience. Resonating with a long intellectual tradition that positions modernization

as an act of alienation from nature, Lefebvre argues an architecture of enjoyment is more likely to take place at the countryside than in the city. Building on the myth of an unmediated nature, he articulates the natural environment in terms of a tabula rasa, where function and program are not already inscribed in form and where nature's "qualitative properties"—sun, water, sand, snow—are widely available (100).

Although conceived as an essay, Lefebvre's text maintains the structure of a book, with subchapters mapping out the concept of enjoyment in a variety of academic disciplines, including philosophy, anthropology, semiology, and economics, as well as architecture. Surprisingly, geography and urban studies are absent. The reason for this, according to Lefebvre, is scale. For him, furniture, buildings, and landscapes constitute potential sites of enjoyment, or leisure, in a way that cities and regions cannot. Behind these choices lies a belief that enjoyment constitutes primarily a personal affair that is in conflict with the interests of the commercial and industrial networks that inform centrally administered urban planning, or the "quantitative space of production and consumption" that drives urbanization (100). Instead, for Lefebvre the architecture of enjoyment is to be found in subjective encounters with nature, bodily experience, and bottom-up spatial practices, sites that often constitute the subject matter of anthropology, psychology, and philosophy.

The central preoccupations of the text are the meaning of "enjoyment," its role in shaping the built environment, and, paralleling Lefebvre's other writings, its potential as a liberating corrective to welfare-state modernism in architecture, at least as deployed in postwar Europe. This is apparent even in Lefebvre's title, which echoes Le Corbusier's celebrated manifesto *Vers une architecture*. Lefebvre's main critique centers on the myth of functionalism and the wide range of architectural programs it had permeated by the 1960s, from entertainment venues to social housing. "Function dominates, asserts itself,

is on display; it is function that signifies,” he claims, arguing that when the production of the built environment follows the directives of predetermined functions, then leisure and individuality succumb to the drives of capitalism (19).

But in the architecture of enjoyment, Lefebvre identifies an opportunity to challenge and evade modernism’s deterministic model of spatial production. Lefebvre assumes that a focus on the rhythms of the body can unsettle the pace of capitalism, contaminating with operational ambiguity and uncertainty modernity’s obsession with utilitarianism and functionality. He proposes the architecture of enjoyment as a type of utopia. For him the utopian impulse, the desire to install and implement an ideal social organization, imbues all attempts to produce space, including capitalistic ones. “There is no plan without utopia,” he claims (147). Within this context Lefebvre distinguishes between the “abstract utopias” of postwar welfare state-led urbanization that aspires to install totalities and the “concrete” or “negative utopia” of the architecture of enjoyment that negates them, as well as “the State and the primacy of the political” (148).

Although untangling enjoyment from the tourism–entertainment complex is relevant to many debates today—for example, on the recent privatization of southern European coasts, access to the beachfront in places such as Malibu, California, and the Disneyfication of Times Square—in places Lefebvre’s essay feels dated. He uses the female body, the exotic orient, and the fantasy of unspoiled nature to exemplify his vision of enjoyment, reinforcing the very same divisions he wishes to abolish. This orientalism and sexism highlights the problematic state of Marxist thought in the late postwar era and its complicated relationship with questions of race and gender. To focus on the trees, however, is to lose sight of the forest. When read as a historical artifact, *Toward an Architecture of Enjoyment* not only provides critical insight into Lefebvre, whose impact is still palpable,

but reveals new connections between his ideas and design and, ultimately, capitalism and the built environment.

AUTHOR BIOGRAPHY

Olga Touloumi is assistant professor of art history at Bard College, where she teaches architectural history.

NOTES

1. For a more detailed analysis of Lefebvre’s work on space, see Łukasz Stanek, *Henri Lefebvre on Space: Architecture, Urban Research, and the Production of Theory* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2011); Łukasz Stanek, Christian Schmid, and Ákos Moravánszky, eds., *Urban Revolution Now: Henri Lefebvre in Social Research and Architecture* (Burlington, Vt.: Ashgate Publishing, 2014).

2. Henri Lefebvre, *The Urban Revolution*, trans. Robert Bononno (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2003).

3. Kenny Cupers, *The Social Project: Housing Postwar France* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2014).

Katherine A. Bussard, Alison Fisher, and Greg Foster-Rice, editors

The City Lost and Found: Capturing New York, Chicago, and Los Angeles, 1960–1980

Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Art Museum, 2015.
272 pages, 250 black-and-white and color illustrations.
ISBN: 978-030-020785-9, \$50.00 HB

Review by Benjamin Holtzman

In the late 1960s on Chicago’s West Side, an African American gang called the Vice Lords turned away from turf battles and street fights. Concerned about the example that members were setting for neighborhood youth and believing that gang infighting perpetuated larger racial and economic oppressions, the group sought to improve relations among neighborhood gangs while also participating in actions for civil and economic rights and developing

black-owned businesses. It announced its transformation with a new name: Conservative Vice Lords, Inc. Social justice filmmaker DeWitt Beall’s 1970 documentary *Lord Thing* chronicles this struggle for political viability in an illuminating representation of life during the decades of America’s urban crisis.¹

Lord Thing is just one of the dozens of projects undertaken by city dwellers from a variety of backgrounds in Chicago, Los Angeles, and New York during the tumultuous 1960s and 1970s discussed in the visually absorbing volume *The City Lost and Found*. The book, which complements an exhibit of the same name in 2014 and 2015 at the Art Institute of Chicago and the Princeton University Art Museum, includes 250 images (many in color), twenty-six short essays by an interdisciplinary array of scholars, and three longer essays. Together, they explore initiatives by urban artists, activists, and planners who aimed to transform, in the words of editors Katherine Bussard, Alison Fisher, and Greg Foster-Rice, “conditions of crisis into provocative and visually compelling statements about the culture, landscape, and politics of the three largest cities in the United States” (10).

The striking visual material—including photography, planning documents, popular media, community organizing publications, and stills from films (feature and documentary) and performance art—creates a fascinating collage of city life during the upending 1960s and 1970s. Collectively, it addresses three broad themes. The first, preservation, reflects the call made by many urban dwellers to prevent further social and physical disintegration of their neighborhoods. The second, demonstration, includes a range of politicized art along with photography and cinematic representations of protests and uprisings. The third, renewal, encompasses projects that proposed specific solutions to urban problems along with more sweeping reimaginings of urban life.

The City Lost and Found is hardly the first volume to highlight how residents of U.S. cities undertook creative initiatives to comment